UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE
SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

NOTICE OF MEETING
TELECONFERENCE OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Wednesday, February 15, 2012
11:00 am - 1:00 pm
To participate in the teleconference, contact your divisional Senate office for the location
of a central meeting place.
If you are off-campus, you may call 1-866-740-1260 and key in access code 9879467#.

I.   Roll Call
2011-12 Assembly Roll Call February 15, 2012

President of the University:
Mark G. Yudof

Academic Council Members:
Robert Anderson, Chair
Robert Powell, Vice Chair
Robert Jacobson, Chair, UCB
Linda Bisson, Chair, UCD
Craig Martens, Chair, UCI
Andrew Leuchter, Chair, UCLA
Susan Amussen, Chair UCM
Mary Gauvain, Chair, UCR
Joel Sobel, Chair, UCSD
Robert Newcomer, Chair, UCSF
Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB
Susan Gilman, Chair, UCSC
William Jacob, Chair, BOARS
Rachael Goodhue, Chair, CCGA
Margaret Conkey, Chair, UCAAD
Katja Lindenberg, Chair, UCAP
Jose Wudka, Chair, UCEP
William Parker, Chair, UCFW
John Crawford, Chair, UCORP
James Chalfant, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (6)
Christina Maslach (alt. for Steven Beissinger)
Paula Fass (alt. for Daniel Boyarin)
Philip Stark (alt. for Ralph Catalano)
Allen Goldstein
Jeffrey Perloff
Patricia Zambryski

Davis (6)
Trish Berger
Theodore DeJong
Richard Grotjahn
Joseph Kiskis
Krishnan Nambiar
Saul Schaefer

Irvine (4)
Christopher Leslie
Tahseen Mozaffar
Carrie Noland
Charles Zender

Los Angeles (8)
Malcolm Gordon
Timothy Lane
Alan Laub
Susanne Lohmann
Joseph Nagy
Jesse Rissman
Monica Smith
Richard Steinberg

Merced (1)
Wolfgang Rogge

Riverside (2)
Jodie Holt
Thomas Morton

San Diego (5)
John Hildebrand
Douglas Magde
Lorraine Pillus
Peter Wagner
Eric Watkins

San Francisco (3)
Farid Chehab
David Gardner
Wendy Max

Santa Barbara (3 -1 TBA)
John Foran
Vicki Scott

Santa Cruz (2)
Joseph Konopelski
Marilyn Walker

Secretary/Parliamentarian
Jean Olson

1

MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

June 8, 2011
MINUTES OF MEETING

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met via teleconference on Wednesday, June 8, 2011 by teleconference. Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Senate Executive Director Martha Winnacker called the roll of Assembly members and confirmed that there was a quorum. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of the April 13, 2011 meeting as noticed.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Budget. Chair Simmons reported that the legislature has not reached a compromise on the state budget. There has been some resistance to the cuts proposed by UCOP to programs funded centrally via legislative earmarks. At the direction of the president, UCOP staff is developing a five-year budget plan. It models the interdependence of levels of state funds and student tuition and aims to stabilize resources so that the University can rationally plan for the future. The model assumes, in a best case scenario, that the state budget allocation will grow by 8% a year and tuition will increase by 8% per year. The plan includes 3% annual merit increases for non-represented employees in addition to regular merits for faculty. Chair Simmons, Vice Chair Anderson and UCAP Chair Palazoglu are participating in a joint Senate-Administration task force that is discussing how to implement any salary increases for faculty.

Online Pilot Project. The Academic Council recently issued two letters regarding the progress of the online pilot project. Council recommended continuing the development of online courses for UC students with the goal of maintaining quality and increasing access. However, it recommended that the pilot be limited to the 29 courses already approved until a market evaluation ensuring that costs can be recovered and evaluations of the courses, themselves, are completed. All courses will be approved through the regular processes of campus course committees. The Senate will need to revise its regulations in order to accommodate systemwide online classes.

Rebenching. The rebenching of state general funds complements the Funding Streams budgetary reform. The joint Senate-Administrative rebenching task force is currently considering ideas generated by the Academic Council's Implementation Task Force and has requested detailed modeling of some of these ideas. Some chancellors wish to have the flexibility to set enrollment, salaries, and fees in order to maintain excellence. Chair Simmons stated that in his remarks to the Regents, he had stated that it is our commitment to the concept of UC as one university operating on ten campuses committed to the same standard of excellence that has made the University

great. In many respects, the Senate has operated as the guardian of UC as a system. The success of each of our campuses is built on this unified system; research excellence and the quality of a UC education should be the same, regardless of location. Students are admitted based on a common set of requirements. The approval of programs is based on the need for the programs across the system. Chair Simmons stated that we should not become ten campuses competing in the marketplace. Flexibility is important, but we must not allow budgetary exigencies to dissolve the glue that holds us together as a system by disregarding the fundamental values that sustain our collective excellence.

IV.   ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST

Provost and Executive Vice President Pitts stated that UCOP is attempting to reduce the funding of central programs in order to reduce the net cut to each campus. UCOP staff also is considering "bridging strategies" to deal with the cuts and supplement operating expenses. He noted that the administration is discussing how to implement the faculty salary increase, particularly whether all or only a portion of it should be applied to the salary scales, and whether some of it should be reserved for recruitment and retention.

The provost reported that he has visited four campuses so far (Berkeley, Davis, Santa Cruz and Los Angeles) to meet with faculty about the online pilot project. Faculty were engaged and interested in developing online education, but they want it done carefully. There is some concern among the faculty about the change in the funding strategy. The president approved a loan through the C3 program, which funds cross-campus collaborations such as the new payroll system and UC Student Health Insurance Program. It operates like a line of credit. Quarterly milestones must be met for continued funding. It is a good investment.

The University is studying how to recruit international students in the most cost effective way across all of the campuses. Part of the strategy will be to recruit from US high schools with populations of international students. UCOP will coordinate teams to visit these schools. Another strategy being considered is to employ EAP offices in the recruitment effort.

Provost Pitts asked Assembly members to convey to him anecdotes about faculty recruitment and retention cases. Indicators do not show a decline in UC competitiveness. The data that UCOP has collected on UC competitiveness for faculty has not changed much in the past two to three years; UC remains successful in about 75% of its recruitments and retentions. But the EVCs feel that there are increasing numbers of institutions that are trying to recruit UC faculty. There is a very high cost to retention failures.

Q: Is the University still using the Comparison 8 to evaluate salary competitiveness?
A: Yes. There has been a slight decline in the competitiveness of our salaries with respect to the Comparison 8. They are 12% lower in the aggregate and the biggest gap is at the Associate Professor rank. Provost Pitts said that UCOP hopes that 5 years of 3% increases will help the University reduce that gap.

Q: Are you collecting information on recruitment and retention from the EVCs and if so, will you share it with the Academic Council? Data should consider other threats to quality, e.g., the relationship between the increasing student-faculty ratio and faculty productivity.
A: Provost Pitts stated that UCOP receives the information from the Vice Provosts for Academic

Personnel and that he would be happy to share this information. He noted that lagging indicators such as the number of new members of the National Academy of Sciences and the number of grants to young faculty do not indicate a decline in quality.

Q: Is it true that the Regents believe that state support will decline and that UC should plan to receive no state funds?
A: Provost Pitts responded that this not generally thought to be the case. UC brings so much value to the state, the legislature will continue to provide some funding. However, no source of money other than tuition can replace state funding. He noted that UCOP is doing all it can to increase and enhance state support for higher education.

V.   SPECIAL ORDERS
The apportionment of representatives to the 2011-12 Academic Assembly was presented as an information item. Representation is as follows: UCB 6; UCD 6; UCI 4; UCLA 8; UCM 1; UCR 2; UCSD 5; UCSF 3; UCSB 3; UCSC 2.

VI.   REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

VII.   REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A.   Academic Council
1. The Academic Council appointed Professor Shane White (UCLA) to the UCRS Advisory Board. This was presented as an information item.
2. The Assembly elected UCOC Vice Chair Stanley Awramik (UCSB) as Chair and Professor Mitchell Sutter (UCD) as Vice Chair of UCOC.
3. Draft Legislative Ruling 6.11.A. addressing the definition of "residence" was presented as an information item.
4. Draft Legislative Ruling 6.11.B regarding the eligibility of an associate dean to serve as a member of the Assembly was presented as an information item.
5. Draft Legislative Ruling 6.11.C. regarding the scholarship requirements for undergraduate students was presented as an information item.
6. Draft Legislative Ruling 6.11.D about voting rights of *Ex officio* members of Senate committees was presented as an information item.
7. Draft Legislative Ruling 6.11.E on the relationship of the Academic Senate with faculties of schools and colleges offering postbaccalaureate, first professional degree programs leading to the award of M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., D.Pharm. and J.D. degrees was presented as an information item.

VIII.   UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [NONE]

IX.   PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

X.   UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XI.   NEW BUSINESS [NONE]

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 am.

Attest: Daniel Simmons, Academic Senate Chair
Minutes Prepared by: Clare Sheridan, Academic Senate Analyst

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of June 8, 2011

President of the University:
Mark Yudof (absent)
Lawrence Pitts (alternate for Mark Yudof)

Academic Council Members:
Daniel Simmons, Chair
Robert Anderson, Vice Chair
Fiona Doyle, Chair, UCB
Robert Powell (absent)
Craig Martens, Chair-elect, UCI (alternate for Alan Barbour)
Ann Karagozian, Chair, UCLA
Evan Heit, Chair UCM
Mary Gauvain, Chair, UCR
Frank Powell, Chair, UCSD
Elena Fuentes-Afflick, Chair, UCSF
Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB
Susan Gillman, Chair, UCSC (absent)
William Jacob, Chair, BOARS
James Carmody, Chair, CCGA
Francis Lu, Chair, UCAAD (absent)
Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair, UCAP
David Kay, Chair, UCEP
Joel Dimsdale, Chair, UCFW
Phokion Kolaitis, Chair, UCORP
James Chalfant, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (5)
Steven Beissinger (absent)
Ralph Catalano
Suzanne Fleiszig (alternate for Mary Ann Mason)
Robert Jacobsen (alternate for Bernard Sadoulet)
Theodore Slaman

Davis (6)
Richard Grotjahn
Joel Haas
Joseph Kiskis
Brian Mulloney
Linda Bisson (alternate for Terence Murphy)
Krishnan Nambiar

Irvine (4)
Luis Aviles

Ulysses Jenkins
Tahseen Mozaffar
Charles Zender

Los Angeles (8)
Linda Sarna (alternate for Paula Diaconescu)
Malcolm Gordon
Jody Kreiman
Timothy Lane
Warren Grundfest (alternate for Duncan Lindsey)
Susanne Lohmann
James Miller (alternate for Purnima Mankekar)
Joseph Nagy

Merced (1)
Ignacio Lopez-Calvo

Riverside (2)
Thomas Morton (absent)
Albert Wang

San Diego (5 – 2 TBA)
Timothy Bigby (absent)
Lorraine Pillus
Peter Wagner (?)

San Francisco (4)
Farid Chehab
David Gardner
Deborah Greenspan
Wendy Max

Santa Barbara (3)
Ralph Armbruster (absent)
Gayle Binion
John Foran (absent)

Santa Cruz (2)
Joseph Konopelski
Marilyn Walker

Secretary/Parliamentarian
Jean Olson

4

III.   ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT
        Mark G. Yudof

IV.   ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR
        Robert M. Anderson

V.   SPECIAL ORDERS

      A.   Consent Calendar [NONE]
      B.   Annual Reports (2010-11)

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
ANNUAL REPORT 2010-11

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE: The Academic Council is the executive committee of the Assembly of the Academic Senate and acts on behalf of the Assembly on non-legislative matters. It advises the President on behalf of the Assembly and has the continuing responsibility through its committee structure to investigate and report to the Assembly on matters of Universitywide concern.

During the 2010-11 year, the Academic Council considered multiple initiatives, proposals, and reports. Its final recommendations and reports can be found on the [Academic Senate website](). Matters of particular import for the year include:

RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FUTURE OF UC

This year, the Academic Council expended a great deal of effort discussing and formulating long-term, strategic responses to the ongoing budgetary challenges facing the University, including advising on major changes in post-employment benefits. Building on its commentary on recommendations emerging from the Commission on the Future throughout 2009-10, in July 2010, Council created a Special Committee on a Plan for UC (the "Powell Committee") to develop a comprehensive plan for the University of California that would address ongoing revenue shortfalls due to reductions in state funding. All of the faculty who participated on the Commission on the Future Workgroups, plus the two faculty who served as members of the Commission, were invited to participate in the work of the committee, and 24 of those invited joined in the effort. Upon receiving the [Powell Committee report]() in January 2011, Council formed an Implementation Task Force to provide advice on how to implement the Powell report recommendations. The [Implementation Task Force]() issued its final report in July 2011. Council endorsed 23 recommendations that constitute a plan for managing the size of the University while leaving campuses with flexibility to manage their enrollments.

BUDGETARY ISSUES

As noted above, budgetary matters predominated this year. In the early fall, the provost hosted a budgetary summit to familiarize all Senate committee and divisional chairs with the fiscal challenges facing the University. The Senate began the year by endorsing an administration proposal to [rename]() "fees" as "tuition," which was recommended by the Commission of the Future, and was subsequently approved by the Regents. The Senate also reviewed and commented on the administration's [Funding Streams]() proposal. While Council was supportive of the principles of Funding Streams, it expressed several concerns, chief among them that the "rebenching" of state general funds—the second phase of budget reform—should occur as soon as possible, and that an enrollment management system should be devised to counter certain incentives of Funding Streams. In June, Council issued a [resolution]() advising the President to request that the Regents increase mandatory systemwide charges effective in fall 2011 in an amount sufficient to offset a new reduction of $150 million in State funding in the state's final 2011-2012 budget. In July, Council adopted a [resolution]() advising the President that the total reduction for 2011-12 of $650 million in state funding should be allocated among the campuses under the methodology for allocating reductions laid out in the Funding Streams proposal. The Funding Streams proposal had recommended different formulas for allocating state funding augmentations and

reductions to the campuses based on the campuses' differential abilities to make up reductions with other revenue sources such as nonresident tuition and professional degree supplemental tuition.

Several Council members also participated on a joint Senate-administrative committee to discuss rebenching the allocation of state general funds per student. The report of the Implementation Task Force provides one approach to rebenching and was distributed to the Rebenching Committee for consideration. A subset of Council members also participated in regular teleconferences held by Provost Pitts to brief them on budget issues.

FACULTY WELFARE

In 2010-11, the Senate played a significant role in shaping a change in post-employment benefits. In 2009-10, Senate members served on the President's Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits, which issued a recommendation for restructuring pension and retiree health benefits at the end of August. The faculty and staff members issued a dissenting statement and requested that the president also consider "Option C," an alternative proposal that the Task Force discussed, but did not include as an option in its recommendation. The president agreed to consider this alternative, and Senate Divisions and committees provided comment, favoring the option put forward by the faculty and staff. President Yudof recommended a modified version of Option C to the Regents, and in November Council endorsed this recommendation and also adopted a resolution calling for funding the employer contributions to UCRP on the state funded compensation base by borrowing from the Short Term Investment Pool.

In 2010-11 a joint UCAP-UCFW-UCPB committee developed three recommendations to restore competitiveness to UC's salary scales, which Council adopted in November 2010. However, in December, the Assembly of the Academic Senate asked Council to continue its deliberations as new information about budget scenarios became available, and because President Yudof indicated that he preferred that increases be linked to individual merit. Council revisited its recommendations at its meeting on December 15 and recommended to the president an increment for faculty who received a favorable merit review sometime in the past five years, as well as those at the Step V and IX barrier steps; the recommendation called for the increment to be applied to the salary scales but not to the off-scale increment. Although Council's first choice was to apply increases to the salary scales across the board based on the individual's rank and step, it lent its reluctant support for the plan's restricted eligibility, based on the urgent need to address non-competitive salaries in the context of abnormal budgetary constraints. In August, President Yudof authorized a 3% merit-based salary increase for UC faculty effective October 1, 2011. The increase will apply to the base and off-scale components of salary and to Above-Scale salaries and will be awarded to all ladder-rank faculty who received a positive merit review in the past four years, those at the Professor V and IX "barrier" steps who had a satisfactory five year review, and those receiving satisfactory "no advancement" reviews at Associate and Full Professor ranks. However, the Senate maintains its position that the salary scales themselves reflect merit and that restoration of their competitiveness is critical to UC's continued excellence and its identity as one university with ten campuses.

2

ADMISSIONS

In December, Council endorsed a draft administration resolution on admissions which was subsequently approved by the Regents in January. The resolution advocated expanding the use of single score holistic review to all of the campuses, but allowed for other methods to be used as long as they produce similar results.

In May, Council endorsed a metric developed by BOARS to determine the staffing required to complete review, selection, recruitment, and yield efforts to implement the new freshman eligibility policy in order to ensure that application review under the new policy is done fairly and transparently.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

In January Council considered revisions to the existing policy on self-supporting graduate degree programs proposed by the administration. Responses to the review of the policy raised broad concerns about the impact of self-supporting programs on the University's core educational mission. Concerns included the need for stricter criteria for the establishment of SSPs, issues of faculty workload and fiscal viability, program quality, and the potential of new self supporting programs to drain resources from existing state-supported programs. In March, Council unanimously endorsed guidelines that CCGA developed for use by campus Graduate Councils and Committees on Planning and Budget in reviewing proposals for new Self-Supporting Programs. Iin June it endorsed CCGA's guidelines for the conversion of existing graduate degree programs from state-supported to self-supported status and from self-supported to state-supported status.

In July, at the request of the Chair of the Finance Committee of the Board of Regents, the Academic Council established a Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support. The Task Force will work with the administration to prepare a report to the Board of Regents on that subject.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

At the direction of the UC Commission on the Future, in February, Chair Simmons reported to the President on the Senate's efforts to facilitate transfer. In conjunction with the Provost's office, the Senate convened faculty and department chairs from all nine general campuses in seven of the most popular majors to discuss commonalities in the requirements for major preparation. In addition, Senate leadership continued to coordinate with its CSU and CCC counterparts through the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) to share understandings of the documentation required to support articulation of Community College courses for transfer to UC.

In April, Council learned that the administration planned to borrow money to fund the UC Online Pilot Project. Council issued a letter to the president requesting that the pilot not be expanded beyond the initially approved 29 pilot courses pending evaluation of the pilot. Subsequently, Senate divisions and committees raised significant concerns upon reviewing the Project Plan for UC Online Education, particularly regarding oversight, implementation, and the feasibility of the financial model for recovering UCOP's investment in the project. Thereafter, Senate leadership was invited to join with a small group of project proponents to monitor the progress of the project and explore implementation issues related to awarding credit across campuses, enrolling non-UC students, and ensuring that

courses are approved according to Senate policies and procedures. Senate representatives also participated in the evaluation of proposals for a common technology platform, and monitoring a market study. In addition, UCEP revised its policy on the approval for systemwide courses to encompass online courses.

RESEARCH ISSUES

In 2009-10, the Compendium was updated, with the exception of the section on MRUs. In July 2010, Council asked UCORP to develop a set of guidelines to address the governance of multicampus research entities. Working closely with staff from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, UCORP addressed the range of multicampus research entities and recommended categorizing multicampus research entities in two ways: Multicampus Research Units, with long-term research horizons, and Multicampus Research Programs, which are shorter-term research projects fully or partially funded by UCOP and limited to two funding cycles. In April 2011, Council endorsed UCORP's recommendations and referred them to the Academic Planning Council as a basis for rewriting that section of the Compendium.

In July, Council asked President Yudof to reconsider his decision to delegate authority to the San Diego Chancellor to determine whether to make human remains discovered on UCSD property available to researchers for study. Council maintained that for the determination would affect research throughout the University, and thus the decision should appropriately be made by UCOP, rather than being left to the discretion of a single campus. The President declined Council's request and affirmed the delegation of authority.

GOVERNANCE

In November, Council endorsed a white paper written by the Senate Directors describing the functions of divisional Senate offices and the resources necessary to carry out those functions. The President declined to instruct the Chancellors in this regard.

In January, Council requested that ANR halt the redirection of endowment funds that previously were used to support graduate students and faculty research pending full consultation with the relevant committees of the Academic Senate. In February Council approved a charge and membership guidelines for a new Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR) to review the mission and strategic objectives of the Division, and to consider issues related to the ANR budget, the Division's academic and capital planning, and the intersection of its academic and outreach missions. ACSCANR's first meeting was held in July 2011.

SENATE TASK FORCES AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Senate members participated on the following task forces and special committees:

- Joint Senate/Administrative Work Group on Rebenching
- UC Online Education Advisory Committee and Work Groups
- Joint Senate/Administrative Task Force on Salary Scales
- UC Merced Chancellor Search Committee

4

- Los Alamos National Laboratory Director Search Committee

REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS AND INITIATIVES

In addition to the proposals noted above (e.g., Funding Streams), the Senate conducted a systemwide review of the Library Planning Task Force Report. Divisional and committee responses emphasized: 1) greater consultation with faculty and faculty involvement in decisions regarding how best to use library resources is needed; and 2) the call for boycotting high-priced publications and publishing in open access journals can only be effected with institutional support and a change in the culture of the peer review system.

Council also wrote three letters (March 8, June 24 and August 15) to the administration regarding Working Smarter projects, all of which called for including faculty in developing and evaluating the projects. As a result, a Senate representative was named to the Working Smarter steering committee, Senate standing committees were invited to appoint participants to the Work Groups, and the administration plans to regularly report to the relevant standing committees on specific efficiency projects. Council also urged that Working Smarter projects be evaluated to ensure that they enhance productivity and save money without merely shifting administrative burden to faculty and other staff.

REVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MANUAL (APM)

Council reviewed and commented on proposed technical revisions to APM -075, Part III. C. 1; 110-4; 140-33-b.; 230-4; 230-17; 240-18; 240-20; 240-60; 246-18; 246-20; 246-60; 500-16. Council had no objections, but did make two suggestions to clarify the proposed language.

In addition, certain standing committees provided feedback on several targeted reviews (limiting feedback to relevant committees), and management reviews, which are initial reviews of draft language to be proposed, circulated for feedback prior to a full systemwide review. These included proposed revisions to APM 670 (Health Science Compensation Plan) and a proposed new APM 668 which would enable general campus faculty to negotiate part of their salary, similar to the provision in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan.

In January, Council adopted a resolution requesting administrative review of a revision to APM 010 and 015 (academic freedom). This revision was proposed by UCAF in response to court decisions that narrowed the scope of academic freedom by threatening the freedom of faculty to express opinions on institutional policy, which could in turn limit the effectiveness of shared governance. The proposed language was reviewed and endorsed by the Senate but has not yet been accepted by the Administration.

On the advice of UCAP, Council recommended to the Vice Provost of Academic Personnel that "above scale" be replaced by "distinguished professor" in the APM. Council also endorsed UCFW's request for a review of APM 510 on intercampus transfers.

RELATIONS WITH OTHER GOVERNING BODIES

<u>Joint Administrative/Senate Retreat</u>

5

The Academic Council meets in alternate years with the Chancellors and with the Executive Vice Chancellors to discuss matters of joint concern. This year, Council members met with the Executive Vice Chancellors in October to discuss: 1) salary scales; 2) post-employment benefits; and 3) funding of the 2012 admissions process under the new eligibility policy.

The Regents
The Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair executed their roles as faculty representatives to the Regents throughout the year, acting in an advisory capacity on Regents' Standing Committees, and to the Committee of the Whole. In addition, Regent Reiss attended the May Council meeting.

ICAS

The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates is a group representing the faculty Senates of the California Community Colleges, California State University, and the University of California. The group was particularly active in advocacy efforts in the state capitol and made multiple visits to legislators and other policymakers. It also cooperated in ongoing efforts to ease transfer between the CCCs and CSU or UC, including development of a CCC Associate Degree for Transfer.

SENATE POSITIONS ON STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATION

- The Senate opposed AB 7 (Portantino), which would prohibit a person employed by the state whose base salary is greater than $150,000 per year from receiving a salary increase or bonus while employed in the same position.
- The Senate opposed AB 620 (Block), which requested that the Regents adopt policies on harassment, intimidation, and bullying because a) the University already has policies and programs to ensure diversity; b) the bill stipulates training faculty to generate inclusive curricula, which violates principles of academic freedom; and c) it could impose unnecessary and costly compliance burdens.
- The Senate opposed AB 661 (Block) which would authorize the San Diego Community College District to establish a baccalaureate degree pilot program because it would violate the fundamental principles of California's Master Plan for Higher Education.
- The Senate opposed on the grounds of academic freedom AB 675 (Hagman), which would prevent state licensing boards from approving continuing education courses with "pro-labor" course content.
- The Senate urged the University to remain neutral on SB 185 (Hernandez) due to significant implementation difficulties, although it supports the bill's intent to provide campuses more flexibility to increase the diversity of their student bodies. SB 185 would authorize UC and CSU to "… consider race, gender, ethnicity, and national origin, along with other relevant factors, in undergraduate and graduate admissions."
- Deferring to what it believed was the University position, the Senate took a neutral position on SB 259 (Hancock), which would classify student workers whose work is related to their educational experience as "employees." Such a classification would make GSRs eligible for unionization. The Senate expressed concern about the educational effects of such a move on this class of graduate student worker.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Daniel Simmons, Chair
Robert Anderson, Vice Chair

Divisional Chairs:
Fiona Doyle, Berkeley
Robert Powell, Davis
Alan Barbour, Irvine
Ann Karagozian, Los Angeles
Evan Heit, Merced
Mary Gauvain, Riverside
Frank Powell, San Diego
Elena Fuentes-Afflick, San Francisco
Henning Bohn, Santa Barbara
Susan Gillman, Santa Cruz

Senate Committee Chairs:
William Jacob, BOARS
James Carmody, CCGA
Francis Lu, UCAAD
Ahmet Palazoglu, UCAP
David Kay, UCEP
Joel Dimsdale, UCFW
Phokion Kolaitis, UCORP
James Chalfant, UCPB

Council Staff:
Martha Winnacker, Executive Director
Todd Giedt, Associate Director
Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst

7

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) met once in Academic Year 2010-2011, to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 130. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Proposed Revisions to Definitions of Academic Freedom and Faculty Code of Conduct

In 2010, UCAF proposed amending APM 010-Academic Freedom and 015-Faculty Code of Conduct to reflect the right of faculty to freedom of speech in shared governance. The committee agreed to the importance of this following discussions about the Hong and Renken cases. The proposal to revise APMs 010 and 015 was submitted to the Academic Council and was sent out for systemwide review in fall 2010. Senate committees and Divisions supported the proposed changes, and the proposal was submitted to the Office of the President for a formal administrative review. In March 2011, UCAF met with Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel to discuss the changes. Vice Provost Carlson reported that the changes to the APM will be reviewed again, including a second Senate review. It is being reviewed by Office of General Counsel since specific language has been approved by Council. OGC is considering what the appropriate language should be and the president is also reviewing the proposed changes. The review at UCOP should be completed this spring.

Privacy and Security Initiative

In March, UCAF met with Stephen Lau, Policy Director, Information Resources and Communication to learn about UCOP's Privacy and Security Initiative. This 18 month initiative was started due to a number of information security breaches of personal information and UCOP decided to revisit how UC looks at privacy and security. Laws related to these issues have changed over recent years. The electronic communications policy is not up to day given changes like new social media platforms. Monitoring email is a slippery slope and how far this monitoring should go is one question. The needs of faculty need to be determined to ensure that any new policies or guidelines are viable. The Chair suggested that UCAF should request the opportunity to participate in the meetings and campus committees should be asked to weigh in as well. Director Lau invited the committee to provide feedback.

Research Using Animal Subjects

UCAF discussed issues related to researchers using animal subjects which is a particularly serious problem at UCLA. Federal and state legislation provides some degree of protection for researchers using animal subjects. However, these laws have not been applied and enforced as it seems that the FBI has not made this a priority and may lack needed resources. The committee suggested that regular forums about this issue attended by proponents and opponents of research on animal subjects could be one way to increase awareness and understanding. The problem is when people use violence to oppose research. UCAF proposed drafting a statement to be submitted to Council that condemns the use of violence. Members agreed that the purpose and benefits of the research could be clarified for the general public. At the systemwide level there could be a task force to put in place the policies needed to protect researchers which would give all of the campuses a structure.

Academic Freedom for Lecturers

UCAF discussed the issue of academic freedom for lecturers and whether the academic freedom of

lecturers should be considered on par with that of other faculty. The traditional rational for academic freedom is that tenure track and tenured faculty have been vetted in a way lecturers are not. Lecturers are not members of the Senate and are not reviewed in the same way. They have different responsibilities and rights than Senate members. It was suggested that academic freedom could be extended to lecturers with qualifications. There are a number of different types of lecturers so they would need to be treated differently. Members agreed that UCAF should determine who academic freedom generally applies to outside of UC. Another possibility is that tenure could be decoupled from academic freedom. This issue will be on UCAF's agenda for 2011-2012.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald Amundson, Chair (R)	Nancy Gallagher (SB)
Roberta Rehm, Vice Chair (SF)	Harold Pashler (SD)
Mary Beth Pudup (SC)	Gregory Miller (D)
Carole Uhlaner (I)	Cameron Gundersen (LA)
Erik Menke (M)	David Steigmann (B)
Piotr S. Gorecki (R)	
Danielle McManus, graduate student (D)	
Alexander Luong, undergraduate student (M)	

Dan Simmons ((D); Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Bob Anderson ((B); Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Brenda Abrams, Committee Analyst

2010-2011 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) had four meetings in Academic Year 2010-2011 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 135 to consider general policy on academic personnel, including salary scales, appointments and promotions, and related matters. The issues that UCAP considered this year are described briefly as follows:

Faculty Salary Scales Plan

Last year's joint committee of UCAP, UCPB and UCFW produced a report on the faculty salary scales and sent three recommendations to Council. The first two recommendations were endorsed by Council and the chairs of the three committees were asked to further discuss the third recommendation. UCAP discussed a revised recommendation for a range adjustment of 5%, applied to both base salaries and offscale increments. UCAP was in favor of raising faculty salaries in the context of the salary scales. In December, Council voted to (1) Support a merit-based increment added to the salary scales for persons who have received a merit in the past 5 years but not to apply raises to the off-scale increment.

Downsizing by Attrition

UCAP was asked to look at the impact of faculty downsizing. CAPs' duties may be affected if there is a decrease in faculty numbers. Teaching requirements may increase, and research output may suffer as a consequence. The evaluation of faculty would have to take such changes into account. UC may be unable to recruit and retain excellent faculty, both because of downsizing and because budgets may not allow competitive remuneration. UCAP supported the principle that faculty downsizing to the point needed to be competitive for a world class faculty may be necessary even at the cost of increasing the use of lecturers to cover the increased teaching duties.

Post-Employment Benefits

UCAP discussed the proposed changes to post employment benefits. This is an important contributor to UC competitiveness because the generous UC pensions have always been an essential component of the faculty compensation package.

Senate Service in Personnel Reviews

UCAP discussed the level of recognition and reward of Senate and non-Senate service in personnel reviews. One question is whether there should be more of an incentive for service. The expectation of participation in shared government should be made clear to faculty, and Chairs should emphasize such service in their letters when it occurs.

Consideration of a Book in Academic Personnel Reviews

The committee discussed the status of book publications in personnel reviews. The book-centered disciplines have seen many changes in the ways that books are published. Some presses have disappeared, online publications are more frequent. There is currently a lack of clarity in the criteria

to be used for promotion. UCAP urges the book disciplines to study the issue and formulate guidelines appropriate for the changing environment.

UCAP reviewed a report from the Center for Studies of Higher Education on peer review in academic promotion and publishing. This report concurs with the above comments: it concludes that in the Humanities it takes longer than five or six years to get a book published, Some campuses have never accepted a series of articles in lieu of a monograph, although this is becoming an increasingly frequent venue for publication. CAPs have been seen as very conservative and slow to recognize that the approach traditionally used will have to change. UCAP could acknowledge major shifts for book disciplines, especially for junior faculty, and encourage CAPs to take these changes seriously. It was noted that changes are occurring in all disciplines. The committee will continue to discuss this difficult set of issues.

Flexibility in Merit Reviews

UCAP discussed issues of flexibility and integration over more than one review period in the reward system. While each CAP has a great deal of flexibility in its reward system, it is clear that all three legs of the stool, research, teaching, and service, must be apparent in all files to merit an advancement. However, it might be appropriate to recognize that there may be a review period where, say, teaching was exceptional and service lagged somewhat, or research was exceptional while teaching was not as good as in other review periods (but not absent or unsatisfactory). Such balances might be recognized in the reward system. On some campuses, exceptional service is rewarded with an acceleration if other components of the file are good. This includes service as department Chair but not other Administrative service, which is rewarded outside of the academic mechanisms.

Replacing "Above Scale" with "Distinguished Professor"

UCAP discussed a proposal to replace the academic "Above Scale" title in all series to "Distinguished." Some campuses allow this already. All but one of the campuses agreed with this recommendation, and the proposal has gone forward to Academic Council (with the opposition of UCB noted) for consideration.

Campus-wide Online Teaching Evaluation System

UCAP shared the concern of some campuses with online teaching evaluation systems. While these evaluations are an essential component in the merit and promotion process, it is not clear that they provide a reliable reflection of teaching quality. The added fact that in some cases these online systems are fully in the hands of the students adds to the unease. The Chair drafted a letter to CAPs reaffirming evaluation guidelines and highlighting best practices.

Consultation with the Administration
Susan Carlson, Vice President, Academic Personnel, Janet Lockwood, Associate Director, Academic Personnel, Patricia Price Interim Director, Academic Advancement, and Jim Litrownik, Coordinator, Data Management, Academic Advancement served as consultants to UCAP. The committee was provided with regular updates about UC's budget and was kept abreast as plans to address the financial crisis were developed.

Other Issues and Additional Business
In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCAP submitted views on the following:

- Proposed Revisions to APMs 010, 015, 530, 668, 670 and 710
- Report from the Task Force on Senate Membership
- Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs
- The Faculty Compensation Plan

Campus Reports

UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to reports about issues facing local committees and comparison of individual campus practices. In these discussions, UCAP members touched briefly on the status of searches; responses to outside offers; special accelerations for retention or other reasons; retention; efforts to streamline processes.

Survey of CAP Practices

UCAP updated its annual survey of local CAP practices and experiences. The survey covers a wide range of topics, including the type and number of files reviewed by CAPs; CAP support, resources and member compensation; final review authority; CAP's involvement in the review of salary and off-scale increments at the time of hiring or in retention cases; and the use of ad hoc committees. UCAP considers the survey to be an important resource that helps the committee identify areas in which campus practices might be brought into closer congruence.

UCAP Representation

UCAP Chair Ahmet Palazoglu represented the Committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements

UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Janet Lockwood, Associate Director, Academic Personnel and Patricia Price Interim Director, Academic Advancement, who presented updates on the implementation of the salary scale plan and systemwide APM policies under review or being prepared for review, including possible policy changes to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan. Jim Litrownik, Coordinator, Data Management, Academic Advancement provided the committee with data analysis critical to UCAP's discussion about faculty salaries.

UCAP occasionally consulted the Academic Senate chair and vice-chair about issues facing the Senate and UC, and the Senate executive director about Senate office procedures and committee business.

Respectfully submitted,

Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair (D)	John Lindow (B)
Katja Lindenberg, Vice Chair (SD)	Kyaw Tha Paw U (D)
Kathleen Komar (LA)	Henry Pontell (I)
Dana Takagi (SC)	Patricia Cohen (SB)
Thomas Harmon (M)	Richard Arneson (SD)
Julia Bailey-Serres (R)	Paul Garcia (SF)

Daniel Simmons ((D); Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Robert Anderson ((B), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex-Officio*)
Brenda Abrams, Senior Policy Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND DIVERSITY
ANNUAL REPORT 2010-11

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) met four times in the 2010-11 academic year. In accordance with its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 140, UCAAD considered policies related to staff, faculty, and student diversity, as well as statistical data and other measures of those policies successful implementation. This year was the fourth year of membership for UCAAD on the Academic Council. In 2007, the Council unanimously approved the addition of UCAAD as a permanent standing member, and in May of that year, the Academic Assembly approved an amendment to Senate Bylaw 125 that codified the addition. A summary of the Committee's work follows below:

Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex and Among Men, Ethnicity, 2009-10
At the end of last year, the Committee was successful in securing the volunteer services of Emerita Professor and past UCAAD Chair Pauline Yahr to resume work on a systemwide faculty pay equity analysis first initiated in 2007-08 by UCAAD in conjunction with Academic Advancement. This effort, led by former Vice Provost Nicholas Jewell, was to be the first UC-wide statistical report of pay practices by gender and ethnicity evaluated across divisions, schools, and departments. UCAAD worked with Academic Advancement to develop the best possible evaluative metrics and comparative standards. Difficulties in securing up-to-date and translatable payroll and personnel data, however, coupled with the departure of Vice Provost Jewell in the fall of 2008, had until this year delayed any further work on the project. Prof. Yahr presented her work at various stages of development at the January, April and June UCAAD meetings affording committee members with multiple opportunities to review and discuss the analysis. The final draft study entitled, *Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex and Among Men, Ethnicity, 2009-10,* was transmitted to Academic Council in July. Council voted to circulate the analysis for systemwide Senate review and will revisit the draft study in September.

Evaluating Contributions to Diversity for Appointment and Promotion (APM 210) Guidelines for all Academic Disciplines
UCAAD continued to discuss the implementation of the diversity revisions to APM sections 210/240/245 originally proposed by UCAAD in 2004, which took effect in July 2005. The APM policy governing faculty appointment and advancement (APM 210) was amended effective July 2005 so that faculty contributions to diversity would receive recognition and reward in the academic personnel process. Previously, UCAAD identified two recurring issues across the UC system: the apparent lack of will and the evident lack of understanding of how to effectively make use of the policy as significant impediments to the timely implementation of APM 210. The Committee discussed next steps and a framework for moving forward including taking the message back to campuses that they need to engage local CAPs and develop a set of common principles, standards, and approach to implementing the guidelines. Members also considered the extent to which a model for monitoring the implementation of *UC Affirmative Action Guidelines for Recruitment and Retention of Faculty,* first developed by UCSF in 2002 could be modified and adopted by UCAAD to serve as the model for the UC system. The Committee discussed the revision of the guide and input from the campuses with the ultimate goal of creating a new document that is jointly authored by the Administration and the Senate and in consultation with Academic Personnel.

Annual President's Accountability Sub-Report to the Regents on Diversity
UCAAD continued to discuss with Chief of Staff to the Provost Jan Corlett and Interim Diversity Coordinator Jesse Bernal: the need for measureable and easily accessible metrics and specified outcomes for the *President's Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity,* presented annually to the Regents; the inclusion of the Health Sciences, and updating of the *2008 Faculty Diversity in the Health Sciences Report;* as well as the need for a dedicated survey to measure campus climate for faculty/staff at all UC locations. UCAAD also provided consultation to the Provost suggestions on specific actions that UC could initiate, at the campus or Systemwide level, to foster diversity and tolerance. In a related effort, former UCAAD Chair M. Ines Boechat graciously continued to serve as the Academic Senate's representative to the newly formed Presidential Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion.

UC Staff Diversity Council Report
UCAAD continued to follow closely implementation of the remediation efforts recommended by the various groups and as contained in UC Staff Diversity Council Report. Last year, the Regents convened several work groups to study diversity at the University, and four of the groups have issued their final reports: faculty diversity; graduate and professional school diversity; undergraduate diversity; staff diversity; and campus climate. The work groups conducted comprehensive assessments of University diversity in order to determine how well UC was meeting the needs of its diverse California constituencies ten years after the passage of Proposition 209. The combined report focuses on a broad range of staff diversity issues, including recruitment, retention and promotion, leadership commitment to staff diversity at each location, and systems for ensuring that best practices in support of staff diversity are woven throughout the fabric of the University.

Implementation of the President's Task Force on Faculty Diversity
In continuation of business begun in 2006-07, UCAAD continued to monitor campus implementation of the recommendations from the President's Task Force on Faculty Diversity. UCAAD Chair Francis Lu graciously continued to serve as the Academic Senate's representative to the Diversity Implementation Committee. In this capacity, he has provided UCAAD input on key issues including the Diversity Accountability Framework, the Diversity Data Collection, and the UCOP Diversity Coordinator job description, among others.

Other Issues and Business
At each meeting, UCAAD devoted a portion of the agenda to reports and updates from its members about issues facing local divisions and committees. These discussions included local faculty search committee practices and hiring data; the role of campus affirmative action officers; equity and career reviews; exit interviews; campus climate issues and climate surveys; and a close look at the newly published work of Prof. Cristina González (UC Davis) entitled, "Clark Kerr's University of California: Leadership, Diversity, and Planning in Higher Education."

In addition to official communications related to the aforementioned topics, UCAAD submitted formal comments on the following policy review issues:

- Lack of diversity in systemwide and divisional Senate committees;
- Campus climate in the wake of the recent wave of LGBTQI-related suicides of teens and college students nationwide;
- Changes in post-employment benefits;
- Recommendation from the Academic Council to the UC Commission on the Future and the Statement of Academic Senate Values and Recommendations, developed by the UCLA division;

- Proposed revisions to APM 010 and 015; and
- Implications of reductions in state funding to UC for the advancement of diversity, equity, and inclusion on the campuses and the particular role that the Merced and Riverside campuses play in advancing UC diversity.

Acknowledgements

UCAAD is grateful to have had valuable input from and exchange with these UCOP and campus consultants over the past year: Provost Lawrence Pitts; Vice Provost Susan Carlson; Chief of Staff to the Provost Jan Corlett; Interim Diversity Coordinator Jesse Bernal; Academic Policy and Compensation Manager Janet Lockwood; Director of Graduate Studies Pamela Jennings; former UCAAD Chair M. Ines Boechat; and Emerita Professor and Past Chair of UCAAD Pauline Yahr. They provided the committee with data, consultation and reports on numerous items and issues, including:

- Graduate and professional student academic preparation educational outreach;
- Legal obligations and responsibilities for faculty and student diversity in relation to both Proposition 209 and federal affirmative action regulations;
- UC programs and fellowships targeting diversity, including the UC-HSBC (Historically Black Colleges and Universities) Initiative and funding of the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program; and
- Local conferences, summits, and symposiums addressing diversity.

The committee also thanks the numerous faculty members who, as alternates, kindly represented their respective campuses at UCAAD meetings throughout the year.

Respectfully submitted:

Francis Lu, M.D., Chair (UCD)   *Beth Schneider (UCSB)*

Margaret Conkey, Vice Chair (UCB)   *Carla Frecerro (UCSC)*

Ori Ganor (UCB)   *Judith Varner (UCSD)*

Monica Vazirani (UCD)   *Susan Kools (UCSF)*

Raju Metherate (UCI)   *Daniel Simmons (ex-officio member)*

Francisco Ramos-Gomez (UCLA)   *Robert Anderson (ex-officio member)*

Cristían Ricci (UCM)   *Eric Zárate (Committee Analyst)*

Manuela Martins-Green (UCR)

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)
ANNUAL REPORT 2010-11

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) met ten times in Academic Year 2010-11 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 145, to advise the President and Senate agencies on the admission of undergraduate students and the criteria for undergraduate status. The BOARS chair also charged two subcommittees – Transfer and Articulation and Evaluation – with reporting to the parent committee about specific topics. One hour of each regular committee meeting was set aside for subcommittee break-outs; the subcommittees also met in between meetings via teleconference. BOARS also collaborates closely with consultants in the UCOP Office of Admissions. The major activities of BOARS and its subcommittees, and the issues they addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S RESOLUTION ON INDIVIDUALIZED REVIEW AND HOLISTIC ADMISSIONS

President Yudof responded to recommendations BOARS made in its May 2010 *Report on Comprehensive Review in Freshman Admissions* by asking BOARS to recommend several next steps to campuses: (1) incorporate electronic read sheet data into their selection process; (2) implement individualized review of all applicants and reduce the number of applicants admitted based on a limited set of factors; (3) develop a plan to use a holistic scoring system as part of the 2012 reforms (selective campuses); and (4) collaborate on generating holistic scores (all campuses).

Some campuses opposed a holistic review mandate, noting that single score holistic review is only one possible approach to comprehensive review. Holistic review has advantages, but campuses should be allowed to rely on established methods of individualized review as the admissions reform is implemented while they explore the possibility of moving to a holistic process. BOARS was also concerned about holistic review being equated with selection; the score is important for campuses that use holistic review, but it is not the only factor they use in selection. School context priorities or proposed major can also have significant impact on admissions outcomes and should not be lost in the discussion.

In its response to the President, BOARS affirmed its goal of having every UC applicant receive an individualized review and every campus using read sheet information in individualized review, noting that campuses will find single-score holistic evaluation useful as they become more selective and that the diversity of the student body can be enhanced through other best practices such as school context priorities. BOARS also affirmed that all campuses should receive Berkeley and UCLA holistic review scores beginning in 2011, and should collaboratively devise a plan for the remaining applications to receive a holistic score. Finally, BOARS agreed to examine the use of the holistic read scores in the referral process and identify areas for further work essential to successful implementation of the new Freshman Admissions Policy taking effect for fall 2012, including establishing a metric for ensuring admissions offices have sufficient personnel for adequate individualized review and outreach at every campus.

In December, BOARS reviewed the President's draft resolution to the Regents regarding *Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions*. At the request of BOARS, the Academic Council endorsed the resolution, noting that its diversity goals can best be realized with enriched and focused outreach, recruitment, and yield efforts. The Regents adopted the resolution at their January meeting.

At the May Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF) meeting, it was suggested that BOARS develop a policy and procedure for campuses that want to request an exemption from holistic review. BOARS views an exemption process as unnecessary. It will respect local Admission Committees' authority to make decisions and not intervene unless concerns are raised. The Committee also asks UCOP to consult with BOARS about any concerns it may have about local implementation first to allow BOARS to make a recommendation.

ADMISSIONS OUTCOMES AT CAMPUSES IMPLEMENTING HOLISTIC REVIEW

BOARS paid particular attention to admissions outcomes at campuses using holistic review in selection for the first time in 2010. One campus followed an approach similar to UCLA and another used a dual review system that admitted applicants based on holistic review and the prior year's numeric comprehensive review. Outcomes on that campus indicated that holistic scoring could result in a smaller proportion of underrepresented minority and First Generation College admits, and a larger proportion of high-income admits, compared to a more numeric comprehensive review. BOARS notes, however, that the holistic score is only one factor in the final selection decision. There are many possible explanations for these outcomes, and the campus has a variety of options for fine tuning their selection processes. BOARS asks that as campuses import holistic scores and/or scoring approaches from another campus, they remember that local values help drive holistic scores. Ideally, each campus should develop its own holistic scoring rubric based on read sheet data and context information reflecting its applicant pool. BOARS stands behind the basic fairness of holistic review, but notes that Regents policy allows campuses flexibility in the approaches they use to meet admissions goals, and there are selective campuses that do not use holistic scores who also achieve academic excellence and diversity in admission outcomes.

COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION AND UCLA STATEMENT ON THE FUTURE OF UC

In November, BOARS commented on an Academic Council recommendation that UC reduce the number of employees, including faculty, though attrition; institute a moratorium on construction; and require chancellors to identify a stable source of funding for any new program and its impact on existing programs. BOARS also commented on an alternative statement drafted by the UCLA division. BOARS expressed concern about the implications of downsizing for undergraduate student enrollment, diversity, and access, but also accepted that serious actions were necessary to protect UC from cuts. BOARS restated its continued support for the Principles for Non-Resident Undergraduate Enrollment authored by BOARS and endorsed by the Academic Council in 2009, and for increasing non-resident undergraduate enrollment insofar as UC can maintain its Master Plan commitment to residents and in the context of appropriate enrollment funding from the state. BOARS also recommended that faculty and administrators work together to coordinate undergraduate programs across campuses to ensure that UC does not unnecessarily reduce undergraduate access.

CLARIFICATION OF PRINCIPLES FOR NON-RESIDENT ENROLLMENT

As the year progressed, it became clear that all campuses planned to increase non-resident enrollment. BOARS discussed the effect of increasing non-resident enrollment on UC's ability to serve the California population. As a result of APTF discussions, Chair Jacob asked the Committee to address an ambiguity in Principle #6 of the Principles for Non-Resident Undergraduate Enrollment. Principle #6 was based upon the Master Plan requirement that out-of-state applicants meet higher entrance requirements and "stand in the upper half of those ordinarily eligible." While BOARS has interpreted this to mean that each campus should admit

2

nonresidents in the upper half of their admit pool, there was the concern that "eligibility" could instead be interpreted as general UC eligibility, which could significantly alter nonresident admit standards at selective campuses, and that this ambiguity could become greater with the 2012 eligibility reform. With the help and consent of the APTF, BOARS drafted a clarification of Principle 6, noting that its purpose is to help prevent a resident applicant from claiming that her/his admission slot was taken by a non-resident with weaker credentials but a willingness to pay non-resident tuition. BOARS also re-emphasized the importance of Principle 3, which states that "non-resident enrollment should not be used exclusively as a revenue-producing strategy to the detriment of resident access," and Principle 5, which urges that "fiscal considerations should not be a primary factor guiding the review of files or admissions decisions." The Academic Council endorsed BOARS' revision in June.

"FUNDING STREAMS" PROPOSAL

Associate Vice President for Budget Debora Obley joined BOARS in February to discuss UCOP's "Funding Streams" budget proposal, which allows campuses to retain all revenues they generate, to help provide background for BOARS' discussion of the distribution and use of application fee revenue. The Committee's comments to the Academic Council on Funding Streams included a concern about how the new budget model could impact admissions processing functions. BOARS also was concerned that Funding Streams could weaken UCOP's ability to influence enrollment targets, and that decentralization of enrollment planning could fail to protect the campuses' collective interests and the systemwide character of the University. BOARS did endorse UCOP's decision to distribute application fee revenue to campuses based on the number of applications received, regardless of fee waivers granted to students applying to a particular campus.

BOARS PRINCIPLES AND METRIC FOR ADMISSIONS FUNDING

In May, the Academic Council endorsed a funding metric developed by BOARS to assist campuses in determining the staffing required for the review, selection, recruitment, and yield efforts necessary to implement the new freshman admissions policy. Council's memo to President Yudof asked the President to forward BOARS' analysis to the campus executive vice chancellors.

The funding metric highlights BOARS' concern that the success of the new admissions policy will require campus admissions offices to have more resources available to handle the anticipated increase in applications and the required individualized reviews, but that campuses may not have adequate resources due to budget cuts and the implementation of the Funding Streams budget model. To develop the metric, BOARS surveyed the nine undergraduate campus admissions offices about their freshman and transfer admissions workload and available staff resources. The survey revealed general consistency across campuses in the time and personnel required for individualized review of particular types of applications. BOARS used the data to determine the personnel resources necessary to support implementation of the policy at each campus. The metric does not prescribe funding levels; rather, it identifies the per applicant staff necessary to meet the Regents expectations regarding comprehensive and individualized review. The admissions process will be at risk if campuses fall below these levels. The funding provided to campuses under Funding Streams will be equalized to ensure that campuses with larger numbers of fee waivers are not handicapped. BOARS believes that admissions offices will have sufficient resources if they receive funding per applicant derived from application fees. Chair Jacob participated in a conference call with campus EVCs, where he communicated BOARS' intent to establish the metric, and the metric was thoroughly discussed and supported by the

3

APTF. BOARS is concerned that admissions offices may be short personnel if application numbers grow substantially next year, which will put the 2012 reforms at risk. The Committee has asked that campuses be given the flexibility to hire back retirees on short notice in December.

TRANSFER ADMISSION

BOARS Transfer Subcommittee
The Transfer Subcommittee (Bill Jacob, Tyrone Howard, John Whiteley, Charles Akemann, Ralph Aldredge, Daniel Widener, and Adam Jackson-Boothby) met monthly to discuss, among other topics, UC's response to transfer legislation; the work of the UC transfer "streamlining" groups who met to explore commonalities in lower division major requirements across campuses; the Course Identification Numbering System; a UCI Computer Science Department request that students receive 12 quarter units for a score of 3 or better on the AP Computer Science BC exam; and a proposal to add the Statway statistics sequence as transferrable to UC and to IGETC. The subcommittee also explored the possibility that UC recognize CSU's General Education Breadth pattern, which would benefit prospective Community College transfers who could choose between IGETC and CSU Breadth knowing they would be prepared for either institution. This latter issue was ultimately rejected by a BOARS/UCEP/UCOPE working group.

Responding to Transfer Legislation
BOARS discussed the California legislature's request that UC and CSU accept more Community College transfer students and make the transfer and course articulation process more efficient and effective. In March, Executive Director Michele Siqueiros and Associate Director Jessie Ryan of the Campaign for College Opportunity joined BOARS to discuss SB 1440 and AB 2302, transfer legislation authored by the Campaign, which requires CSU and the California Community Colleges to design Associates Degrees for transfer to CSU and requests the participation of UC in streamlining transfer to UC. BOARS expressed support for the goals of the legislation, although there was concern about unintended consequences and the lack of data projecting the effect of the CCC/CSU implementation of SB 1440 on transfer readiness, which could backfire for students uncertain of their intended major upon entry to the CCC. BOARS' work on transfer and its Transfer Proposal are also discussed in UC's June 2011 interim report to the legislature as required by AB 2302.

Transfer Proposal
In July, the Academic Council voted to send a BOARS proposal for major-based transfer admissions to the campuses for targeted review. The proposal outlines new pathways to transfer admission that parallel the "entitled to review" feature of the new Freshman Admission Policy taking effect for fall 2012. UC transfer applicants would be entitled to a review (though not guaranteed admission) if they complete any one of three proposed pathway options: completion of a yet to be developed UC Transfer Curriculum with a minimum GPA set by each campus; completion of an SB 1440 AA Degree for Transfer with a minimum GPA to be set by each campus; or the current pathway specified in Senate Regulation 476. The proposal responds to the requirements of AB 2302 that UC consider aligning transfer with the AB 1440 Transfer AA degrees. BOARS believes the approach will also improve the preparation of UC transfers, as many campuses/departments currently evaluate applicants on the basis of specific major preparation, but others admit them using general transfer requirements and GPA. It is in the best interest of UC and potential transfers to have a consistent evaluation approach. BOARS wants to

4

communicate to community college students that if they pick a major, prepare for it, and show a strong case for being able to complete their declared majors in two years, they will be fully considered for transfer to UC. The proposal will retain current Transfer Guarantee Programs (TAG), which some campuses may choose to expand while other campuses are reducing due to yield that exceeds capacity.

Transfer Credit for Courses Taken in the Military

On the advice of the Transfer Subcommittee, BOARS endorsed a proposal from the Office of Student Affairs to remove current restrictions on the acceptance of military coursework for transfer to UC. The change allows UC to accept American Council on Education (ACE) credit standards to award academic credit for courses completed as part of military education.

Revisions to Senate Regulation 480

Admissions Evaluation Coordinator Evera Spears joined BOARS in March to discuss UCOP's proposed clarification of Senate Regulation 480, which relates to transfer credit for students whose pre-collegiate education was largely completed in a single language other than English, and who then enroll in courses in that language. Campus evaluators differ in their interpretation of the regulation and were asking for clarification. BOARS and the Transfer Subcommittee agreed to a revision, which the Academic Council approved in April. It will be reviewed by the Academic Assembly in 2011-12.

BOARS ARTICULATION AND EVALUATION (A&E) SUBCOMMITTEE

The A&E Subcommittee (George Johnson, Juan Poblete, John Heraty, Lynn Huntsinger, Susan Amussen, Bonnie Halpern-Felsher, and Mallory Valenzuela) was charged with reviewing issues around high school preparation, the 'a-g' requirements, and selected courses submitted for a-g approval where faculty input is required. It focused considerable attention this year on on-line provider applications, and more generally, the role of online education in secondary education. The Subcommittee met monthly during regular BOARS meetings and also held additional conference calls to conduct business.

Online Providers of 'a-g' Courses

Early in the year, A&E expressed concern that BOARS' 2006 policy outlining the Criteria for Approval of Online Providers and Courses was no longer relevant to the rapidly evolving nature of the online education industry. The subcommittee recommended that BOARS suspend course and provider applications until it had a chance to consult with educators and experts to help determine whether the current criteria and processes are appropriate, review data on course-takers, and compare online and traditional course completion, passing rates, and grade distributions. There was concern that BOARS would be obligated to assess applications according to existing criteria and that delaying approval would inconvenience under-resourced school districts and students that need online courses to help fulfill the a-g criteria. In January, BOARS met with Senior UC Counsel Mary MacDonald to review the legal ramifications of a moratorium.

The A&E subcommittee spoke on the phone with representatives from the Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Clara, San Francisco, and San Jose school districts, who answered questions about their rationale for partnering with online providers, how districts provide and assess online courses, and how they address the possibility of differential access to online courses and technology. In April, Kelly Schwirzke, Santa Clara County Office of Education Online Learning

5

Coordinator, met with both BOARS and A&E to discuss her study of online learning in K-12 school districts. A&E agreed to resume consideration of pending applications according to the current policy with the understanding that all providers would be asked to regularly provide data that are not currently being provided. The Subcommittee approved several new providers and rejected others. BOARS also expressed interest in obtaining more information about the number and type of online courses taken by UC applicants, and approved the idea of including a box on *ApplyUC* that applicants would check if a course was taken online; however, this addition to the application was deemed unworkable at present.

SCORE SHARING PLAN FOR 2012 ADMISSIONS
BOARS discussed UCOP's plan to offer all campuses the same application data in "read sheet" form that UCLA and UCB now receive, to use as they see fit, campus plans to incorporate these data into their review processes, and additional data elements that would be useful to incorporate into the read sheets. The read sheets would be customized to include campus specific data elements (comparisons among applicants to that campus) for each campus. BOARS also discussed the idea of generating holistic review scores for every UC applicant and sharing them across campuses. BOARS decided it would be better to propose a general plan for score sharing that does not push for a specific mode of implementation to allow campuses to maintain systems that reflect their unique values. Eventually, each campus will develop its own individualized review process rather than rely on the UCLA/UCB scores or processes. BOARS' white paper describing the plan is a statement of understanding between BOARS and the admissions directors that can be modified periodically. Members asked that when campuses share scores, they provide information that will help other campuses interpret the scores; particularly the scoring rubrics and justifications for using the scores. Throughout these discussions it was emphasized repeatedly that a holistic score does not define selection, as there are many other aspects of the process.

BOARS investigated the extent to which campuses might be able to use UCB and UCLA holistic review scores as part of (or in lieu of) a local review. UCOP Institutional Research Content Manager Tongshan Chang presented data to BOARS showing the distribution of freshman applicants and admitted students to individual campuses based on variety of UCB or UCLA holistic read scores and the "Predicted Value" gradations for students within the UCB 4-5 single score range for applicants and admits to each campus, compared to the UCLA score. BOARS believes that score sharing will help all campuses improve their review processes, project enrollment, and compare comprehensive review outcomes, and that having access to UCLA/UCB scores could allow some campuses to devote more time to their own individualized review of applicants with lower scores. The Committee doubts, however, that score sharing will produce significant new efficiencies or monetary savings in the near future.

REVISIONS TO 'AREA C' (MATHEMATICS) AND 'AREA B' (ENGLISH) DESCRIPTIONS
BOARS revised the "area c" (Mathematics) description in the UC Freshman admissions requirements. The revision replaces citations to the 1998 California Math Standards with language referring to the Common Core Mathematics Standards, which were adopted along with the Common Core Language Arts Standards by the California State Board of Education in August 2010. A BOARS subcommittee also revised the 'area b' (English) description to incorporate concepts that reflect California's adoption of the Common Core Standards for the language arts. In July, BOARS sent the draft 'area b' revision to an intersegmental area 'b' task force for review and feedback by August 15.

JOINT MEETING WITH CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

In June, CSU faculty and administrators—Academic Senate Chair James Postma, Admission Advisory Council co-chair Stephen Stepanak; Assistant Vice Chancellor Eric Forbes; and Chancellor's Office Associate Dean Ken O'Donnell—joined BOARS by phone to discuss issues associated with fostering and improving the transfer path, including SB 1440 and BOARS' transfer admission proposal, the role of 'a-g,' and Career Technical Education. CSU representatives expressed support for the BOARS transfer proposal, noting that there would be an additional benefit if UC could align its UC Transfer Curricula with CSU's Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs). The CSU guests also noted key problems related to transfer: some community college students are unable to find courses they need, or receive poor advising; and others lose motivation due to a general education curriculum that tracks them into remediation sequences before they can enroll in a more engaging curriculum connected to the real world. Legislation may require the development of CTE courses that would not necessarily be UC-approved for a-g, but would be CSU approved for a-g in disciplines that might not be offered at UC.

JOINT MEETING WITH THE UC ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS

In July, BOARS met at UC Berkeley for its annual half-day meeting with the UC admissions directors. BOARS and the directors discussed topics of shared interest, including the transition to the 2012 admissions policy, non-resident enrollment, score sharing, admissions funding challenges, and the BOARS transfer admission proposal. Each director was asked to share perspectives and suggestions. Concerns about adequate staffing and funding to implement the 2012 policy were prominent, with directors noting that during the read season it is not always possible to give campus visitors an adequate level of attention. Directors also provided feedback on the Transfer Proposal, which was amended to reflect the discussion. They noted that collaboration between faculty and administration was strong and helpful this year.

OTHER BRIEFINGS

➤ Chair Jacob, Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons, and Vice Chair Robert Anderson briefed BOARS at each meeting about Academic Council business, and presentations made to the Council about state budget cuts, faculty salaries, and other topics.

➤ Chair Jacob briefed BOARS about the work of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senate (ICAS) on the C-ID project, implementation of transfer legislation (in particular the AB 1440 work underway in the CCC and CSU), and ICAS' collective advocacy on behalf of public higher education in California.

➤ The Admissions Processing Task Force is chaired by UCSB Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Michael Young and consists of the campus admissions directors, UCOP Admissions staff and the chair and vice chair of BOARS. Chair Jacob and Vice Chair Johnson regularly reported on APTF work, which focused on holistic review training/score sharing, processes for implementing the 2012 Admissions policy, collaboration involving wait lists and the referral pools (including the new nonresident referral pool), and some intense discussions of criteria for admission of nonresident applicants. The APTF provides a critical forum for exchange of ideas and information between BOARS and the campus Admissions Directors.

➤ Bonnie Halpern-Felsher introduced BOARS to research on the stress felt by ultra-competitive high school students whose daily lives are scheduled beyond a reasonable limit with the goal of getting into a top college.

➤ Don Daves-Rougeaux briefed BOARS on two UC-organized Curriculum Integration Institutes, which brought together high schools teachers to develop academic courses

7

integrated with CTE content that are sufficiently rigorous to be approved for a-g. Chair Jacob attended both meetings and Vice Chair Johnson attended the second as BOARS representatives and to interact with participants on math, science and Engineering content.

➢ In October, Director Wilbur outlined the process by which the Eligibility in Local Context cohort would be determined for entering 2012 freshman class, which will be selected in accordance with the new eligibility policy. Instead of identifying the top 4% of each high school graduating class and sending them a letter that they attained an ELC guarantee, UC will collect transcripts for the top 15% cohort at each school and send them a letter stating that they have been identified as among the school's top students and encourage them to apply. If they do apply, UC will match GPA information with the transcript to see if they qualify for the 9% ELC and will then provide that information to the campuses. UC is confident that it can identify the complete top 9% by asking for the top 15%. Later, UC will analyze transcripts from 1/3 of high schools each year to update its records about average GPAs. An external vendor will also analyze the transcripts and send information about ELC segments of 1% each up to 9%.

➢ In May, the Admissions Office consulted BOARS on a proposal to increase the UC application fee, and in July BOARS learned it will increase by 25%, from $60 to $75. Fee waivers for low-income students will remain in place.

LOOKING AHEAD TO 2011-12

BOARS will monitor implementation of the Freshman Admissions Reform Policy, the progress of holistic review score sharing, and appropriate funding of admissions functions on the campuses. Chair Jacob and Vice Chair Johnson are working with UCOP staff (Kate Jeffery, Shawn Brick, Tongshan Chang) on developing research questions and appropriate data and analysis to evaluate the new 2011-12 policy. BOARS will continue work on its transfer admissions proposal based on feedback from campuses. The success of the admissions policy will depend in part on UC admitting some students who are Entitled to Review but not guaranteed, and on the smooth operation of the referral pool. BOARS will monitor and ensure that the entire 9% ELC cohort is accepted by campuses the students actually want to attend, so that no subgroup is overly relegated to the referral pool. BOARS will develop metrics to help measure the success of the policy, include how well it expands the applicant pool, particularly into underserved populations; diversity outcomes in both the applicant and admitted pools; and outcomes for the 9x9 cohorts, both overall and in the referral pool. Initial applicant outcomes will be available at the December 2011 BOARS meeting.

BOARS REPRESENTATION

BOARS Chair Jacob represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, the Academic Assembly, the Admissions Processing Task Force, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, and the Executive Director of Admissions Search Committee. Vice Chair Johnson substituted for Chair Jacob in his absence at the Academic Council, and also served on the Admissions Processing Task Force and the Executive Director Search Committee. Charles Akemann represented BOARS on the Education Finance Model Steering Committee.

CONSULTATION WITH UCOP AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

BOARS benefited from regular consultation with Vice President for Student Affairs Judy Sakaki, Admissions Director Susan Wilbur, and Interim Director Pamela Burnett, who updated BOARS at each meeting about preliminary and final data on application, admission, SIR, and enrollment outcomes for freshmen and transfers; initiatives to promote access and affordability;

enrollment management; the new wait list system; the new pilot referral process for non-residents; improvements to the *ApplyUC* website; and the struggles of California high schools to offer a full set of curricular offerings in the context of budget cuts. Director Wilbur also shared observations and suggested priorities for admissions policy at her final meeting before retiring in January after many years of distinguished service to UC. Associate Admissions Director Don Daves-Rougeaux attended each meeting to brief BOARS on the high school 'a-g' course certification process, efforts to help high schools develop rigorous CTE courses, and other topics. He also worked closely with the A&E Subcommittee to review online provider and course applications. Associate Director Shawn Brick attended each BOARS meeting to update the full committee about transfer initiatives and legislation, and worked closely with the Transfer Subcommittee. BOARS also appreciates the time and work of Debora Obley, Tongshan Chang, and Evera Spears; the campus admissions directors; and the CSU representatives who met with BOARS in June.

Thanks also to the faculty who attended meetings as alternates for regular committee members: Steven Clark (UCR), Katherine Snyder (UCB), and Rahul Warrior (UCI).

Respectfully submitted,

William Jacob, Chair (SB)	Juan Poblete (SC)
George Johnson, Vice Chair (B)	John Whitely (I)
Charles Akemann (SB)	Daniel Widener (SD)
Ralph Aldredge (D)	Adam Jackson-Boothby, Graduate (R)
Susan Amussen (M)	Mallory Valenzuela, Undergraduate (LA)
Bonnie Halpern-Felsher (SF)	Daniel Simmons, *ex officio*
John Heraty (R)	Robert Anderson, *ex officio*
Tyrone Howard (LA)	Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst
Lynn Huntsinger (B)	

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
2010-11 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Pursuant to Senate Bylaw 150, in 2010-11 the University Committee on Committees (UCOC) oversaw the appointment of chairs and vice chairs for each of the standing committees of the Assembly; oversaw the nomination of Senate members to serve on ad hoc or ongoing joint Senate-Administration committees and task forces; and authorized the Chair of the Assembly to appoint active members of standing committees to serve on joint committees and task forces subject to UCOC approval.

UCOC met twice in person and communicated regularly through its listserv to conduct its business. We report on the major issues and accomplishments of the year.

Appoint Chairs and specified Vice Chairs of the Senate's Standing Committees.
At its October meeting UCOC appointed a member to serve as a liaison to each standing committee. The liaison was tasked with gathering information from the chair, vice chair, and, where appropriate, members and committee staff on the committee's effectiveness in the current year. The liaison recommended one or more individuals to be considered for service as chair and, where required, vice chair of his/her designated committees in 2011-12. The committee reviewed these recommendations at its April meeting. Appointments to all required positions have been confirmed.

Appoint members of Senate committees, subcommittees, or task forces that report to the Assembly. The ten divisional Committees on Committees nominated divisional representatives to the standing committees. Subsequently, UCOC appointed members for two-year terms, and appointment letters, which specify the term of appointment and describing the committee's charge, have been issued. The committee was also successful in fully populating the UCFW Health Care Task Force (HCTF). At the time of this writing, UCOC is replacing one member of the HCTF due to additional campus obligations.

Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR): Following approval of ACSCANR's charge by Academic Council, UCOC proceeded to nominate three at-large members for this new special committee. UCOC replaced one member who resigned due to his acceptance of a deanship and was therefore ineligible to serve in this capacity per Senate Bylaw 128.D, which prohibits any Senate member from "holding an administrative position higher than department chair."

Appoint Senate Representatives to Ad Hoc and Joint Senate-Administrative Bodies.
Where appropriate, UCOC asked the standing committees of the Assembly to identify current committee members to serve on ad hoc and joint bodies whose charge matched or overlapped those of the respective committees. In that spirit, UCOC nominated, appointed, or confirmed representatives as appropriate to serve on a number of joint Administration-Senate task forces and other groups. These included the Educational Fee

Model Committee, C-ID Governing Committee, UCCS Governing Committee, CSU Breadth Working Group, UCEAP Governing Committee, Undergraduate Student Health Insurance (UCSHIP), Accountability Report Advisory Group, UCDC Governance Committee, Rebenching Workgroup, IGETC Standards Review Committee, and the Online Courses Review Panel. For a complete list of nominations, see the supplemental enclosure to this report.

Search committees: UCOC nominated Senate participants for search committees for the Merced Chancellor, Director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, and Director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

Chancellorial Reviews. UCOC nominated a slate of candidates for the *Irvine Chancellorial Review*. In addition, the committee concluded that five nominations from UCOC are not sufficient to complete the process. Toward the end of making this process more effective, the charge should be expanded to allow for a larger nomination slate of seven to ten nominations. There should also be a disciplinary breadth in the nomination slate. A letter to this effect was sent to Council Chair Simmons.

Challenges: In fulfilling its responsibilities, UCOC was challenged by the volume and ad hoc timing of requests. UCOC continues to support a recommendation made by past chairs that it is far better to bundle requests for Senate nominations on predictable timelines, rather than repeatedly attempting to mobilize members from the ten divisions for one-off tasks. UCOC remains concerned that the proliferation of ad hoc and joint committees carries at least the potential to reduce the effectiveness of the Senate's standing committees in shared governance. Finally, the committee notes that finding Senate members to serve as standing committee chairs, vice chairs, and even members is becoming increasingly difficult, given expanding teaching loads and administrative burdens being placed on UC faculty.

Future Issues: In the coming academic year, UCOC will face a number of issues beyond the usual challenges of appointing standing committee chairs, vice chairs, and Senate representatives to joint Senate-Administrative task forces and work groups. One of these issues is the consolidation and/or expansion of standing committees or special committees of Academic Council. As one example, ACSCANR was created by Academic Council earlier this year. UCOC discussed this issue at its April meeting, and agreed that UCOC can definitely advise on the health of certain committees, but it should not have any role in establishing new committees. That said, UCOC should be consulted with respect to the membership. As always, subcommittees could come out of the various standing committees. However, UCOC members opined that there could be a provision for suspension of the bylaws of a committee if it was found that a committee's charge was no longer needed. That said, concern was expressed about the lack of inertia involved with formally "suspending" a committee. With respect to selecting members for Senate-Administration Joint Task Forces, UCOC suggested that requests should go to the relevant standing committee(s) with a copy to the UCOC chair; UCOC should simply review and confirm those nominations where appropriate. In cases of nominations of members not already appointed to standing committees, these nominations must be

absolutely confirmed by UCOC. Finally, the charge of special committees should always require them to report back to a specific Senate body or agency.

ANNUAL REPORT 2010-2011

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC) is charged by Senate Bylaw 155 to represent the Senate in all matters of instruction and research policy involving the use of information and communications technology and advising the president concerning the acquisition and use of information and communications technology. UCCC held two meetings during the 2010-2011 academic year. Highlights of the committee's actions are outlined below.

Supercomputing Resources

UCCC discussed supercomputing resources. It is useful to have powerful supercomputing resources at the campuses. Existing resources are not shared in large part because the needs are different across disciplines, or because the federal funding agencies prefer to fund computing systems for particular scientific areas. One problem is that the machines require a lot of electricity including cooling, which faculty are not charged for; the money campuses put up to cover such costs are typically matching funds for equipment grants. Cheaper electricity and often better administrative support could be provided if computers were located remotely at supercomputer centers. UCSC makes limited money available for faculty to pay for charges for remotely locating computers at the San Diego Supercomputer Center at UCSD. There will be limits to where the centers can be remotely located until a new building in Berkeley is built, and it is not clear when this center will be available. At UCB there is a group looking at energy efficiency and different financial models. Faculty may be charged and these costs could be recharged to grants, although some of these costs might have to be treated as indirect costs.

Another related issue is the Shared Research Computing Project and the fact that the pilot was not openly announced. The campus Vice Chancellors for Research picked all the faculty participants, many of whom were already using supercomputing resources. UC could have provided this resource to faculty who do not currently use these resources or do not have access to them. The Shared Research Computing Project is now considering how to continue to pay for the program in the future, for example by having faculty participants pay in advance for computational nodes including administrative support and electricity for three years. It is not clear how viable this is. Faculty in some disciplines have free access to much more powerful national supercomputer systems supported by the main federal funding agencies, so perhaps these agencies will not want to support large computer systems at individual university centers.

Campus Wireless Infrastructure

UCCC discussed the fact that campuses need to be rewired both between and within buildings. Rewiring within buildings can be very expensive. An alternative is high speed wireless within buildings, although the cost savings are not as significant as some would expect. A problem with wireless is the question of who will pay for it. At UCB the Chancellor is covering the costs now but the departments will eventually be charged.

eTextbooks

The committee discussed the strengths and weaknesses of different platforms used with eTextbooks including how interactive they are. There are issues related to accessibility for disabled students. Students also may prefer being able to mark up hard copies of textbooks.

Proprietary eTextbooks are locked to particular devices, so UCCC could ask for broad format adoption so students are not required to buy any specific type of platform. The current costs of some devices may be prohibitive for some students, although campuses may be able to make deals for bulk purchases. A question is whether UC can standardize on one platform.

Remote and Online Instruction

UCCC discussed UC's online pilot project. It is not clear if or how significantly other universities have implemented online instruction. One member reported conducting online lectures and using Teaching Assistants to answer students' questions. It will be important to make sure that faculty get credit for creating and teaching the courses and that students are not penalized for taking them. There are ongoing costs associated with refreshing the courses. Another issue is the faculty may not support the courses in later years so a plan for Teaching Assistants to do this needs to be in place. It might be good to provide faculty with partial credit for teaching online courses.

UC Privacy and Security Initiative

Stephen Lau, Systemwide IT Policy Director, IR&C, joined UCCC to discuss the UC Privacy and Security Initiative. Two aspects of privacy are the issues of civil liberties and data protection. This is an 18 month initiative launched by the president to look at how UC views privacy and information security, to consider best practices and determine whether UC's policies need to be updated. Current policies and rules were written prior to things like videoconferencing and shared resources so there is a lot of conflict with new laws. Faculty, staff and students have an expectation of privacy unless there is a justifiable reason or consent has been given. Emails and web traffic are not monitored. New regulations that make UC responsible to ensure that medical information is not leaked. In industry, Social Security Numbers are monitored. UC does not monitor these things so there is a risk that this information could be leaked but monitoring runs counter to UC's culture. Two issues include the electronic aspect in terms of monitoring for privacy and the civil liberties aspect where people feel they are being watched. UCB Professor Chris Hoofnagle, a privacy expert, spoke to the steering committee members. Most academic institutions are just beginning to explore this problem. A member of the UCLA privacy board also spoke to the committee. This board looks at these issues on a campus level and UCOP is exploring whether there could be a similar board across the system and established at each campus. One situation that occurred was a computer science researcher wanted to conduct search engine research and monitor network traffic to see how people on a UC campus were utilizing search engines such as Google or Yahoo with the goal of optimizing them. UC's policies prohibited the researcher from conducting this type of monitoring. The researcher contacted the search engine companies himself and was able to purchase the data, thereby circumventing UC policy.

Campus Gmail

UCCC discussed the email systems used by students and faculty. UCD and UCSC switched all students to Gmail last year and it was a success. The students are reportedly very happy with Gmail. UCR students have switched to Gmail. UCSD provides and manages a centralized exchange server to students but this has not resulted in notable cost savings. UCSB has not changed its email system. UCB runs its own in-house email and it is an inexpensive solution. UCM has not switched to Gmail and there is no plan to do this in the near future.

The discussions between UCOP and Google about moving to Gmail for faculty and staff have apparently now been successfully concluded. UCD has a small pilot with a few hundred faculty and staff. The goal of immediately transferring all faculty and staff has been postponed. At UCD, there are 100 different email systems being used by different departments. There was a push from students and staff to use tools like Google documents, calendaring, and other applications. The campus is concerned about Google mining information if it is used for everyone. Other concerns are that emails could be leaked out and that the servers are outside of the US.

Office 365 guarantees that emails will be hosted in the US whereas Google would charge UCD to host the emails in this country. Faculty doing certain types of research will be restricted by ITAR from using email providers with servers outside the US. UCD will continuously monitor whatever system is used if the email is ultimately outsourced. A member commented that it is important to have flexibility to accommodate different types of usage. UCD's campus wide email will exclude the medical center but will share feedback on the experience with the center's leadership. Office 365 allows users to have emails hosted locally and the basic service is free. This system also offers larger mailboxes than Google and it also allows for larger attachment sizes. The advantage to Google for hosting faculty and staff email is not obvious. One question is whether UC or Google would be liable for the unauthorized release of emails.

Consultation with the Administration
David Ernst, Associate Vice President for Information Resources and Communications (IR&C), and Stephen Lau, Systemwide IT Policy Director, IR&C served as consultants to UCCC. The committee received updates about the Shared Research Computing Services pilot project. AVP Ernst reported that the new LBNL building would open in late 2014 if it is built at LBNL but if it is built on another site it would open in 2015. It is not clear if the facility will be in a new building or in an existing space. UC needs to determine its longer term plan to provide research and general computing resources in secure regional facilities at a lower cost than would campuses would have to pay. Regional UC facilities may be a transitional step toward doing most of the computing in the cloud instead of at UC. The supercomputer centers will probably be full in two years. The center at UCSD is not a long-term solution for UC. Commercial co-location is being discussed and CENIC may be the middle man between Amazon and the CENIC partners. There is interest at UCOP to move toward regional computing outside of or at UC sites. By the end of the calendar year there will be a proposed strategic plan that will be evaluated by the system. There is willingness at UCOP to invest in strategies that will offer savings in the longer term.

Budget Cuts
The committee discussed the cuts to UC's budget and concluded that it is not clear what will happen with respect to IT in order to manage the budget cuts. Currently faculty have equipment in closets so UCB is looking at creating a number of tiers of data centers in terms of reliability, availability and power utilization efficiency. There would be incentives to move equipment to the campus data centers. The campus data center has not been very reliable and it is close to the limit in terms of thermal cooling so new facilities would need to be built. UCSC is also running out of space at its center and there is a pilot project to remotely place data at UCSD. Shipping containers are being used as pods at UCB. A significant investment by UCSC would be required for their remote facility to be used but these investments would result in savings in the future. Vice Chair Anderson noted that there are loans through UCOP that might be used by campuses

for this type of work. According to Chair Primack, as much money will typically be spent on electricity, including cooling, as is spent on hardware over the course of three years.

Additional Business
UCCC devoted part of each regular meeting to reports on issues facing local committees. Discussions included UC's budget and computing space**.**

Representation
The UCCC Chair, Joel Primack, was not invited to be a faculty representative to the Information Technology Leadership Council, apparently due to an error that may be rectified in 2011-12. He served as an *ex officio* member of the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications.

Acknowledgements
UCCC is grateful for the contributions made by its Office of the President's Information Resources and Communications (IR&C) consultants, Associate Vice President David Ernst and Systemwide IT Policy Director Stephen Lau.

Respectfully submitted,

Joel Primack, Chair (SC)   Brett Stalbaum, Vice Chair (SD)
Tony Givargis (I)   Jun Li (R)
Sreenivas Jammalamadaka (SB)   Ida Sim (SF)
Felix Wu (D)   Anthony Joseph (B)
Maurizio Forte (M)
Lawrence Lin, Graduate Student Representative (SF)

Richard Schneider ((SF); Chair, UCOLASC, *Ex-Officio*))
Dan Simmons ((D); Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Bon Anderson ((B), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Brenda Abrams, Senior Policy Analyst

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
ANNUAL REPORT 2010-11

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs met eight times during the 2010-11 academic year.

Reviews of Proposed Graduate Schools and Graduate Degree Programs
One of CCGA's primary responsibilities is to review all campus proposals for new graduate schools and graduate degree programs. A total of 29 proposals were submitted to CCGA for review throughout the academic year. Program proposals received by CCGA in the latter stages of 2010-11 will be carried over into the 2011-12 academic year. The following table summarizes CCGA's disposition of these proposals as of August 2011.

Campus	School/Program Proposed	Lead Reviewer	Disp. Date	Disposition
UCB	M.A./Ph.D. in Film and Media	S. Farmer	12/7/2010	Approved
UCM	Ph.D. in Cognitive and Information Sciences	M. Beattie	12/7/2010	Approved
UCI	J.D./Ph.D. in Law and Graduate Studies	D. Hale	2/1/2011	Approved
UCM	Ph.D. in Psychological Sciences	R. Goodhue	2/1/2011	Approved
UCD	Ph.D. in Quantitative and Systems Biology	M. Maduro	2/1/2011	Approved
UCSD	Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) in Wireless Embedded Systems	R. Goodhue/ M. Maduro	3/1/2011	Approved
UCSD	Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) in Medicine Device Engineering	R. Mulnard/ M. Beattie	3/1/2011	Approved
UCI	Ph.D. in Public Health	A. Buckpitt	3/1/2011	Declined to review at this time; proposal returned to campus.
UCSF	M.S. in Biomedical Imaging	R. Mulnard	3/1/2011	Approved
UCB	Joint Master's degree in Translational Medicine between UCSF and UCB	J. Carmody	4/5/2011	Declined to review at this time; proposal returned to campus.
UCSD	Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) in Structural Health Monitoring	A. Buckpitt/ S. Farmer	4/5/2011	Approved
UCI	M.S./Ph.D. in Software Engineering	S. Farmer	4/5/2011	Approved
UCI	M.S. in Biomedical and Translational Science	M. Maduro	4/5/2011	Approved
UCI	Ph.D. in Epidemiology	K. Gylys	4/5/2011	Approved
UCLA	Executive M.B.A. in cooperation with the Universidad Adolfo Ibañez in Santiago, Chile	R. Goodhue	5/3/2011	Approved

UCI	M.S. in Biological Sciences and Educational Media Design	S. Carter	5/3/2011	Approved
UCD	M.A./Ph.D. in the Study of Religion	C. Kello	5/3/2011	Approved
UCSD	Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) in Simulation-Based Engineering	C. Kello/ S. Carter	6/7/2011	Approved
UCSF	Post-Baccalaureate Graduate Certificate	A. Buckpitt	8/30/2011	Approved
UCB	Master of Development Practice	R. Goodhue	8/30/2011	Approved
UCB	Online Professional Master of Public Health (M.P.H.)	R. Mulnard	–	Under review
UCI	M.S. in Biotechnology Management	R. Goodhue	–	Under review
UCI	M.S. in Engineering Management	M. Vanderwood	–	Under review
UCD	Master of Professional Accountancy (M.P.Ac.)	D. Arovas	–	Under review
UCD	M.S./Ph.D. in Energy	D. Arovas	–	Under review
UCI	Ph.D. in Nursing Science	K. Gylys	–	Under review
UCR	M.S. in Computer Engineering (Proposal received by CCGA 7/22/2011)	TBD	–	Deferred to first meeting of 2011-12 (10/4/2011)
UCR	Online M.S. in Engineering (Proposal received by CCGA 7/22/2011)	TBD	–	Deferred to first meeting of 2011-12 (10/4/2011)
UCR	M.A. in Accounting, Auditing and Assurance (Proposal received by CCGA 7/22/2011)	TBD	–	Deferred to first meeting of 2011-12 (10/4/2011)

CCGA worked on a number of key initiatives and issues related to graduate education over the course of the 2010-11 academic year, including:

Faculty Consultation on the Establishment of New Professional Degree Fees (PDFs)
CCGA discussed the issue of faculty consultation on the establishment of new professional degree fees. Among the Committee's chief concerns is the potential for the expanded use of supplemental "professional" fee to further privatize the University in advance of appropriate Senate deliberation. Members felt very strongly that the Senate and the local Graduate Councils need to be involved in a substantive way in the campus' initial deliberative process of deciding on these new fees. In the end, CCGA recommended Council inform the Provost that effective immediately, CCGA has decided to invoke its delegated authority to require review of graduate programs not previously designated as professional programs before they may charge professional tuition; request that "first-time" professional degree fee proposals from UC Davis and UCLA be pulled from the list submitted by UCOP; and request that all proposals for new professional degree fees be submitted to local Graduate Councils and CCGA for comment.

Guidelines for Senate Review of New Self-supporting Graduate Degree Programs
Given the state of California's financial difficulties and the University's resulting financial constraints, CCGA anticipates a significant increase in the volume of new self-supporting degree programs being proposed for the indefinite future. The projected increase, along with the absence of specific guidance in the Compendium regarding review of self-supporting programs and the lack of a formal policy on such approvals, underscored the need for instructive language about the different stages of the Senate review process of new SSP proposals and culminated in the issuance of policy guidelines that describes the review process that will be followed by Divisional Graduate Councils in the course of determining whether to approve a self-supporting degree program. The CCGA guidelines, with the Council's approval, direct campus Graduate Councils to consider particular issues in the exercise of their review and state that new self-supporting degree programs will not be approved in the absence of answers to the questions posed by Divisional Graduate Councils.

Review of New Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Proposals
Numerous prior discussions by CCGA on the review of new Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) proposals resulted in the adoption of revised guidelines stipulating that new PDST proposals shall be submitted to Divisional Graduate Councils for comment. In the case that such proposals have not also been submitted for comment to Divisional Planning & Budget Committees, Graduate Councils shall request comments directly from Divisional Planning & Budget Committees. Campus entities seeking Regental approval for new PDSTs should inform Graduate Council of their intentions as early as possible. The current process for requesting approval of new PDSTs includes requirements that concerned faculty and students be consulted. Satisfactory proof of adequate consultation of all concerned parties must be provided to Graduate Councils. Graduate Councils should take whatever steps they consider necessary to verify that the required consultations have taken place. In addition to assessing the impact of the proposed PDST on the academic quality of the program, Graduate Councils shall consider the potentially adverse impact of the proposed fee on the diversity of the applicant pool as well as the economic realities of the job markets that graduates of the degree program in question are expected to enter.

Conversion of Existing Graduate Degree Programs from State-supported to Self-supported Status or from Self-supported to State-supported Status
After careful deliberation, CCGA determined that the conversion of an existing graduate degree program from state-supported to self-supported status or from self-supported to state-supported status cannot be considered under the name change provisions in the Compendium and that such a conversion far exceeds those provisions. The Committee fleshed out policy language addressing the conversion of existing graduate degree programs from state-supported to self-supported status and from self-supported to state-supported status. The policy, which was later on adopted by Council, specifies that existing state-supported graduate degree programs may request their own disestablishment as state-supported degree programs in accordance with policy. Concurrently, faculty involved in the research, teaching, and administration activities of such existing state-supported graduate degree programs may present a proposal for the creation of a new self-supported program. The reference in the policy to disestablishment and establishment is necessary because of the absence of a procedure in the existing Compendium.

Review of On-line Graduate Degree Programs
CCGA discussed information gleaned from the campuses on the various issues associated with on-line graduate degree programs including teaching load questions; new modalities for existing programs; review of on-line iteration of an existing program; and others. Initially, the Committee set-out to craft a set of guidelines for the review of on-line graduate degree programs. Members eventually reached the conclusion that CCGA should apply the same review guidelines that it uses to review any other new degree program proposals and that for now, the Committee put off working on review guidelines.

Systemwide Reviews

Post-Employment Benefits. CCGA carefully considered the two proposed sets of changes in post-employment benefits recommended by the President's Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits. Members broadly discussed the impact of these changes on the quality of graduate education at the University of California. In particular, members expressed grave concern that these proposed changes pose a serious threat to the University's ability to remain a leader in graduate education; sustain competitive re-numeration for UC faculty; and retain and attract faculty, staff and graduate students. The Committee endorsed the general provisions of the resolution put forth by the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), that expressly stated a strong preference for "Option C"; opposition to requiring an employee contribution in excess of 7% for those who choose to remain under the current plan terms if current employees are offered the choice under the current UCRP plan terms for their future service; and support for the creation of a credible plan to raise faculty and staff salaries to competitive levels over the next three years, before the implementation of the new tier.

Renaming Fees as Tuition. CCGA considered the Administration's proposal to rename the education and professional degree fees as "tuition." Members agreed with the Academic Council's view that doing so is a good idea, in principle. The Committee did however express a number of concerns and made several key suggestions. First of all, the proposed new name for professional fees broadens the reach of those fees and removes an explicit reference to "professional schools" and substitutes a vague reference to "professional programs" potentially raising concerns that programs that have been approved as "non-professional" and that have functioned for some time as "non-professional" programs may be re-designated "professional" in order to justify the imposition of the proposed "Professional Supplemental Tuition". Secondly, the term "supplemental" is problematic and suggests that the proposal does not apply to self-supporting programs. In actuality, a professional self-supporting program is not really charging supplemental tuition; it is charging tuition to cover expenses. And lastly, the proposed new term for professional fees has alerted CCGA to the extent to which the term "professional" is itself troublesome in its vagueness.

Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University. In considering the Council recommendation and UCLA statement on the future of the University. CCGA discussed how to analyze the impacts of downsizing the faculty; decreasing ladder-rank faculty vs. increase in "teaching" faculty and the effect on the vigor and viability of graduate programs; and increasing the ratio of undergraduate to graduate students and resultant demand for more GSIs.

1996 Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs and its Implementation Guidelines. CCGA had extensive discussions of the policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Programs (SSP) over a series of meetings during the 2008-09 and 2009-10 academic years. The Academic Planning Council considered a new draft of the SSP policy at its July 2010 meeting. That draft incorporated one of CCGA's most important recommendations – that Ph.D. programs not be constituted as SSPs. CCGA strongly recommended and urged that Ph.D. programs explicitly be excluded from the current and future SSP policies. CCGA considered the current draft of the SSP policy at its October, November, and December meetings, culminating in an extensive and well thought-out assemblage of concerns and recommendations which were forwarded to Council.

Funding Streams Proposal. CCGA discussed the proposal to change the University's policies and practices related to the distribution of funds across the system. The Committee expressed overall support for the proposal and applauded the transparent nature in which it was prepared. A few cautionary notes were voiced by CCGA members about the opacity and fluidity connected with implementing the new principles and recommendations going forward. Members expressed unease with the wording of the recommendation on graduate financial aid and concern with the uncertainty of "revenue neutrality" into the future that is central to the new model. CCGA felt that the proposal should include a strong statement warning against the further erosion of support for graduate fellowships; as a matter of policy, campuses should be directed to do everything in their power to maintain competitive levels of graduate student support.

UC Merced's Interim Individual Graduate Program Authority

CCGA has reviewed on an annual basis UC Merced's Interim Individual Graduate Program (IGP) Authority and approved the continued use of the IGP through the 2011-12 academic year.

Reviews of Name Changes, Discontinuances, Consolidations, and Other Programmatic Matters

As shown below, CCGA considered multiple requests for name changes, consolidations, reconstitutions, discontinuances, of degree titles, programs, departments, graduate groups, or schools.

Campus	School/Program/Group	New Name/Group	Requested Action	Disposition
UCLA	M.A. in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL)	–	Discontinuance	Approved
UCLA	Discontinuance of the M.A. in Biology	Establishment of the M.S. in Biology (Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology)	Disestablishment and Establishment	Approved

Acknowledgements

CCGA is grateful to have had valuable input from and exchange with these UCOP and campus consultants over the past year: Provost Lawrence Pitts; Vice President for Research and Graduate Affairs Steven Beckwith; Director of Graduate Studies Pamela Jennings; Director of Academic Planning Todd Greenspan; Academic Planning Assistant Director Hilary Baxter; and Academic Senate Associate Director Todd Giedt. The committee also thanks the numerous faculty members who, as alternates, kindly represented their respective campuses at CCGA meetings throughout the year.

Respectfully submitted:

Jim Carmody, Chair (UCSD)   *Susan Carter (UCSC)*

Rachael Goodhue, Vice Chair (UCD)   *Daniel Arovas (UCSD)*

Dorothy Hale (UCB)   *Michael Beattie (UCSF)*

Alan Buckpitt (UCD)   *Philippe Marchand (UCB student)*

Ruth Mulnard (UCI)   *Karinna Hurley (UCD student)*

Karen Gylys (UCLA)   *Daniel Simmons (ex-officio member)*

Christopher Kello (UCM)   *Robert Anderson (ex-officio member)*

Morris Maduro (UCR)   *Eric Zárate (Committee Analyst)*

Sharon Farmer (UCSB)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
EDUCATIONAL POLICY

2010-2011 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) met eight times in Academic Year 2010-2011 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 170 and in the Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (the "Compendium"). The major activities of the committee and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows.

UC's Financial Crisis

UCEP discussed and responded to a variety of proposals and recommendations on how to deal with UC's ongoing financial crisis. What emerged over the course of the year from the Academic Council and the administration was an understanding that UC funding levels affect three interdependent axes: access (the number of students UC can serve), affordability (how much a UC education costs the student), and quality (preserving the quality of UC research and instruction—in particular, the quality of the faculty and of the students). By the end of the year it was widely understood that decreases in access or affordability can be reversed relatively quickly if increased funding becomes available, but that quality, once lost, may take decades to recover.

UCEP discussed a variety of cost-cutting and revenue-generating measures, all of which resulted by the end of the year in the report of the Academic Council's Implementation Task Force. One measure discussed by UCEP was to consider increasing the use of teaching-oriented faculty (Unit 18 and SOE lecturers, for example), in preference to increasing the teaching loads of ladder-rank faculty to noncompetitive levels. UCEP developed a set of "best practices" for the use of teaching-oriented faculty; this document is available on the UCEP web site. Another measure was to increase the number of non-resident students (whose tuition more than supports the full cost of their education). A third measure was to encourage the reexamination of prerequisite streams and program bottlenecks, to facilitate degree completion within four years. A measure that UCEP recommended against pursuing was an emphasis on facilitating degree completion in three years.

UCEP members also voiced concern that UC's practice of continuing to accept funding cuts and continuing to produce good research and education was ultimately counterproductive, giving the impression that the funding cuts did not have severe consequences.

Towards the end of the year, UCEP considered the Senate's role in decisions to cancel programs, particularly programs that do not exist elsewhere at UC. In 2011-12, UCEP may choose to propose new language for the Compendium that allows a divisional Senate (or perhaps Senate member) to bring to UCEP's attention the proposed cancellation of a program unique at UC, with arguments focusing on the program's value systemwide.

UCEP also reviewed changes to UC's post-employment benefits and proposals to allocate transparently to the campuses the funds each campus generates ("funding streams").

Transfer Students and Articulation
Over the course of this year, the committee discussed issues related to community college transfer students and course articulation. The focus for UC has been how things can be streamlined for transfer students, enabling them to earn their bachelor's degrees in (close to) two years at UC after transfer. The Legislature, too, is concerned with this issue and has requested in AB 2302 that UC address it. UCEP has attempted to understand the size and shape of the transfer population and to assess the success of transfer students by discipline. The perception that transferring into UC is a difficult process is based on anecdotal information; UCEP has identified and requested from UCOP a range of data that will help determine the nature and extent of any problems; in 2011-12, UCEP may wish to analyze these data and make further recommendations.

UCEP received reports that some students transfer to UC having chosen a major that requires a long stream of prerequisites (as is often the case in the sciences) but without any preparation for that major. BOARS has a proposal, currently out for targeted review, that establishes preparation for a major at UC as a main criterion for transfer admission; UCEP endorsed this proposal in principle and will review it formally in 2011-12. Also in 2011-12, UCEP may choose to review the Associate's Degree for Transfer programs developed by the community colleges, to evaluate their potential for streamlining transfer admission to UC.

The committee also suggested that faculty who make articulation decisions about specific courses for specific programs take a holistic approach to approval, focusing more on whether the course proposed for articulation will prepare the student to succeed in the subsequent courses at UC rather than on whether the proposed course covers 100% of the topics in the locally articulated course. The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) drafted and endorsed a memo to this effect, to be distributed to UC department chairs.

UCEP also received reports of an initiative by the provost to identify commonly accepted lower-division preparation for certain majors across the campuses; the initially participating disciplines were math, history, psychology, biological sciences, and computer science. If this initiative produces agreements about commonly accepted preparation, UCEP may choose to review them in 2011-12.

UCEP discussed the creation of a database to collect all of the articulation decisions that are made systemwide, to inform and possibly facilitate subsequent decisions involving similar courses. This is being considered as part of the UC online education initiative; in parallel, UC is undertaking a redesign of the assist.org web site that catalogs articulation arrangements between community colleges, CSU, and UC. In 2011-12, UCEP may wish to receive status reports on these efforts.

Online Education
This year, UCEP continued its discussions about UCOP's online education initiative and pilot project. The pilot project was proposed as a research project aimed at exploring a variety of faculty-driven techniques for employing digital tools in instruction and at evaluating the effectiveness of those techniques. When UCOP was unable to secure external funding for the

project, the president decided to make about $7 million available as a loan from UC funds under a program that supports initiatives that may create new efficiencies or generate new revenue. UCEP members were disappointed with this decision, especially since the committee was on record as supporting the pilot only if external funding was utilized. They were concerned that the focus of the program would shift from its research orientation towards revenue generation from non-UC students, since it is enrollments from that source that are contemplated as providing the revenue to repay the loan and support the online project on an ongoing basis.

Part of the pilot project is an evaluation and assessment framework. Initially, little detail was available about the personnel and plans for this evaluation effort. UCEP requested more detail, which it received in the form of a draft roadmap document in July. Some UCEP members provided comments on this document; in 2011-12, UCEP will probably review and comment on the evaluation plans more formally, taking a formative role in guiding the evaluation team's activities. UCEP also recommended, and Council endorsed, the formation of an independent "blue-ribbon" panel of experts in the assessment of on-line instruction at the postsecondary level. In 2011-12, UCEP will participate (with the assistance of UCOC and the Senate leadership as appropriate) in the formation and formal appointment of this panel, which will be charged with reviewing the evaluation team's plans and reports to help inform UCEP and the Council as they make their recommendations about the future conduct of on-line education efforts at UC.

Most divisional Senates have adopted policies for the approval of courses that involve a significant amount of non-traditional electronic instruction. The current policies have been collected and made available on the UCEP web site. In 2011-12, UCEP may wish to create a model or minimum set of approval criteria for on-line courses.

Many issues surrounding online education have yet to be resolved, including those listed below. Some of these are being addressed by joint Senate-administration working groups in the summer of 2011. As these groups make their recommendations, UCEP will review them in 2011-12.
- What background will be required of non-UC students and how enrollment of non-UC students will be managed so that the character of courses will not be affected.
- How designers, instructors, and offering departments will be compensated for their efforts (both for courses offered to regularly enrolled UC students and for non-UC students, whether concurrently enrolled or enrolled in separate sections)
- How students will learn of the availability of online courses on a given topic, how they will enroll, and how their completion of the course will be reflected on their transcripts (see "Systemwide Courses" below)

Systemwide Courses
One aspect of online instruction is the accessibility of online courses to students who are not geographically located or enrolled at the campus offering the course. Questions of publicity, enrollment, articulation, and recording of credit for non-local students have yet to be resolved; existing measures are reportedly paper-based and difficult for students to navigate. Besides online courses, other UC courses pose many of the same issues: UCDC and Sacramento Center, EAP, Arabic Without Walls, and potentially other programs.

Senate Regulation 544 addresses enrollment by UC students in courses at another UC campus. It also contemplates the designation of "systemwide courses" that would be approved by the usual Senate bodies on a campus and then designated as systemwide by UCEP (or CCGA for graduate courses). Systemwide status under SR 544 mandates listing of the course in every campus catalogue, though practical mechanisms to accomplish this may not be in effect.

Proposed regulations to apply and extend SR 544 to online and similar courses have been drafted with these goals and forward to UCEP:
- Any credit-bearing course must be designed and proposed by an academic department and approved through the existing Senate course approval bodies on campus
- Instructors for credit-bearing courses are approved by the responsible academic department
- For a regular UC course to be open to non-UC students ("concurrent enrollment"), the instructor has authority over what background the non-UC students must have and how many of them can be accommodated in the course
- Courses designated as systemwide must be approved like any other course and then proposed as systemwide to UCEP
- Systemwide courses receive systemwide publicity, not only listings in campus catalogs but also inclusion in the various electronic course information systems
- Systemwide courses may generate expedited consideration for articulation with general education and major requirements across the UC campuses
- The grading standards in systemwide courses should be the same as in the equivalent course offered by the responsible department
- UC students receive credit for systemwide courses to the same extent as they would for the equivalent course offered by the responsible department

In 2011-12, UCEP will need to finalize these regulations and launch the approval process. It will also be necessary to work with UCOP and the registrars to make sure that the registrar functions involved with non-local course enrollment are fully and effectively implemented.

In 2011-12, UCEP may wish to enhance its guidelines and criteria for approving proposed systemwide courses, such as whether the course has differential workload or differential units to accommodate students from both quarter and semester campuses, whether the course provides for an appropriate level of student interaction, and whether sufficient measures are contemplated to ensure that students are evaluated based on work they produced themselves.

Also related to non-local courses is Senate Regulation 610, which defines the term "residency" as used in various degree requirements (e.g., that the final 45 units completed for a degree be earned "in residence"). UCRJ ruled on a close vote that for these purposes, residence refers to courses approved by the relevant UC Senate bodies rather than physical presence on campus. This is consistent with current practice that allows students to complete UCDC, EAP, or field studies in the last term of their degree. UCEP agreed with this determination, noted that it would come into play as online courses become more frequent, and proposed language changes to SR 610 that make the UCRJ interpretation explicit. Council endorsed this language and sent it forward in the approval process; in 2011-12, UCEP will want to monitor the progress of this change.

UC Quality

A statement drafted last year on UC quality was slightly revised by Chair Kay with input from the members. Quality based on the totality of the experience at UC should be the focus, not just any single course. The document is intended for internal use as a more concrete description of the various aspects of "UC Quality." It would need revision before being suitable external audiences such as the legislature. The statement was submitted to Council in March and endorsed. It was also submitted to the Task Force for the Implementation of the Powell Committee Report.

Other Issues and Additional Business

In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCEP also issued views on the following:

- Securing Senate representation in labor negotiations with academic student employees
- Requesting UC to negotiate with appropriate federal agencies to achieve parity in the flexibility of academic student employee working conditions between international students and US citizens
- Proposal to rename fees "tuition"
- Proposed revisions to APM 010 and 015
- Report of the Task Force on Senate Membership
- Self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs
- Implementing Powell Committee recommendations
- UC Policy to Address Student Privacy Issues
- Report of the Library Planning Task Force

UCEP touched on a variety of other issues related to the business of the Academic Council, Academic Assembly, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, and the work of campus Committees on Educational Policy.

UCEP Representation

UCEP Chair David Kay represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, and Academic Assembly, and regularly attended meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates. Chair Kay also participated on the UCDC Governing Council and a group advising UCOP on the development of the online pilot project.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements

UCEP benefited from consultation and reports from Daniel Greenstein, Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination, Hilary Baxter, Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination, and Shawn Brick, Associate Director, Transfer Admissions Policy. In addition, UCEP consulted the Academic Senate chair and vice-chair, who updated the committee on issues facing the Academic Council and Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

David G. Kay, Chair (I)
Michael Dennin (I)
Constantin Teleman (B)
Peter Loomer (SF)
Begoña Echeverria (R)
John Yoder (D)
Justin Riordan (Undergraduate student-SC)

Jose Wudka, Vice Chair (R)
Gregg Camfield (M)
John Tamkun (SC)
Laurie Smith (SD)
Sherrel Howard (LA)
Cynthia Skenazi (SB)
Jason Chou (Graduate student-R)

Dan Simmons ((D), Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Bob Anderson ((B), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio)*
Brenda Abrams, Senior Policy Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
2010-11 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Under Senate Bylaw 175, the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) considers and reports on matters concerning the economic welfare of the faculty, including salaries, benefits, insurance, retirement, housing, and conditions of employment. UCFW held eleven in-person meetings during the 2010-11 academic year, and the major actions and discussions of ongoing issues are highlighted in this report.

UCFW has two key subcommittees with memberships independent of UCFW and with particular expertise in: (1) the University's Retirement System (UCRS) including its policies and its investments (the Task Force on Investment and Retirement, TFIR); and (2) the University's health plans for employees and retirees (the Health Care Task Force, HCTF). These committees monitor developments and carry out detailed analyses of questions and issues in their respective areas and report back to the parent committee, UCFW, for further action. UCFW is indebted to the extraordinary commitment and skills of our two subcommittee chairs, Helen Henry (TFIR) and Robert May (HCTF).

It is important to recognize that although this is the report of UCFW, the work done by the two subcommittees forms the basis of much of what is reported here. These subcommittees spend a great deal of time in consultation with systemwide Human Resources (HR). Many of these consultants also regularly attend UCFW meetings and lend their expertise to our discussions. We are indebted to these consultants, and they are individually acknowledged at the end of this Report.

POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS: The 2009-10 academic year was dominated by an investigation into redesigning post-employment benefits (PEBs) in order to lower costs and enhance their long-term fiscal stability. This discussion and debate lasted well into the 2010-11 academic year. After the Post Employment Benefits Task Force issued its recommendations, a public education campaign ensued. Helping to educate UC faculty and staff at town hall discussions throughout the system afforded Senate representatives the opportunity to articulate the Senate's position directly to our constituents. This direct communication was important as UCFW disagreed with many of the PEB Task Force's official recommendations. Instead, UCFW argued in favor of maintaining the current practice of offering an annuity whose rates are not determined in consideration with Social Security; this recommendation was subsequently embraced in concept by President Yudof in his final recommendations). UCFW also challenged several of the economic and performance assumptions underlying the Task Force's recommendations, most especially what was required to incentivize career-length employment at UC. As a result, a compromise position emerged that preserved the best elements of UCRP while making concessions to lower normal costs and a different age factor structure.

In December, The Regents adopted formally the Senate's preferred option of the final choices made available to them. That option leaves incumbent employees members of a largely unchanged UCRP, while new hires (after July 1, 2013) will be members of a

"new tier" of UCRP whose plan documents are still being drafted. Still to be finalized are disability provisions as well as the long-term employee contribution rates for existing tier members.

The federal economic uncertainty, state budget concerns and, in some quarters, a challenging attitude toward public workers and public sector pensions also continue to challenge UCRP. UCFW and its task forces will continue to work with CFO Taylor to monitor the plan's funding status and to develop plans and alternatives for maintaining the plan's health.

HEALTH AND WELFARE BENEFITS: As insurance costs continue to rise and as the University budget continues to shrink, lowering expenditures on health and welfare benefits has become a higher administration priority. One effort to lower on-going costs was the development of the Blue and Gold plan within HealthNet. Although the plan affords some employees a lower premium rate for comparable coverage, other employees were forced into the higher premium option due to lack of local providers. This outcome was concentrated in certain northern California markets, and many employees reacted negatively to the forced change in premiums and health care providers– an outcome exacerbated by perceived poor communications surrounding the new option. UCFW and its HCTF continue to monitor changes to the Blue and Gold program, such as the participation of more, but not all, providers in the differentially impacted areas.

UCFW and/or HCTF participated in discussions about other possible options to curtail University outlays in health and welfare expenditures going forward, including changing the subsidy rates to part time employees or for family coverage, which are still under investigation and consideration for out-year implementation.

These diminutions follow previously approved cuts to retiree premiums as agreed upon in the PEB process.

COMPLIANCE CONCERNS AND RISK ABATEMENT EFFORTS: Previously, UCFW welcomed Senior Vice President Sheryl Vacca, Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Audit Services, and her message that compliance should be user-friendly. As a result, UCFW recommended, and the Academic Council endorsed, the creation of a joint task force to help see these initiatives to completion. The joint working group was empanelled in the spring of 2011, and is undertaking a systemwide audit of mandatory training courses and their development with the goal of simplifying the record keeping associated with various trainings, combining trainings where possible, and clarifying the responsible parties and units for each training. The work group recommendations are expected in the winter of 2012. The UCFW representatives on this joint task force have been challenged to find a common framework and language for productive discussions with the administrative representatives and as a consequence progress has been steady but slow.

 "FAMILY FRIENDLY" POLICIES:

Fee Waivers for Dependents: UCFW continues to recognize the value of fee waivers for enrollment at UC of dependents of employees, but still could not recommend funding them over other considerations; nonetheless, UCFW will continue to monitor this issue and will support viable options.

Dependent Care: The Berkeley campus completed a pilot program on emergency back-up dependent care, and expanded eligibility for campus participation. The program allows participants to secure last-minute professional babysitting, elder care, or even care during professional travel. The Systemwide Advisory Committee on the Status of Women worked with Human Resources to develop a systemwide RFP to offer this benefit at each UC location to both faculty and staff. A final report is expected in the fall of 2011. In the meantime, other individual UC locations are independently exploring this program.

CASH COMPENSATION ISSUES:
Salary Scales: In anticipation of a 3% salary augmentation pool for faculty, discussion focused on how to allot the increase. UCFW, in keeping with its stated position of support for the salary scales, recommended that only the base salary be eligible for the 3% augmentation, and that off-scale and above-scale portions not be augmented. Various voices in the administration indicated that any increase, regardless of the salary scales, had to be tied to demonstrated meritorious performance reviews. But given the state's dire fiscal situation, any increases would also have to be defended cogently and consistently. This augmentation is still expected in the 2011 calendar year, but precisely how it will be implemented is yet to be finalized.

Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP): Previous efforts to redraft the policy regulating the HSCP, Academic Personnel Manual (APM) section 670, were not endorsed by various administration officials, and so redrafting began anew. UCFW was not swayed by the arguments presented by the administration in declining to adopt the Senate's recommendations, however, and negotiations continue.

UCFW has also called for a total remuneration study for health sciences faculty and staff, since their considerable portion of the University population was not included in the 2009 general campus total remuneration study. Securing data from competitors that is comparable in a meaningful way to UC, though, has proven difficult. Both the uniqueness of UC's HSCP and the complexity of its component parts, as well as similar obstacles among competitors, have made securing data or adequate proxies either impossible to devise or too expensive. UCFW will continue to lobby for this study as it believes that recruitment and retention efforts will be strengthened with the additional transparency that such data will provide.

Alternate Compensation Plans: In 2009-10, the Office of Academic Personnel was charged to investigate compensation plans for general campus faculty, similar to HSCP for other disciplines, in such disciplines as business, engineering, and the biological sciences. This year, proposed new APM 668 was circulated for management review, and UCFW as well as several other Senate bodies opined. A revised version for formal review is expected in 2011-12.

OTHER POLICY ISSUES AND SYSTEMWIDE REVIEWS:
Task Force on Senate Membership: UCFW reviewed the report and recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership. UCFW was split in its reception of them. Some agreed with the findings that no significant changes to membership parameters should be made after all faculty are properly coded and assigned to the appropriate title. Others asserted that the Task Force did not deal with the

underlying issue: that a significant portion of the faculty – namely in the health sciences, but also in specialists in Agriculture and Natural Resources – have insufficient voice, ~~nor~~ representation, and redress in the current system. To many, however, it was unclear how Senate membership would alter the situation. It is likely that this will be a recurring topic for discussion in both UCFW and the Academic Council.

WORKING SMARTER INITIATIVE: Spurred partly by external financial considerations and partly by concern that UC was not following current business best practices, the administration launched a Working Smarter Initiative designed to update out-of-date practices and to leverage system economies of scale, with the stated goal of saving the University $500M over five years by lowering recurring expenses. UCFW was concerned that some of the projects would compromise educational quality or not generate the anticipated savings due to unanticipated structural problems at the implementation phase. As a result, UCFW suggested, and the Academic Council concurred, that Senate participation through Shared Governance processes was needed to help inform the development of new practices and policies with an eye to user-friendliness and consequences to faculty that may not be apparent to administration project leads.

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MANUAL REVISIONS: Several sections of the APM were up for review, and some new sections were proposed. UCFW opined on each of the following drafts:

- 200 and 205 (Recalls)
- 510 (Internal Recruitment)
- 530 (Non-residents)
- 668 (Alternate Compensation Plans)
- 670 (Health Sciences Compensation Plan)
- 700 series (Leaves of Absence)

CORRESPONDENCE: Beyond submitting opinions and recommendations on the topics above, UCFW opined on the following matters of systemwide import:

- Insurance coverage for faculty traveling abroad on sabbatical or for other extended business;
- Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs;
- Changes to messaging around and implementation of the Mortgage Origination Program;
- New effort reporting guidelines.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: UCFW is indebted to its consultants and guests, without whom the committee's work could not be done:

External consultants from Mercer, Deloitte, and Segal.

Finally, we are particularly grateful for the involvement, support and guidance from the Senate leadership, Chair Daniel Simmons and Vice Chair Robert Anderson.

Respectfully yours, UCFW 2010-11

Joel Dimsdale, Chair
William Parker, Vice Chair
Yale Braunstein, UCB
Lisa Tell, UCD
Gopi Meenakshisundaram, UCI
Shane White, UCLA
Sean Malloy, UCM
J. Daniel Hare, UCR
Farrokh Najmabadi, UCSD
Grayson Marshall, UCSF
Gayle Binion, UCSB
Suresh Lodha, UCSC
Helen Henry, TFIR Chair
Robert May, HCTF Chair
Ernest Newbrun, CUCEA Chair (ex officio)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
ANNUAL REPORT 2010-11

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Responsibilities and Duties
Per Senate Bylaw 182, the University Committee on International Education (UCIE) is primarily charged with 1) considering and reporting on matters of international education referred to the Committee by the President of the University, the Academic Council, the Assembly, a Divisional or any Senate Committee; and 2) continuing review of the Education Abroad Program and its policies. As part of its charge, it consults with the University of California Education Abroad Program (UCEAP) on future program development, including modification of the programs of existing Study Centers, establishment of new Study Centers, and disestablishment of EAP programs. The committee also oversees the formal review of programs and advises the President on the appointment of Study Center Directors. UCIE met in-person two times and held two iLinc video conferences during the 2010-11 academic year; the committee's key activities and accomplishments are highlighted in this report.

UCEAP Overview: Stabilization and Renewed Growth
In 2010-11, after a couple of years of downsizing, UCEAP experienced a period of general stabilization that culminated in renewed program development towards the end of the year. In August 2010, Professor Jean-Xavier Guinard was appointed as the new Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director for UCEAP; his term began on October 1, 2010. In November 2010 UCEAP's Santa Barbara staff numbered 70 (from approximately 120 FTEs a couple of years ago) and 75 FTEs abroad. By May 2011, EAP enrollments stood at 4,834 students and 1,117 reciprocity students (as compared to 4,189 students in 2009-10). UCEAP faced two crises this past year, in Egypt and Japan, which required evacuations of its students. Due to the tsunami in Japan, UCEAP evacuated 77 students in its Japan programs, and all of the Japan programs were suspended (thereby cancelling the spring programs for an additional 46 students). After the uprising in Cairo, the Egypt programs were also suspended and students evacuated. UCEAP suffered $400,000 in cumulative losses resulting from both these crises.

With General Fund state appropriations to EAP ending by 2013-14, UCEAP continued to implement its new budget model, which relies on student fees to fund its programs. Fiscally, UCEAP should eliminate its budget deficit in 2011-12 and begin to accumulate a contingency reserve to hedge against the inherent risks in study abroad (currency fluctuations, natural disasters, political unrest, etc.). UCEAP also entered into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with UC Santa Barbara (UCSB), which took force on July 1, 2010, and established an administrative partnership (concerns information technology, human resources, and faculty support), but allows UCEAP to retain its independent identity. The MOU also altered Director Guinard's reporting line so that he now has a "dotted" line to the UCSB EVP Gene Lucas, but he still directly reports to Vice Provost Dan Greenstein at the Office of the President (UCOP). Finally, UCEAP initiated strategic planning efforts in January 2011 with a focus on study abroad opportunities for all students, academic excellence, and best business practices.

EAP Governance Committee
UCIE Chair Haviland, Vice Chair Kagan, and Errol Lobo participated in the EAP Governance Committee meetings this year. EAP Governing Committee minutes can be found at:
http://web1.eap.ucop.edu/staff/bulletinboard.htm.

EAP Program Development

UCIE lifted its informal "ban" on new programs, which had been in place since 2009.[1] When it lifted the ban, UCIE made the following statement to UCEAP:

> "UCIE agrees to consider new program proposals with the expectation that new programs will be reviewed on an ad-hoc basis, will be self-supporting, and that faculty consultation will take place through the relevant FACs, which should be involved at the preliminary stages of the development of the new program. UCIE should be informed that such planning is taking place."

Towards the end of 2010-11, UCEAP moved forward with a number of new program proposals. UCIE approved new programs at the following host institutions and third-party providers: Bogazici University and Koc University, Istanbul, Turkey; CIEE Taipei Intensive Chinese Language Program, Taiwan; Tsinghua University, Beijing, China; Hong Kong Polytechnic University; Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona, Spain; Chinese University of Hong Kong; Universidad Tres de Febrero, Buenos Aires, Argentina; University of New South Wales Traveling Summer School, New South Wales, Australia; CIEE (Critical Studies), Paris, France; Free University (Summer), Berlin, Germany; University College, Dublin, Ireland; National University of Singapore; Singapore Agency for Science, Technology, & Research, and the London School of Economics. For more details on these programs, please see Appendix A.

Study Center Directors
UCIE made recommendations on study center director (SCD) candidates for Argentina and Chile and Argentina, Egypt and the Middle East, France, Mexico, and Spain. UCEAP consolidated the SCD positions in Argentina/Chile (one SCD for both countries), China (the Beijing SCD was consolidated under the Shanghai SCD), and France (only one SCD for France). The Egypt SCD will also have responsibility for the Turkey programs. UCEAP consultants have informed UCIE that EAP is heading towards a model of governance that does not include faculty SCDs. This decision is being driven by both cost and the fact that SCDs represent, in UCEAP's opinion, an outmoded operational model in the field of study abroad. Instead, EAP will primarily rely on local liaison officers, who are usually faculty members at the host institutions. The liaison officer would either oversee academic matters only or oversee both operational and academic matters. At many locations, administrative details are being handled by staff at the host institutions.

2010-11 Formal Reviews
UCIE reviewed four programs in the 2010-11 academic year – Australia, China, Korea, and New Zealand (see Appendix B):
- *Australia*: UCIE approved the Australia review report at its May 2011 meeting (see p. 4 of the May minutes); formal follow-up by UCEAP will take place in one year.
- *China*: UCIE approved the China review report at its June 2011 meeting (see pp. 1-2 of the June minutes); formal follow-up by UCEAP will take place in one year.
- *Korea*: UCIE approved the Korea review report at its June 2011 meeting (see p. 2 of the June minutes); formal follow-up by UCEAP will take place in one year.
- *New Zealand*: UCIE approved the New Zealand review report at its May 2011 meeting (see p. 4 of the May minutes); formal follow-up by UCEAP will take place in one year.

2011-12 UCIE Formal Review Committees

---

[1] See UCIE's 2009 report "UCEAP General Budget Principals," which was prepared for the EAP Task Force.

Members approved the following programs to be formally reviewed in the 2011-12 academic year: Ireland, Paris Summer Language and Culture Program (three-year review), Scandinavia, and South Africa.

Faculty Advisory Committees
UCIE advised UCEAP on the formation of a number of faculty advisory committees (FACs) in 2010-11; these included the following FACs: FAC on UCEAP in China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong, FAC on UCEAP in Southeast Asia, a FAC on UCEAP in the Middle East, and FAC on Spanish Language and Culture Programs. With the exception of the Turkey FAC, members for these FACs have two-year terms. UCIE also recommended establishing a FAC on Heritage Language Programs.

UCIE Whitepaper on Academic Integration
At the June meeting of the EAP Governance Committee, UCIE Chair John Haviland presented UCIE's white paper on Academic Integration (AI). The white paper (see Appendix C) outlined the elements of AI, provided a status update on AI activities on some of the campuses, presented a number of recommendations. In short, UCIE noted that AI efforts involve five categories of activities: outreach, promotion, advising, requirements and bridges. It also observed that the level of AI activities vary widely by campus. Finally, it made the following recommendations: 1) Continuing ongoing administrative support to UCEAP and campus education abroad offices; 2) Giving appropriate priority to creating a database of individual EAP approved courses; 3) Increasing faculty involvement in vetting new program proposals and periodic review of existing programs; and 4) Active and widely distributed involvement of the administration and faculty towards the stated goal of ""internationalization".

UCEAP Miscellaneous Proposals and White Papers
- *White Paper on Reciprocity*: UCEAP released its white paper on reciprocity to the EAP Governing Committee and UCIE. See http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucie/Reciprocity_white_paper.pdf.

Acknowledgements
UCIE wishes to acknowledge the contributions of its principal consultant, Associate Vice Provost and UCEAP Executive Director Jean-Xavier Guinard, as well as UCEAP Regional Director Linda York.

Respectfully submitted:

John Haviland, Chair (UCSD)	Yang Ye (UCR)
Olga Kagan, Vice Chair (UCLA)	Ann Craig (UCSD)
Richard Kern/Vincent Resh (UCB)	Errol Lobo (UCSF)
Jeanette Money (UCD)	Kum-Kum Bhavnani (UCSB)
Volodymyr Bilotkach (UCI)	Robert Anderson (Council Vice Chair, ex-officio)
Cristían Ricci (UCM)	Daniel L. Simmons (Council Chair, ex-officio)
Giacomo Bernardi (UCSC)	Todd Giedt (Analyst)

Title	Year	Description	Status	Reviewer	Follow-Up
Australia	2010-11	UCIE approved the report. UCEAP will submit a report on the follow-up to this review in one year's time.	Completed	Vincent Resh	5/18/2012
New Zealand	2010-11	UCIE approved the review report. UCEAP will submit a report on the follow-up to this review in one year.	Completed	Kum-Kum Bhavnani	5/18/2012
China	2010-11	UCEAP should submit a report on the follow-up to this	Completed	Giacomo Bernardi	5/18/2012
Singapore	2009-10	UCEAP submitted a follow-up report to this review at the	Completed		
Taiwan	2009-10		Completed		
FU Best	2009-10	UCEAP submitted a follow-up letter on FU-BEST to UCIE in	Completed	Debra Lewis	
Korea	2010-11	UCEAP should submit a report on the follow-up to this	Completed	Cristian Ricci	5/18/2012
Chile	2007-08		Completed		
Rome	2007-08		Completed	Errol Lobo	
Russia	2007-08	A new Russia program was established with CIEE in June	Completed	Olga Kagan	
Barbados	2008-09		Completed	John Haviland	
Hungary	2008-09	Program was subsequently closed due to the budget	Completed		
Madrid Summer L&C	2009-10		Completed		

UCIE Program Reviews,
2010-11

Title	Host Institution/3rd Party Provider	City, Country	Duration	Start Date/Status	Approval Date
Tsinghua University	Tsinghua University	Beijing, China	Spring Semester	Spring 2013	5/13/2011
Hong Kong Polytechnic University	Hong Kong Polytechnic University	Hong Kong	Fall Semester;#Spring Semester	Fall 2012	5/13/2011
Pompeu Fabra University	Pompeu Fabra University	Barcelona, Spain	Winter Quarter;#Spring Quarter	Winter 2013	5/13/2011
Chinese University of Hong Kong	Chinese University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Summer	Cancelled	5/13/2011
Universidad Tres de Febrero	Universidad Tres de Febrero	Buenos Aires, Argentina	Summer	Summer 2012	6/16/2011
University of New South Wales Traveling Summer School	University of New South Wales Traveling Summer School	New South Wales, Australia	Summer	Summer 2012	6/16/2011
Critical Studies Program	CIEE	Paris, France	Fall Semester;#Spring Semester;#Year	Spring 2012	6/16/2011
Free University Berlin Summer	Free University	Berlin, Germany	Summer	Summer 2012	6/16/2011
University College Dublin , Quinn School of Business, Summer	University College Dublin	Dublin, Ireland	Summer	Cancelled	6/16/2011
National University of Singapore Biodiversity Program	National University of Singapore	Singapore	Summer;#5 weeks	Summer 2012	6/16/2011
Singapore Agency for Science, Technology, & Research	Singapore Agency for Science, Technology, & Research	Singapore	2-6 Months	Fall 2012	6/16/2011
London School of Economics	London School of Economics	London, England	Summer;#6 Weeks	Summer 2012	6/16/2011
Bogazici University	Bogazici University	Istanbul, Turkey	Fall Semester;#Spring Semester;#Year	Fall 2012	1/21/2011
Koc University	Koc University	Istanbul, Turkey	Fall Semester;#Spring Semester;#Year	Fall 2011	1/21/2011
CIEE Taipei Intensive Chinese Language Program at National Chengchi University	CIEE	Taipei, Taiwan	Fall Semester;#Spring Semester;#Year	Summer 2011	3/21/2011

<div style="text-align: center;">

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
2010-2011 ANNUAL REPORT

</div>

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) met three times in the 2010-2011 academic year to conduct business in accordance with its charge, outlined in Senate Bylaw 185, to advise the president about the administration of University libraries. Highlights of the committee's major activities are outlined briefly below.

Negotiations with Nature Publishing Group

Ivy Anderson, Director, Collection Development & Management at the California Digital Library reported on the negotiations with Nature Publishing Group. Last spring UC received its official quote for its licensing fee which represented a quadruple increase in the costs. CDL reduced costs by 8% with a large set of publishers and this increase would undo CDL's efforts. CDL had reached out to publishers to discuss the budget situation. Last spring a letter was sent to faculty about the proposal from Nature which indicated the possibility of a boycott. The letter was met with some consternation but much more support. NPG sees themselves as a premier service that should be expensive. The cost of Nature with the quadruple increase would be very unreasonable. UC entered into discussions with NPG which are about an entirely new model.

Under the proposed new model, authors would pay for submission and then for publication. The author will have to determine if an article should be submitted to Nature or some other journal. Paying for publication of the article can be seen as part of the experiment and the fee can be taken out of a grant although support will need to be provided for faculty that do not have grants. Authors will keep the copyright. By default of shifting costs, the goal is that eventually open access will be achieved, although in the short term, access will continue to be restricted to subscribers. Faculty in the Humanities and Social Sciences could be supported by the funds that are coming back into the University. If NPG agrees to change its model the hope is that other publishers will adopt it. NPG can decide how much to charge authors and possibly end up with higher revenue, and if the submission fee is too high authors will not publish in their journals. The negotiations have forced NPG to look at their current business model and where they want to be in the future. Currently UC has a month to month journal licensing agreement with NPG.

Journal Negotiations

Director Anderson also reported on recent negotiations with other journal publishers for systemwide subscriptions. In fiscal year 2011, CDL had $39 million in systemwide expenditures and 87% was from the campuses and 13% was from CDL. Sixty-seven percent went to journals and 28% went to other kinds of content. The increase in the percentage to journals was related to publisher acquisitions and more content coming to UC. CDL has been working on reducing expenditures in the last several years and worked closely with publishers to do this. Zero percent increases were negotiated with many publishers while in the past typically there were increases in the range of 7%. These contracts included Sage and Wiley. CDL was asked to reduce expenditures by 15%. CDL had $13 million in expenditures last year which includes a 15% reduction with Wiley. After a 30 day trial of SCOPUS this database was not purchased because it did not provide value in terms of its underlying content. This database would have cost UC

approximately $1 million. Elsevier is developing a number of expensive search tools that use SCOPUS.

This year there were negotiations with Springer. The open access pilot with this publisher was well received. Springer is the third most expensive contract and on a cost per article download basis they are high. Springer was not willing to let UC cancel any journals, stating that the value of the deal is in the bundle. Data from purchase history is used to determine what will be used as a basis for what CDL proposes to pay. A small core of journals is heavily used and a larger group had medium usage. Libraries did not want to eliminate the low usage journals which would have resulted in about a 10% decrease in cost. CDL looks at how much a journal is cited by UC faculty and cost effectiveness which includes cost per use and per impact factor among other metrics. A list of journals is developed based on campus bibliographers and the metrics. The agreement with Springer was scaled back and open access was taken off the table. Springer was sold before the most recent negotiation and they are operating in a new management environment. The company is now owned by two different private equity investors. Three hundred sixty seven journals were canceled but UC will have access to some journals in the next year, but access will be lost to others. Springer is the first publisher to push open access on a large scale and now they have 70 journals under the Springer Open imprint.

Library Planning Task Force
The Library Planning Task Force attempted to identify areas where there could be budget savings. The Task Force's report is a series of recommendations around four broad strategies which are to expand and collectively manage shared library services, supporting faculty efforts to change the system of scholarly communication, explore new sources of revenue, and to improve the existing framework for planning and decision making. More work will be done in terms of how the Task Force's recommendations could be implemented. Implementation will occur in three phases.

Some recommendations would require start up costs that UCOP could get loans for as long as the projects will be able to pay UCOP back. The goal is $14 million in savings in year one and $25 million in year two, with the goal of saving approximately $52 million by the end of year three. UCOP will consider ways to provide systemwide services that save the campuses' money and the savings could be added to increase CDL's budget. The task force suggested a variety of ideas including how space is used. UCOP has taken on some centralized functions of the libraries which has worked well and the question is can more be done centrally. Shared library services need to be pursued There are services that make sense to provide on a systemwide basis although some could be done by the campuses which would give them more flexibility in how funds are used.

The Task Force report will be reviewed by the EVCs and the campuses, and as the recommendations are implemented there should be consultation with UCOLASC. In September a group will be formed to determine how to implement recommendations in phase one with the goal of beginning implementation in January 2012. The budget may impact libraries before they are positioned to manage reductions or benefit from shared services. The Task Force was able to build on planning already conducted by the University Librarians. The draft report will formally be evaluated by SLASIAC. The report will be finalized in the fall. The decisions about cuts to library budgets will be made by the campuses, not UCOP. There will be an 18% reduction of the

UCOP budget and the goal is to be selective about what is cut. Libraries will continue to evolve and increasing efficiencies should be done regardless of the budget situation. UCOLASC submitted a memo outlining a number of concerns with the report.

Update on Library Initiatives

The is a working group on next generation collection services for libraries which appointed three task groups that will make recommendations on how to maximize systemwide efforts to benefit the individual campuses. One is looking at improving the systemwide financial infrastructure, another with exploring enterprise level collection management services and the final group is looking at new modes for organizing and providing access to digital materials, archives and special collection materials. There were forty recommendations that were prioritized with the highest priority given to recommendations that are aligned with recommendations from the Library Planning Task Force. One example is that UC could sign a systemwide agreement to acquire shelf ready services. A task force is looking at doing more digital library services. Digitizing high use materials can be done more systematically. Google has digitized more than UC could have afforded although special collection and non-text materials are not included in this effort. Campuses have put small digitization projects in place and this could be done more systematically.

Infrastructure to manage data has been put in place by CDL. This is an expensive undertaking that is done more economically at a central level. The University of California data center is a direct response to NSF's mandate for data management. A tool has been developed for faculty to create data management plans. Rationalizing the print collections has been a focus of the ULs for many years and this needs to continue. UC is a leader in respect to looking at print collections but other research universities are in a similar position. There is also work on rationalizing retrospective print journal collections. An archive of single copies of journals in different parts of the country is being considered.

Concern about Library Budgets

UCOLASC learned about the reduction of the libraries' operations budgets as a result of the cuts in state funding to UC. Library budgets have been cut by as much as twenty percent and future cuts are being explored. There have also been substantial reductions in library hours at many of the campuses. Discussions about consolidating or eliminating libraries have occurred. Special collections have been closed and specialized staff have separated from UC.

Google Booksearch

Dan Clancy, Former Engineering Director, Google Books and Jimi Crawford, Engineering Director, Google Books joined UCOLASC in May to discuss issues related to the Google digitization project and the failed settlement agreement. The committee wanted to inform Google about what is important to faculty. Lack of engagement with the Academic Senate and others at UC hurt the project and settlement agreement. Google felt that the agreement was a compromise that balanced the different interests, and that UC and Google have similar values. Having more conversations with faculty earlier would have been beneficial.

According to Mr. Clancy, the settlement was rejected primarily because it had forward going permissions. Scanned books in the public domain can be fully accessed and if publishers give Google the books, only 20% can be accessed. Most of the books scanned were from academic authors. Faculty with out of print books may not necessarily know if they have rights to them.

Google is still talking with the plaintiffs about whether there is another type of settlement. On the questions of pricing and monopoly, for the vast majority of academic books most of the authors would be willing to give their books away. University presses could be encouraged to support academic authors to distribute their books for free.

One major hurdle was figuring out what the content Google provides would look like. Faculty would like to maintain a boundary between the content and commercialization. UCOLASC was also concerned about privacy issues and the lack of information from Google about their plans for this was a problem. Google was not able to figure out a way to allow other companies to scan the books and was advised by the DOJ that this was not possible under class action law. Mr. Clancy thinks that if the settlement had been approved there would immediately have been legislation that prevented Google from holding a monopoly.

Mr. Clancy stated that Google had no intention of having advertisements and that this would have been bad business. If ads were run, this would have been in order to charge a university less for the subscription.   Google used the subscription model grudgingly. In the settlement Google explicitly stated that academic authors could offer their books for free. The consumer price was separated from the institutional subscription. In Google Search and Google Scholar there is no directed research and the company is religious about not having a bias. The company does try to have links to authoritative sources and sponsored links have nothing to do with the organic ranking. Books that are in the limited snipet view are ranked lower because Google's consumer surveys find that people do not like them. OCR is run on all of the books and correction is done through recapture which improves OCR errors. The settlement agreement would have allowed institutions to have access to all of the books Google scanned.

Whether anything is happening with the settlement has to be determined and then the question of how to involve academics will need to be addressed. Google is willing to unlock the scanned books and giving them to users. There should be an initiative from academics promoting giving the books away. Most authors of out of print books can write the publishers to request that the rights are reverted to them. A statute will be implemented in 2013 that addresses reverting copyright. The money Google is spending on the project far outstrips the benefit to the company. Google has scanned 15 million books and there is no goal for how many will ultimately be scanned. The company has a new CEO and it is still unclear if this will have an impact on the Book project. Google should be invited to a meeting next year so the committee can have ongoing discussions with the company.

Joint Meeting with University Librarians
UCOLASC met with the University Librarians in February to discuss common topics of interest, including funding streams, the library planning task force, and library initiatives.

Campus Reports
UCOLASC devoted part of each regular meeting to member reports about issues facing divisional Senate library committees. In these discussions, faculty members touched on library budget and space issues, and collections.

Other Issues and Additional Business
In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCOLASC submitted views on the following:

- Proposed Revisions to APMs 010 and 015
- Near Term Choices for UC
- Library Planning Task Force

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements

UCOLASC acknowledges the contributions of its administrative consultants and guests. The committee benefited from consultation and reports from University Librarians Convener Virginia Steel (UCSC), University Librarian and Assistant Chancellor Karen Butter (UCSF), California Digital Library Executive Director Laine Farley, Vice Provost, Academic Information and Strategic Affairs Dan Greenstein, and Librarians Association of the University of California President Michael Yonezawa (UCR). UCOLASC also occasionally consulted the Academic Senate chair and vice chair about issues facing the Academic Senate.

Respectfully submitted:

Richard Schneider, Chair (SF)   Roberto Manduci (SC)
Christopher Kelty (LA)   Sholeh Quinn (M)
Chikako Takeshita (R)   Larry Armi (SD)
Timothy Morton (D)   Stuart Linn (B)
Lee Ann Baxter-Lowe (SF)   Laurie Monahan (SB)
Garrett Liles (Graduate student-D)

Joel Primack ((SC); Chair, UCCC, *Ex-Officio*))
Daniel Simmons ((D), Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Bob Anderson ((B), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, , *Ex Officio*)
Brenda Abrams, Committee Analyst

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) met ten times in Academic Year 2010-11, including two conferences calls, to conduct business with respect to its duties to advise the President and other University agencies on policy regarding planning, budget, and resource allocation as outlined in Senate Bylaw 190 and in the *Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units* (the "Compendium"). The major activities of UCPB and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

UCPB helped lead the Senate's response to the deteriorating state and University budget situation, UC's options for post-employment benefits design, and two major administrative budget reform efforts. UCPB interacted with a variety of senior UC administrators and argued forcefully and effectively for budget action based on principles, notably the importance of competitive faculty total remuneration (relative to comparison institutions) and a strong research enterprise to the future quality of the University of California. The Committee monitored the progress of budget negotiations in Sacramento, analyzed opportunities for achieving local and system-wide budget efficiencies; assessed the degree to which local budget committees have access to information and input into budget decision-making; and worked with other Senate committees on issues of common interest and concern. Conversations were shaped in large measure by recommendations the Committee issued last year in *The Choices Report*.

POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

UCPB began the year by scheduling a special September meeting to discuss the report of the President's Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits with senior UC administrators and Senate leadership. UCPB Chair Jim Chalfant was a member of the Task Force's Finance Work Group and the group of faculty and staff who wrote the Dissenting Statement sent to the President with the main Task Force report. The Committee was brought up to speed quickly about the problems facing the UC Retirement System, their impact on the UC budget, and proposals for benefits redesign recommended by the President's Task Force. UCPB discussed several new UCRP tier options for future employees outlined in the report and Dissenting Statement, and at its October meeting, reviewed four resolutions from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare regarding the proposed options for PEB re-design. UCPB passed four of its own resolutions addressing UCFW's points—opposing new tier "Option A"; supporting Option C over Option B; and opposing requiring an employee contribution in excess of 7% for employees covered by the current terms in the plan. UCPB also resolved that its support for any new tier plan would be conditional on the implementation of a plan for competitive faculty and staff salaries. The Academic Council sent the Senate's views to the President in November, and the Regents held a special December meeting to act on the President's recommendations.

STIP BORROWING AND THE POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FINANCE PLAN

The UC Chief Financial Officer joined UCPB at two meetings to discuss a plan to finance a portion of UC's UCRP obligations with income from the Short Term Investment Pool (STIP). UCPB explored options for reducing UCRP's unfunded liabilities, the implications of various options for financing contributions to amortize the unfunded liability and achieve fully funded status, the mechanics of borrowing from STIP, and the pros and cons of pre-funding the retiree

health benefit. In a memo to Council, UCPB noted its support for borrowing STIP funds and contributing them to UCRP, to allow the University to move more quickly to increase employer contributions to UCRP, to the point where the full Annual Required Contribution (ARC) could be made. Council endorsed UCPB's recommendations.

FUNDING STREAMS

UCPB had several discussions with senior UC leaders about two major UCOP budget reform efforts. The first, "Funding Streams" allows campuses to retain all revenue they generate from most sources, and funds UCOP and systemwide programs through a flat assessment on all campus expenditures. The Associate Vice President for Budget, Operating Budget Director, Provost, and Executive Vice President discussed UCOP's plans with the Committee at several meetings. In a February memo to the Academic Council, UCPB recommended support for Funding Streams as an opportunity to simplify and clarify UC's budgeting process, and to provide campuses with more authority and autonomy in the way they generate and distribute revenue. UCPB also expressed concern about the extent to which Funding Streams would provide a greater incentive to campuses to raise revenue through increased non-resident enrollment; what it could mean for the relationship between medical center and general campus; and its implications for program growth. Instead of a predetermined assessment rate, UCPB preferred that the assessment rate be set and updated based on an initial determination of UCOP's needs; in any particular year, the rate would be calculated to yield the revenue needed to provide funding for an approved level of spending. UCPB felt that the alternative, where funding rose and fell at the center, based on campus revenues and a fixed assessment rate, was not a good model for budgeting.

REBENCHING AND THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE

The second budget reform effort is a developing proposal to "re-bench" or re-balance the historical state general fund allocation formulas that determine the proportion of state funds UCOP distributes to each campus. UCPB and other Senate agencies see rebenching as an opportunity to align the per-student ratio of state funds more equally across campuses. UCPB asked UCOP to begin the rebenching effort at the same time as Funding Streams, or soon after. A small UCPB subcommittee (Brent Haddad, David Lopez, and Gary Leal) drafted a set of principles to guide the effort. This work was later subsumed into the "Implementation Task Force," led by UCPB Chair Chalfant, which was charged by Council to develop an actionable plan grounded in the report of the Academic Council Special Committee on a Plan for the University of California ("The Powell Commission"). Chair Chalfant briefed UCPB on the Implementation Task Force's emerging recommendations for managing the budget gap, enrollment, and costs and a proposed rebenching formula that introduces a common state subsidy per student across campuses. Council voted to forward the Task Force draft report to President Yudof's Budget Rebenching Task Force. UCPB will follow the progress of this effort when it resumes work in the fall.

In addition, Shawn Kantor and Gary Leal drafted a memo discussing options for enrollment and tuition that asked UCPB and UCOP to support increasing tuition and undergraduate enrollment, especially of non-resident students, on a temporary basis, and to oppose any mandate to campuses to reduce overall undergraduate enrollment. Chair Chalfant took these comments to the Implementation Task Force.

FACULTY SALARIES AND RESTORING UC COMPETITIVENESS

In September, the Academic Council endorsed recommendations from a UCPB/UCAP/UCFW Subcommittee on Faculty Salaries for a 2% across-the-board range adjustment in total salaries (base plus off-scale) to compensate for the 2% restart of UCRP contributions. Council tabled a

2

third recommendation for an additional 5% range adjustment and the three committees developed a substitute resolution in support of a subsequent 5% increase in the form of a 3% range adjustment plus 2% market adjustment. The committees also recommended that President Yudof appoint a joint Senate-Administration task force to study options for resuming the abandoned Faculty Salaries Plan and restoring the competitiveness of UC faculty salaries and total remuneration as soon as possible. Council sent the President its final recommendation in December.

UCPB discussed salary and competitiveness issues regularly with Provost Pitts, EVP Brostrom, and Vice Provost for Academic Personnel Susan Carlson. The Committee opposed an administrative proposal that would have applied 3% of the total faculty salaries budget to enhance regular merit raises over three merit cycles. UCPB said the plan would further weaken the published salary scales and the power of the faculty to recognize the merit of their peers, which has been fundamental to UC excellence. UCPB emphasized that competitive total remuneration should be UC's top budget priority; quality will decline if UC is unable to meet the challenge of competitive recruiting and retention; and UC should do everything it can to restore the integrity of the merit system by bringing the salary scales back to competitive relevance.

Vice Provost Carlson also joined UCPB in January to discuss a presentation on faculty competitiveness she and Senate Chair Simmons had prepared for the January Regents meeting. In March, she presented data showing average faculty UC salaries and pay increases for faculty present at UC in both October 2008 and October 2010.

Donald Senear represented UCPB on a Joint Senate-Administration Compensation Plan Steering Committee that was considering a compensation plan for general campus faculty based on the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, which would allow faculty to increase their salaries with outside funding.

Discussions by the committee recognized that this concept is not exactly parallel to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, insofar that different disciplines have widely different opportunities to raise salary increases from external sources. UCPB expressed concerns that inequities might result from a poorly thought out plan along these lines, and urged that a careful analysis of possible unintended consequences be conducted before such a plan is adopted.

COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION AND UCLA STATEMENT ABOUT THE FUTURE OF UC

Early in the year, UCPB considered a Council recommendation about the future of the University and an alternative statement from the UCLA division. Senate Chair Simmons asked UCPB to quantify the financial impact of Council's recommendation for reducing undergraduate enrollment and the number of ladder-rank faculty, and explore ways to focus the program approval process more closely on the budget and ensuring the availability of resources for new programs. UCPB, CCGA and UCEP decided they would work with divisional committees to ensure that proposals for new schools and programs include a viable long-term funding plan. Divisional CPBs will be consulted to help develop specific budget questions that will be useful to include in program reviews, including the opportunity cost of starting new programs or enhancing existing programs. The effort to quantify the financial impact of Council recommendations was subsumed within the Implementation Task Force effort.

MANAGING THE STATE BUDGET CUTS

Vice President for Budget Patrick Lenz joined each meeting to update the committee about budget negotiations in Sacramento, UC's advocacy strategies and efforts, contingency planning, and other UC-specific budget matters. UCPB members discussed emerging campus and systemwide strategies for addressing the $500M budget cut. Most campuses were being forced to implement cost saving measures, including staff hiring freezes, cancelled faculty searches, delayed plans for new programs and facilities, and program consolidations. Some campuses were

actively modeling severe cuts, including the closure of libraries and schools, and all were increasing efforts to enroll more tuition-bearing domestic and international non-residents. In the spring, Provost Pitts joined UCPB to discuss a list of centrally-funded academic programs being considered for budget cuts. UCPB's view was that the conversation about cuts to UCOP should account for the importance of maintaining systemwide activities, but that no systemwide programs should be immune to cuts. The committee also felt that principles were needed, to determine what activities should be funded on a systemwide basis, as opposed to allocating additional funding to the campuses.

ONLINE EDUCATION PILOT PROJECT

UCPB met with Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Daniel Greenstein and Provost Pitts twice to discuss concerns about UCOP's Online Education Project—particularly, a new financial model that relies on borrowing and attracting significant numbers of non-UC students. UCPB recommended to Council that the Senate limit its future support for the project until UCOP clarified its goals, developed a business model consistent with those goals, and allowed UCPB to review the business model to determine the desirability and potential value of on-line education at UC. UCPB also recommended that UCOP should not expand the project beyond the currently contemplated courses until there is a full Senate review of the results of the initial project. In June, UCPB reviewed UCOP's financial model for the pilot project. UCOP agreed to consult with the committee about the upcoming market survey, the progress of the program, and milestones for evaluating its continuing financial viability.

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES (ANR)

UCPB scrutinized the viability of all centrally-funded research programs in the context of declining state support, but was particularly concerned about a lack of transparency and faculty involvement in decision-making concerning the ANR budget, which accounts for a large proportion of UCOP's discretionary spending. In April, UCPB met with ANR Associate Vice President Barbara Allen-Diaz to discuss the ANR budget. The Committee noted the importance of maintaining shared governance principles regarding the budget and other ANR matters through the Senate's established committee structure. In January, UCPB, CCGA, UCORP sent a letter of concern to Council regarding ANR's plan to redirect money from two campus endowments to fund other ANR priorities and initiatives around the state. Council endorsed the letter and asked ANR to suspend the redirection pending full consultation with Senate committees concerning the effects of the reallocation on research and graduate education and the importance of the proposed new research initiatives. Starting next year, Chris van Kessel will represent UCPB on the new Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON LABORATORY ISSUES

Chair Chalfant and Vice Chair Minster represented UCPB on the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues. Discussions of direct interest to the Senate involved the use of the UC portion of the management fee (about $16M) by Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Beckwith, either in the form of targeted joint research between campuses and National Labs, or as merely an additional source of income. In addition, UCPB requested a briefing by the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory on the current status of plans for the development of a second campus for LBNL in the Bay Area. This briefing will be provided either by televideo over the summer, or at a UCPB meeting in the early fall.

OTHER BRIEFINGS

4

➢ In November, Mark Esteban, Director of HRB-Policy & Program Design, Robert Semple, Principal Analyst, HRB-Pension & Retirement Programs, and Michael Deleon of Deloitte LLP joined UCPB to discuss the impact of health benefits changes affecting faculty and staff at UC Santa Cruz, UC Davis, and UC Berkeley, as well as plans for the grandfathering of retiree health benefits under the new UCRP tier.

➢ Executive Director of Procurement Services Haggai Hisgilov briefed UCPB on UC's strategic sourcing programs, which seek to leverage UC's buying power to save money on widely-used commodities.

➢ Assistant Budget Director Clifford Brown briefed UCPB about the Facilities Infrastructure Renewal Model, which allows UCOP to predict capital renewal needs for state eligible space by projecting the amount of money needed each year to renew each building or system.

➢ EVP Brostrom briefed UCPB on a plan to extend financial support further into the middle class by providing tuition relief to students in certain income ranges. He also discussed options for generating more unrestricted revenue from restricted assets by increasing endowment cost recovery.

➢ Vice President for Human Resources Dwaine Duckett and Director of Pension and Retirement Programs Gary Schlimgen, updated UCPB on the process and timeline for new employee and employer contributions to UCRP, the implementation of the new UCRP tier, and the University-wide payroll system project.

OTHER ISSUES AND ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

UCPB also submitted comments to the Academic Council about UCOP's proposed revisions to Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs, which would make it easier for campuses to offer self-supporting programs that charge their own (higher) fees, and about a proposal to rename the "educational fee" as "tuition" and "fees for professional school students" as "professional supplemental tuition. The Committee recommended that professional school and professional program fees be called "Professional Degree Program Supplemental Tuition," and noted that this should not be a backdoor for creating new professional fees. UCPB discussed a letter signed by 36 UC executives demanding that the Regents implement an IRS rule waiver that allows the University to increase the salary base used to calculate pensions beyond the federal cap of $245,000. Finally, UCPB issued brief formal views about the Report of the Task Force on Senate Membership and the University Committee on Academic Freedom's Proposed Revisions to APM 010 and 015.

INTERACTIONS WITH UCOP ADMINISTRATION

On the whole, UCPB enjoyed fruitful, informative, candid dialogue with UCOP administrators who responded to UCPB requests with timely, informative data. The Budget Office provided thoughtful, informative presentations about the state budget situation, UC's budget allocation process, and various budgetary reform projects. Other UC leaders shared high level updates and observations about UC's pension obligations and debt programs, contingency scenarios for UC's budget expectations, and a plan to move UC campuses toward common administrative systems, increased strategic sourcing contracts, and shared service centers. For their part, UCPB members asked thoughtful, probing questions and challenged administrators to do more to communicate UC's chronic under-funding and demonstrate the real consequences of state de-funding on student fees, enrollment, and programs.

UCPB REPRESENTATION

5

Chair James Chalfant represented UCPB at the Academic Council, Academic Assembly, Academic Planning Council, and the Provost's Budget Advisory Group, and a task force reviewing proposals for the online pilot project. Vice Chair Minster represent UCPB on the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues. David Lopez and Peter Chung served as UCPB's representatives to the UC Education Abroad Program Governing Committee; David Lopez also chaired a new finance subcommittee of the Education Abroad Program Governing Committee. Donald Senear represented UCPB on the Joint Senate-Administration Compensation Plan Steering Committee.

LOOKING AHEAD TO 2011-12

James Chalfant and Jean-Bernard Minster will continue as UCPB chair and vice chair in 2011-12. UCPB will monitor the state fiscal situation and its impact on the UC budget, the rebenching effort, the financing of LBNL's proposed second campus, and the online education project. The Committee will play an active role in helping UCOP and the Senate confront difficult choices in terms of both short-term and long-range budget planning resulting from the reduced state funding to UC. UCPB will continue to advocate for budget planning that maintains the quality of education, research, and service throughout the 10 UC campuses. UCPB will endorse no plan for UCRP that further erodes compensation and benefits for UC faculty, whose total remuneration is already uncompetitive.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

UCPB is grateful to the following committee consultants and guests for their valuable contributions: Provost and Executive Vice President Lawrence Pitts; Executive Vice President Nathan Brostrom; Vice Provost Daniel Greenstein; Vice Provost Susan Carlson; Chief Financial Officer Peter Taylor; Vice President Patrick Lenz; Vice President Dwaine Duckett, Associate Vice President Barbara Allen-Diaz; Associate Vice President Debora Obley; Operating Budget Director Michael Clune; Executive Director, HR Strategic Planning & Work Force Development Randy Scott; Associate Director, Strategic Initiatives, CFO Division Maria Anguiano, Associate Director, Strategic Initiatives, CFO Division Lisa Baird, Director of Pension and Retirement Programs Gary Schlimgen, Executive Director Haggai Hisgilov, Mark Esteban, Director of HRB-Policy & Program Design, Robert Semple, Principal Analyst, HRB-Pension & Retirement Programs and Assistant Budget Director Clifford Brown.

Thanks also to the faculty who served as alternates for regular committee members: Douglas Mitchell (UCR) and Christopher Kello (UCM).

Respectfully submitted:

James Chalfant, *Chair* (UCD)	Jean-Bernard Minster, *Vice Chair* (UCSD)
Chris van Kessel (UCD)	Shawn Kantor (UCM)
John Ellwood (UCB)	Steven Cheung (UCSF)
Brent Haddad (UCSC)	David Lopez (UCLA)
Y. Peter Chung (UCR)	Eric Halgren (UCSD)
Gary Leal (UCSB)	Donald Senear (UCI)
Daniel Simmons, *ex officio*	Robert Anderson, *ex officio*
Neil Sircar, Undergraduate (UCSD)	Eric Barba, Graduate (UCLA)
Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst	

6

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION
ANNUAL REPORT 2010-11

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) met twice and the UCOPE-ESL (English as a Second Language) Advisory Group met once during the 2010-11 academic year. Both groups considered matters in accordance with its duties as set forth in Senate Bylaw 192, which state that UCOPE shall advise the President and appropriate agencies of the Academic Senate on the broader issues related to preparatory education, including the language needs of students from diverse linguistic backgrounds; monitor and conduct periodic reviews and evaluations of preparatory and remedial education; to supervise the *University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement* (UC-ELWR), and to establish Universitywide standards for the *University of California Analytical Writing Placement Examination* (UC-AWPE); monitor the implementation of Senate Regulation 761 (Remedial Courses) on the campuses. A summary of the committee's activities and accomplishments follows below:

UC Analytical Writing Placement Examination

- **Administration and Budget.** UCOPE members reviewed the implementation of the UC-AWPE vis-à-vis reports from AWPE Analyst Julie Lind. The UC-AWPE has had a history of structural deficits, as the costs to administer, score and manage the program exceed the revenue generated by its current fee structure. UCOPE has continued to closely monitor this issue and to work to ensure that AWPE standards are not compromised by future cost-cutting measures and that the pedagogical and curricular consequences associated with on-line scoring are carefully considered. At its January 2010 meeting, UCOPE members emphatically made it clear that: 1) the AWPE should be regularly assessed for both reliability and validity (particularly given the changes being made to the administration and scoring of the exam); and 2) the proposed changes must lead to fiscal solvency. Accordingly, the administration, vis-à-vis Sue Wilbur, then Director of Admissions agreed to these points. In January 2011, the Committee strongly objected to news that that the fee for taking the AWPE would be raised this academic year from $90 to $110, and possibly to $120 for the 2011-12 academic year. Given earlier understandings reached with the administration, the planned fee increases are simply appalling in UCOPE's estimation.

- **Review and Selection of the 2011 Analytical Writing Placement Examination Essays.** In January, UCOPE members selected the essay to be used in the 2011 UC-AWPE administration, in accord with Senate Regulation 636B.1. The selection is an annual event led by UCOPE Consultant George Gadda (UCLA).

- **Norming of AWPE for 2011.** In April, UCOPE members reviewed sample essays to ensure that norming procedures used in evaluation of the 2011 AWPE exam would be consistent with SR 636A and SR 636B.1 This session is an annual event led by UCOPE Consultant George Gadda (UCLA).

Senate Regulation 636. University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement
UCOPE members discussed with Evaluation Issues Coordinator Evera Spears, concerns regarding the interpretation of SR 636, particularly the wording of paragraph (E) of the regulation:

> E. Once enrolled at the University of California, a student must satisfy the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement before earning transfer credit for the purpose of satisfying any subsequent University of California writing requirements by taking courses at other institutions. (Am 30 Jan 2008)

The Committee addressed the original intent of the provision that included not wanting to allow students to "double-dip" by using one course to satisfy two requirements. After a lengthy discussion of selected hypothetical scenarios culled from the campuses and presented by Director Spears, UCOPE determined that SR 636 is indeed being interpreted correctly. In the end, members decided that it was preferable for evaluators to exercise reasonable judgment rather than rely on a set of rigid policies.

UCOPE English as a Second Language (ESL) Advisory Group
The UCOPE-ESL Advisory Group met once this year. Advisory Group Chair Robin Scarcella (UCI) reported that almost every member expressed deep concerns regarding how the UC budget situation is impacting ESL programs and services on the campuses. The Advisory's Group considered the new online scoring procedure of the AWPE and possible difficulties that might arise from its use. They also discussed plans to increase the enrollment of international students on several UC campuses. Members felt strongly that any that any proposed increase in the enrollment of international students include commensurate services with funding, in particular from the Size and Shape Working Group of the Commission on the Future. As a final point, the Advisory Group voted to put forward for UCOPE's endorsement a proposal to change its official name to the *English for Multilingual Students Advisory Group*. The name change was later approved by UCOPE at its April meeting.

White Paper on Support of English Language Support Programs and Services
Last year, UCOPE enthusiastically endorsed the Advisory Group's "white paper" that urged the University to fully fund academic English support course work and services as a part of the students' academic curricula. UCOPE ultimately decided to submit the white paper to Academic Council and request that it be widely disseminated. Although several Council members praised the quality of the analysis contained in the white paper – particularly the need for Systemwide policies and funding mechanisms to sustain programs such as ESL support services that have far-reaching repercussions for the success of the University system as a whole – the Council as a whole elected not to endorse and distribute the white paper.

STATWAY Curriculum
UCOPE discussed the recent adoption by CSU of faculty recommendations on the Statway curriculum and the approval of a temporary exception to the current requirement that courses qualifying for "GE Breadth Area B4 Quantitative Reasoning" carry a prerequisite of intermediate algebra. For students placing in developmental mathematics, Statway offers a substitute approach move toward achieving success in both mathematics and statistics, evolving into better problem-solvers, and becoming more confident and competent in situations requiring statistical or mathematical reasoning. The overarching goal of Statway is to provide students with a meaningful pathway to, and through transfer-level introductory statistics. UCOPE members responded positively to the Statway curriculum but that it would need to pass a rigor test.

The Achieve Project
UCOPE members discussed UC's continued involvement with the Achieve Project, an inter-segmental state and national project focused on improving state standards and assessment instruments for K–12 mathematics and English language preparation. The Achieve Project has generated many positive outcomes and resulted in fruitful collaborations across the higher education segments (UC/CSU/CCCs) and nurtured dialogue beneficial to all the partners in defining college readiness and how readiness is assessed. UCOPE member Jan Frodesen (UCSB) serves as one of the two UC delegates to the Achieve Project.

Other Issues and Business

In addition to official communications related to the aforementioned topics, UCOPE considered and in some cases submitted formal comments on the following policy issues under review:

- Impact of budget cuts on the future of preparatory education in the UC System;
- Funding Streams Proposal;
- Development of a written proposal and intellectual framework for adopting the concept of a Systemwide math diagnostic test; and
- Assembly Bill 1237: Remedial Instruction Funding.

UCOPE also devoted a portion of each meeting for reports and updates from its members about issues facing local divisions and committees. These discussions included reports by members on the impact of the budget situation on preparatory English and math programs on their respective campus, with attention given to any areas of concern for UCOPE or that might call for action by the committee in the future. Reports by the UCOPE Chair about Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senate (ICAS) meetings were also discussed.

Acknowledgements

UCOPE gratefully acknowledges the contributions of these UCOP and campus consultants over the past year: Evera Spears, Evaluation Issues Coordinator; Julie Lind, AWPE Analyst; George Gadda, UCLA Writing Program Director and Chair of the Analytical Writing Placement Examination Committee; Robin Scarcella, Chair of the UCOPE-ESL Advisory Group; and all the members of the UCOPE-ESL Advisory Group. The committee also thanks the numerous faculty members who, as alternates, kindly represented their respective campuses at UCAAD meetings this year.

Respectfully submitted:

Jonathan Alexander, Chair (UCI)	*Leslie Zimmerman (UCSF)*
Steven Axelrod, Vice Chair (UCR)	*David Smith (UCSC)*
Susan Schweik (UCB)	*Alan Leung (UCM student)*
Alyssa Johns (UCD)	*Daniel Simmons (ex-officio member)*
Richard Weiss (UCLA)	*Robert Anderson (ex-officio member)*
Virginia Adan-Lifante (UCM)	*Eric Zárate (Committee Analyst)*
Jan Frodesen (UCSB)	**See Chair for UCI representative*
Ross Frank (UCSD)	**See Vice Chair for UCR representative*

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
ANNUAL REPORT 2010-11

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), as specified in Senate Bylaw 200, is responsible for fostering research, for formulating, coordinating, and revising general research policies and procedures, and for advising the President on research. During the 2010-11 academic year, UCORP met eight times, seven times in person and once via teleconference. This report briefly outlines the committee's activities.

RESEARCH POLICY ISSUES:

1. Multi-Campus Research Unit (MRU) Guidelines in The Compendium

   In continuation of a project begun in 2009-10, the Academic Council charged the 2010-11 UCORP to undertake a revision of The Compendium section on MRUs. The complexity and import of the issue required UCORP to focus significant time and energy to make sense of the project. In this effort, the committee was assisted by the Research Grants and Program Office (RGPO) in the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS), led by Mary Croughan and aided by Kathleen Erwin, who provided detailed information about existing multi-campus research entities. The constellation of extant MRUs, MRU hybrids, and non-MRUs functioning as MRUs was mapped, and their various histories and geneses traced to the extent possible. After deliberations that spanned several months, UCORP produced a new set of guidelines governing the operation of MRUs. The salient points of the proposed guidelines are as follows.

   - In steady state, there will be just two categories of multicampus research entities: Multicampus Research Units (MRUs) and Multicampus Research Programs (MRPs).
   - MRUs have a longer research horizon, while MRPs are shorter-term research projects funded or partially funded by UCOP. Both MRUs and MRPs require the participation of at least three campuses or at least two campuses and at least one national laboratory.
   - MRUs can exist independently of UC funding, while MRPs exist only as long as they are funded by UCOP.
   - Both MRUs and MRPs can be awarded funding from UCOP as a result of a periodic competition; however, MRPs are allowed to compete for UCOP funding in at most two funding cycles, while MRUs are eligible to compete for UCOP funding throughout their existence.
   - An MRP can apply to be reconstituted as an MRU.
   - MRUs are established via a streamlined process; several other changes aiming to streamline the oversight, review, and disestablishment of MRUs are proposed.

Both the Academic Senate's Academic Council and the administrations Academic Planning Council endorsed the proposed guidelines, and Compendium-appropriate policy language is being drafted.

2. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) Compliance
   UCORP heard appeals from a group of researchers concerned that the University had not exhausted every avenue available to it in its advocacy for researcher access to sensitive materials. After further consultation with the Office of General Counsel and ORGS, UCORP agreed that additional steps could be taken, and recommended through the Academic Council that those steps be taken. The administration defended its position, and UCORP will continue to monitor the situation.

3. Assignment of Patent Rights
   The Supreme Court of the United States upheld a lower court's finding in *Stanford v Roche* that Stanford University's patent assignation form did not preferentially protect the university's right to assume ownership of researcher inventions due to use of the future verb tense. The University of California has used similar language, which now needs to be amended. In 2009-10, when UCORP first heard of the lower court decision, recommended that roll-out of the amended forms be done with researcher deference – perhaps targeting likely inventors first or tying the new forms with new funding proposals and merit reviews for those who do not file; the current committee reiterated this position. The 2010-11 UCORP will monitor the process of securing amended agreements.

RESEARCH PORTFOLIO:
1. White Mountain Research Station (WMRS)
   The White Mountain Research Station (WMRS) was one of three MRUs not competed in the initial MRPI funding process. Instead, ORGS proposed that WMRS be converted to part of the Natural Reserves that UC stewards. UCORP heard a report outlining the conversion process and the benefits such a realignment would bring both to White Mountain and to University researchers. ORGS' investigation of how to comply with federal regulations continues, and UCORP will continue to monitor the process.

2. University of California Observatories (UCO)
   The University of California Observatories (UCO) was another of the three MRUs not competed in the initial MRPI funding process. Instead, due to the scale of astronomy projects and the long-term nature of astronomy investments, UCO is being reviewed by a high-level external review team that will also take into account a report produced by a UC Astronomy Task Force charged to set goals and priorities for Astronomy research in the UC system. UCO Director Bolte also visited UCORP to provide additional background to members first-hand and to discuss broadly the scale and long-term nature of astronomy projects. UCORP awaits issuance of the external review team's report.

3. California Institutes of Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs)
   Governor Gray Davis initiative the California Institutes of Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs), and UC won the bid to host and administer them. Part of UC's administration includes five-year reviews, modeled on the academic reviews to

which UC MRUs are subjected. To that end, UCORP opined on the draft protocols for the second review of the California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (CalIT2) and the first draft protocol for the California NanoSystems Institute (CNSI). UCORP awaits issuance of the external review findings for the California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences (QB3) and the Center for Information Technology Research in the Interest of Society (CITRIS).

4. Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR)

   UCORP renewed its consultative relationship with the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources this year, receiving updates on internal ANR budget allocation processes and programmatic changes necessitated by budget contractions. Also this year, the Academic Council empanelled the Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR), comprised of representatives from impacted divisions, UCORP, and the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). Both UCORP and ACSCANR will continue to work with ANR to ensure that research opportunities are maximized throughout the system.

5. Department of Energy National Laboratories

   UCORP is also represented on the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues (ACSCOLI), and the committee heard updates regarding events at the national labs stemming from federal budget contraction and scientific discoveries. As part of the budget-induced changes, potential changes to UC's allocation of the fees it earns for its role in managing the labs have been proposed; UCORP opined that integrated research between the labs and the campuses should be protected and encouraged by preserving the maximum dollars possible for the program. UCORP cited both the oversubscription of the previous lab fee RFP and the perceived disproportionate cuts already made to the research enterprise.

RESEARCH BUDGET:

UCORP consulted frequently with Vice President Steve Beckwith from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies throughout the year, and much discussion focused on cuts and curtailments to centrally funded research programs, such as the UC Discovery Program, MRUs and, possibly, efforts funded through DOE lab management fees. The committee heard with dismay that some programs would be discontinued permanently, while others may still be able to reconstitute themselves should they be able to acquire external funding. Following previous cuts to the research enterprise, this year's cuts were viewed as especially detrimental. Vigilance and nimbleness will be needed to maintain UC's allure as a research university and as pole of attraction of leading researchers nationwide. The cascading impacts of cuts to research on both faculty and graduate student recruitment and retention need to be fully understood by a wider audience.

CORRESPONDENCE REPORT:

In addition to communications relating to the above, UCORP opined on the following items and topics of systemwide import:

- Post-Employment Benefits

- UC's Long-term Strategic Plan
- Effort Reporting Guidelines
- Senate Membership
- Libraries
- Online Education Pilot
- Self-supporting Graduate and Professional Degree Fee Programs
- Proposed changes to the Academic Personnel Manual
- UC Seminar Network

UCORP REPRESENTATION:
The Chair or, when not available, the Vice Chair, or another committee member represented UCORP on the following systemwide bodies during the year: Academic Assembly, Academic Council, Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues, and Academic Planning Council. Throughout the year, UCORP's representatives provided updates on the activities of these groups.

UCORP INITIATIVES:
In 2009-10, implementation of the furlough program and relative low prioritization of the research aspect of the University mission by the Commission on the Future (COTF) led the 2010-11 UCORP to continue the work of the COTF's Research Strategies Workgroup (RSW) effort to develop a Research Mission Statement for the University of California. Vice Chair Crawford led the effort, consulting with COTF RSW co-Chair Mary Croughan, now an executive director in the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS) in the Office of the President. It is expected that the draft Research Mission Statement will be circulated for comment in early fall 2011.

UCORP also invited Lynn Tierney, Associate Vice President, Communications and members of her staff to discuss the effectiveness of research-related communications, as well as the overall plan for effectively articulating UC's research mission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:
UCORP is most grateful to its consultants, who have provided invaluable information and perspective to the committee: Steven Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS); Mary Croughan, Executive Director for Research Grants and Program Office (RGPO), ORGS; Kathleen Erwin, Director, RGPO; and Jenny Gautier, Deputy to the Vice President (ORGS).

UCORP also wishes to thank its invited guests and campus alternates for their participation and support, as well as colleagues across the system who brought to the attention of the committee research-related issues of concern.

Respectfully submitted, UCORP 2010-11:
　　　　Phokion G. Kolaitis, Chair (UCSC)
　　　　John Crawford, Vice Chair (UCI)
　　　　Mike Tarter, UCB
　　　　Mike Kleeman, UCD

Hugh Roberts, UCI
Hans Schollhammer, UCLA
Robert Clare, UCR
Frank Wuerthwein, UCSD
Ralph Marcucio, UCSF
Jianwen Su, UCSB
Quentin Williams, UCSC
C. Taylor Gilliland, Graduate Student Representative (UCSD)
Megan Roberts, Graduate Student Representative (UCD)
Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst (UCOP)

VII.   REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES
    A.   **Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J) [INFORMATION]**
        ▪   **Robert M. Anderson**
      1.   **Legislative Ruling 6.11.A. Definition of "residence."**

A request for Legislative Rulings was received from Chair Williams of the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) of the Academic Senate of the University of California in regard to the interpretation of Senate Regulation 610, which defines "residence" for purposes of degree program requirements for both undergraduate and graduate students. Chair Williams had the required standing to make this request as a member of the Academic Council of the Academic Senate of the University of California.

After due deliberation and consideration of background materials (available on request), the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction of the Academic Senate of the University of California (UCR&J) rendered a decision and now publishes the following Legislative Rulings. As per Senate Bylaw 206.II.A, these Legislative Rulings were presented previously to the Academic Council of the Academic Senate of the University of California for consideration and comment, and to the Assembly of the Academic Senate of the University of California for information.

Robin Fisher (Chair, UCR&J 2010-11)

UCR&J Legislative Rulings of 3/2/11 (Item 1)

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction of the Academic Senate of the University of California renders the following Legislative Rulings in regard to the interpretation of "residence" as defined by Senate Regulation 610 (SR 610, "Residence in any regular term is validated by a program of courses or other exercises approved by the Faculty of a student's college or school. For undergraduates this shall be at least six units of resident courses of instruction. Graduate Students validate residence with programs of instruction or research approved by the appropriate Graduate Council."(EC 15 Apr 74)(Am 9 Mar 83; Am 6 Mar 85)). At issue are requirements for physical presence and close interactions between faculty and students on sites of campus and approved off-campus instruction and research.

1) By a vote of three ayes and two nays, UCR&J determined that the definition of "residence" endorsed by the Academic Senate Special Committee on Remote and Online Instruction and Residency (residency determined by course approval by the relevant Faculty and Senate governing entities of the University of California, not linked to the physical presence of a student on campus) is consistent with SR 610. The majority opinion was based on a liberal interpretation of SR 610, which may permit on-line, off-campus instruction when courses have been duly reviewed and approved by Faculty and Senate governing entities. The minority opinion was based on a literal interpretation of SR 610, where a requirement for the physical presence of a student at on- and off-campus sites may limit or even exclude on-line, off-campus instruction regardless of review and approval by Faculty and Senate governing entities.

2) By a vote of five ayes and zero nays, UCR&J determined that the interpretation of "residence" employed by SR 610 in its present form is sufficiently ambiguous, and of such significant

consequences, that the issue should be taken under consideration by the Assembly of the Academic Senate of the University of California. The issue should be resolved finally by legislative amendment of SR 610 to reflect explicitly either, but not both, of the liberal or literal interpretations of "residence" proffered by the preceding Legislative Ruling. This recommendation is consistent with Academic Senate Bylaw 205.B.2, whereby it is the duty of UCR&J "to prepare and to report to the Assembly or to any of the Divisions such changes and additions to the Bylaws and Regulations as may seem to it advisable".

Dissenting Opinion for Legislative Ruling 1:

SR 610 states that residence for undergraduates will require "at least six units of resident courses of instruction". Senate Regulations do not define the term "resident courses" anywhere, but I believe it was intended to mean courses where a student is physically present at a campus of the University. While definitions can adapt in the presence of new technology, allowing "any course approved by the appropriate Divisional Committee, regardless of the mode or location of delivery" is too big a change to be accommodated by the wording of SR 610.

Such an interpretation would also render meaningless SR 694 which places strong restrictions on "off-campus graduate instruction", including SR 694.2 "No more than one-half of the total unit and residence requirements for the degree of Master of Arts or Master of Science may be satisfied by off-campus graduate study." How can online courses approved by the appropriate Divisional Committee be less restricted than off-campus courses (including those that are approved by the appropriate Divisional Committee)?

2. Legislative Ruling 6.11.B. Eligibility of an associate dean to serve as a member of the Assembly

A request for a Legislative Ruling was received from Chair Fuentes-Afflick of the San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate of the University of California in regard to the interpretation Academic Senate Bylaw 104.A.4, which excludes certain academic administrative officers of the University from service in the Assembly of the Academic Senate. Chair Fuentes-Afflick had the required standing to make this request as a member of the Academic Council of the Academic Senate of the University of California. After due deliberation and consideration of background materials (available on request), the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction of the Academic Senate of the University of California (UCR&J) rendered a decision and now publishes the following Legislative Ruling. As per Senate Bylaw 206.II.A, this Legislative Ruling was presented previously to the Academic Council of the Academic Senate of the University of California for consideration and comment, and to the Assembly of the Academic Senate of the University of California for information.

Robin Fisher (Chair, UCR&J 2010-11)

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction of the Academic Senate of the University of California (UCR&J) renders the following Legislative Ruling in regard to the interpretation of Academic Senate Bylaw 105.A.4 (ASB 105.A.4, "Membership...Forty Divisional Representatives chosen from other than chancellors, vice chancellors, deans, chief administrative officers of colleges and schools, and members of the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction…"). The particular question involves the eligibility of an associate dean for appointment to represent the Division in the Assembly of the Academic Senate.

By a vote of three ayes and two nays, UCR&J determined that ASB 105.A.4 does not explicitly exclude associate deans from service in the Assembly. The majority opinion was based on a strict, literal reading of the Bylaw, which excludes deans but contains no mention of associate deans or comparable academic administrative officers. The appointment process of each Division was seen as adequate to weigh potential conflicts of interest between the academic administrative and Faculty roles of colleagues during the course of their selection. The minority opinion was based on the ease of delegation of decanal authority to associate deans (the term "dean" is often understood generically to mean anyone holding a decanal title, with or without an associate prefix), which presents *de facto* the same conflict of interests underlying the explicit exclusion of the deans, and is consistent with the spirit if not the letter of the Bylaw. It was the unanimous opinion of UCR&J that there is no constitutional impediment to the legislative amendment of ASB 105.A.4 to explicitly extend the exclusion list to include associate deans and comparable academic administrative officers.

In response to the specific question posed by the request for this Legislative Ruling, the associate dean duly appointed to the Assembly by the Division is eligible for this service.

_____

3. Legislative Ruling 6.11.C. Scholarship requirements for undergraduate students

A request for Legislative Rulings was received from Chair Vafai of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate of the University of California in regard to the interpretation of Senate Regulation 900.C.2, which specifies that "Undergraduate students in particular schools or colleges may be subject to more stringent norms with respect to academic probation or disqualification, but only on the basis of regulations adopted by a Division of the Senate and approved by the Assembly of the Senate". Chair Vafai had the required standing to make this request as a chair of a divisional Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction. After due deliberation and consideration of background materials (available on request), the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction of the Academic Senate of the University of California (UCR&J) rendered a decision and now publishes the following Legislative Rulings. As per Senate Bylaw 206.II.A, these Legislative Rulings were presented previously to the Academic Council of the Academic Senate of the University of California for consideration and comment, and to the Assembly of the Academic Senate of the University of California for information.

Robin Fisher (Chair, UCR&J 2010-11)

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction of the Academic Senate of the University of California (UCR&J) renders the following Legislative Rulings in regard to the interpretation of Senate Regulation 900.C.2 (SR 900.C.2, "Undergraduate students in particular schools or colleges may be subject to more stringent norms with respect to academic probation or disqualification, but only on the basis of regulations adopted by a Division of the Senate and approved by the Assembly of the Senate."). At issue is the constitutionality of proposed revisions of program requirements for an undergraduate degree.

1) By a unanimous vote of five ayes and zero nays, UCR&J determined that the proposed revisions of degree program requirements cannot be implemented without the approval of both the Division and the Assembly of the Senate consistent with the final oversight clause of SR 900.C.2.

2) By a unanimous vote of five ayes and zero nays, UCR&J determined that the stated purpose of the proposed revisions, enrollment management of an undergraduate major, is an insufficient justification in regard to educational merit so as to be consistent with the provision of more stringent norms with respect to academic probation or disqualification permitted by SR 900.C.2.

3) By a unanimous vote of five ayes and zero nays, UCR&J expressed concern that the more stringent norms of the proposed revisions according to SR 900.C.2 may result in cases of academic probation or disqualification (not simply transfer to a less demanding major) for students who meet the minimum qualifications of the University as delineated in Senate Regulations 634 ("Except as provided in Senate Regulation 782 for the grade of Passed/Not Passed, to receive a Bachelor's degree a student must obtain a grade-point average of at least 2.00 for all courses attempted in the University.") and 900.A.1-2 ("The following minimum provisions or their equivalents, as ratified by the Assembly, govern the scholastic status of undergraduate students as indicated in strictly internal University records. 1. Academic Probation. An undergraduate student is normally subject to academic probation (a) if at the end of any term the student's grade-point average for that term, or the student's cumulative grade-point average, is less than 2.0 (C average) computed on the total of all courses undertaken in the University (however, see paragraph (E) below); or (b) by other provisions approved by the Assembly. 2. Academic Disqualification. An undergraduate student is subject to disqualification for further registration in the University (a) if at the end of any term the student's grade-point average for that term is less than 1.5 (however, see paragraph (E) below), or (b) if the student has completed two consecutive terms on academic probation without achieving a cumulative grade-point average of 2.0 as provided above."). At minimum, a variance would have to be obtained before implementation of the proposed revisions in order to eliminate this inconsistency.

4) UCR&J advises amendment of the proposed revisions including, perhaps, systematic employment of a "pre-major" and clear due notice statements of the more stringent degree program requirements before entry into the major to reduce or mitigate the discrepancy noted above in Legislative Ruling 3. This approach should provide for adequate enrollment management consistent with the recommendations of the Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) of the Academic Senate of the University of California in their "White Paper on Impacted Majors" of 8/5/09.

4. Legislative Ruling 6.11.D. *Ex officio* member voting rights

A request for a Legislative Ruling was received from Chair Karagozian of the Los Angeles Division of the Academic Senate of the University of California in regard to the interpretation of voting rights defined in Academic Senate Bylaw 50.C, which includes the chief administrative officer of a College or School (usually a dean) as an *ex officio* member of the Faculty Executive Committee of the College or School. Chair Karagozian has the required standing to make this request as a member of the Academic Council of the Academic Senate of the University of California. After due deliberation and consideration of background materials (available on request), the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction of the Academic Senate of the University of California (UCR&J) rendered a decision and now publishes the following Legislative Ruling. As per Senate Bylaw 206.II.A, this Legislative Ruling was presented previously to the Academic Council of the Academic Senate of the University of California for consideration and comment, and to the Assembly of the Academic Senate of the University of California for information.

UCR&J Legislative Ruling of 3/2/11 (Item 4)

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction of the Academic Senate of the University of California (UCR&J) renders the following Legislative Ruling in regard to the interpretation of *ex officio* member voting rights as defined by Academic Senate Bylaw 50.C (ASB 50.C, "Each Faculty shall elect the Chair of the Faculty and members of its Executive Committee. The chief academic administrative officer of the college or school shall be an *ex officio* member of the Executive Committee but may not serve as Chair of the Faculty or the Executive Committee."). The particular question involves the *ex officio* member voting rights of the chief academic administrative officers (typically deans) in the associated Faculty Executive Committees (FECs).

By a vote of four ayes and one nay, UCR&J determined that in and of itself, ASB 50.C implicitly allows voting rights for chief academic officers in the associated FECs. The majority opinion is based on ASB 35.C.3 ("…*ex officio* members have the same powers as other members unless otherwise specified."), ASB 45 ("…the membership of each Faculty is defined by the bylaws of the Division to which it is responsible, or by the Bylaws of the Senate for those Faculties directly responsible to the Assembly. Membership in a Faculty is limited to the following Senate members: the President of the University, the Chancellor, the chief academic administrative officer of the school or college, all members of the Academic Senate who are members of departments assigned to that school or college (Academic Senate members who have retired and transferred to emeritus/a status retain departmental membership.), such other Senate members as are specified in Divisional Bylaws or these Bylaws. Only voting members of the Senate may vote in Faculties of which they are members.") and the provision of ASB 50 for the *ex officio* membership of the chief academic administrator in the associated FEC. The majority opinion is concordant with the usual description of *ex officio* member voting rights as described in Sturgis' *Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure*. However, UCR&J finds no constitutional impediment for an explicit <u>nonvoting</u> *ex officio* membership category in these and comparable committees based on duly approved bylaws, as shown in the current Bylaws of the Academic Senate and the Divisions. The minority opinion is based on ASB 128.H ("Members holding an administrative position higher than department chair may not serve as members of Assembly committees."), the *de facto* function of FECs as comparable standing committees of the Faculty of a School or College, and concern for potential conflicts of interest between academic administrative and Faculty roles of such chief officers.

_____

In response to the specific questions posed by this request for Legislative Ruling:

Question 1: Does UCR&J concur regarding the inherent conflict of interest between decanal administrative authority and faculty authority, and, if so, can (and will) UCR&J remedy the matter with a legislative ruling?

Response: This Legislative Ruling of UCR&J provides an interpretation of ASB 50.C that does not directly address the issue of inherent conflicts of interest between decanal administrative authority and Faculty authority on FECs. Pursuant to its majority opinion, UCR&J will not at this time seek to remedy the issue by Legislative Ruling or propose relevant amendments of Academic Senate Bylaws for consideration by the Academic Assembly. However, UCR&J finds no constitutional impediment for an explicit nonvoting *ex officio* membership category in these and comparable committees based on duly approved bylaws should the Divisions or the Faculties of the Schools and Colleges employ this means of addressing the issue.

Question 2: If deans should be excluded from voting on FECs, what, if any, are the implications of other administrative *ex officio* members of other Senate Committees? Should they also be excluded from voting?

Response: This Legislative Ruling of UCR&J finds that deans have implicit voting rights in FECs (a baseline of voting *ex officio* membership) unless these voting rights are constrained by explicit exclusion through duly approved bylaws (a constitutionally defined category of nonvoting *ex officio* membership). By extension of the principle, administrative *ex officio* members of other Divisional and Faculty committees have implicit voting rights except when these rights are explicitly excluded in the bylaws that establish the committees and/or their parent organization(s).

---

5. **Legislative Ruling 6.11.E. Relationship of the Academic Senate with the Faculties of schools and colleges offering postbaccalaureate, first professional degree programs leading to the award of M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., D.Pharm. and J.D. degrees**

A request for Legislative Rulings was received from Chair Mattey of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate of the University of California in regard to the interpretation of Standing Order of the Regents 105.2, which specifies that "The Academic Senate, subject to the approval of the Board, shall determine the conditions for admission, for certificates, and for degrees other than honorary degrees"(SOR 105.2(a)) and "The Academic Senate shall authorize and supervise all courses and curricula offered under the sole or joint jurisdiction of the departments, colleges, schools, graduate divisions, or other University academic agencies approved by the Board, except that the Senate shall have no authority over courses in the Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco Art Institute, in professional schools offering work at the graduate level only, or over non-degree courses in the University Extension. No change in the curriculum of a college or professional school shall be made by the Academic Senate until such change shall have been submitted to the formal consideration of the faculty concerned."(SOR 105.2(b)). Chair Mattey had the required standing to make this request as a chair of a divisional Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction. After due deliberation and consideration of background materials (available on request), the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction of the Academic Senate of the University of California (UCR&J) rendered

a decision and now publishes the following Legislative Rulings. As per Senate Bylaw 206.II.A, these Legislative Rulings were presented previously to the Academic Council of the Academic Senate of the University of California for consideration and comment, and to the Assembly of the Academic Senate of the University of California for information.

Robin Fisher (Chair, UCR&J 2010-11)

UCR&J Legislative Rulings of 3/2/11 (Item5)

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction of the Academic Senate of the University of California (UCR&J) renders the following Legislative Rulings in regard to the interpretation of Standing Order of the Regents 105.2 (SOR 105.2, "The Academic Senate, subject to the approval of the Board, shall determine the conditions for admission, for certificates, and for degrees other than honorary degrees" (SOR 105.2(a)) and "The Academic Senate shall authorize and supervise all courses and curricula offered under the sole or joint jurisdiction of the departments, colleges, schools, graduate divisions, or other University academic agencies approved by the Board, except that the Senate shall have no authority over courses in the Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco Art Institute, in professional schools offering work at the graduate level only, or over non-degree courses in the University Extension. No change in the curriculum of a college or professional school shall be made by the Academic Senate until such change shall have been submitted to the formal consideration of the faculty concerned." (SOR 105.2(b))). At issue is the constitutional relationship of the Academic Senate and Faculty of exceptional "graduate degree programs", particularly postbaccalaureate, first professional degree programs leading to the award of M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., D.Pharm. and J.D. degrees.

1) By a unanimous vote of five ayes and zero nays, UCR&J determined that the 8/29/08 statement of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs of the Academic Senate of the University of California (CCGA), as approved on 7/23/08 by the Academic Council of the Academic Senate of the University of California ("CCGA is reinstating its plenary role in the approval of *new* M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree programs effective immediately. It leaves the discretion of oversight of established degree programs to their campus Graduate Councils or their designees."), is consistent with SOR 105.2(a) and (b), and defines the exceptional nature of Academic Senate authority for these degree programs only. Under normal circumstances, the academic oversight of these degree programs is delegated to the Faculty of the Schools wherein the programs are located, consistent again with the cited CCGA statement ("…CCGA concurs that ongoing oversight is best left to professional schools offering these five degree titles pursuant to Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(b)…").

2) By a unanimous vote of five ayes and zero nays, UCR&J determined that the academic oversight of all other graduate and undergraduate degree programs and courses is governed through the Faculties, Divisions (Graduate and Undergraduate Councils) and Senate by means of the regular Bylaws and Regulations of the Academic Senate as per SOR 105.2(a).

3) By a unanimous vote of five ayes and zero nays, UCR&J determined that in circumstances where a School or academic unit operates degree programs included in both Legislative Rulings 1 and 2 above, M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree programs will be governed pursuant to Legislative Ruling 1 and all other degree programs and courses of the School or academic unit will be governed pursuant to Legislative Ruling 2.

_____

Given the unanimity of UCR&J opinion in these Legislative Rulings, recusal of Member Mattey was not requested.

_____

The following responses pertain to the direct questions posed in this request for Legislative Ruling:

Question 1: What criteria determine whether a professional school offers work at the graduate level only?
Response: For present purposes, only the exceptional academic programs noted above (M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree programs) meet the criteria as determined above by Legislative Ruling 1. These are all postbaccalaureate, first degree professional degree programs. They consist of two parts: a taught academic component supervised by practicing and/or non-practicing Faculty and, usually (elective in some J.D degree programs), a "clinical" experience component closely supervised by practicing Faculty. Unlike regular graduate degree programs governed by broader Senate authority as determined above by Legislative Ruling 2, there are no requirements for satisfactory completion of examinations (i.e., qualifying and/or comprehensive examinations), production of original creative work (i.e., "research") and successful defense of this original creative work. The exceptional degree programs are all subject to regular and substantial academic review by professional accrediting agencies, and graduates must pass significant examination requirements before entering into practice.

Question 2: If a professional school meets the criteria for offering work at the graduate level only, does it have sole jurisdiction, without Senate approval beyond that of the faculty of the professional school, over its courses, grading policies, and/or degree programs?
Response: Under normal circumstances, Faculty in the Schools offering the exceptional degree programs (M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D.) have authority delegated by the Academic Senate and its Divisions for the academic oversight of these degree programs including courses, grading policies and degree program requirements as determined above by Legislative Ruling 1.

Question 3: If a professional school does not meet the criteria for offering work at the graduate level only, how does this fact affect the sole jurisdiction that it has? Does only the portion of the curriculum involving non-graduate level work fall under broad Senate authority, or does such authority extend to all matters, so that the exception in SOR 105.2(b) does not apply to it at all?
Response: The exceptional authority related to the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree programs is independent from the offering of other academic programs by the same Faculty or academic unit as determined above by Legislative Ruling 1 and 3. The unexceptional authority for all other academic programs proceeds as determined above by Legislative Ruling 2.

_____

VII.   **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES [CONT.]**
    B.   **Academic Council**
        ▪ **Robert M. Anderson**
        1. **Proposed revisions to SR 480** (Language Credit for Native Languages other than English) **[ACTION]**

At the request of admissions evaluators in the Office of Student Affairs, BOARS has proposed amendments to clarify the meaning of SR 480, which pertains to students whose pre-collegiate education was largely completed in a single language other than English and describes the conditions under which they may receive transfer credit for courses in that language. The Academic Council approved the proposed legislation, and UCR&J found that the proposed changes to SR 480 are minor, and consistent with the Bylaws and Regulations of the Academic Senate.

JUSTIFICATION

Campus admissions evaluators differ in their interpretation of the regulation and sought faculty guidance on two points. First, it is unclear to some evaluators how to define the clause "at least nine years of education." The regulation uses this as the benchmark definition of "native language" and requires it for upper division language course credit for college-level language courses if the language of instruction was also the student's native language. Second, it is unclear to what extent the regulation allows or prohibits transfer credit for a literature course taught in the native language. The confusion has made it more difficult to determine eligibility for some transfer students.

BOARS worked with the Office of Student Affairs to develop a clearer policy message and proposed revisions including the following: (1) A preamble clarifying the purpose of the regulation; (2) language clarifying the intent of the "nine years" clause; and (3) language clarifying whether the courses under consideration are offered for the purpose of studying literature or acquiring language. Note that these changes are intended only to clarify existing policy, not to change the policy.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve the proposed amendments to SR 480.

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools
Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 480
April 2011

Current Regulation:

SR 480. A student whose native language is not English and who has completed at least nine years of education conducted in that native language may receive credit for language courses in it only if the courses are advanced courses at the upper division level. College credit for literature in the native language is allowed only for courses taken in native institutions of college grade, or for upper division and graduate courses actually taken at the University of California or at another English-speaking institution of approved standing.

Proposed Revision with Changes Tracked (additions underlined; deletions noted by strikethrough):

Proposed SR 480. This regulation refers to students whose pre-collegiate education was largely completed in a single language other than English and describes the conditions under which they may receive transfer credit for courses in that language. It applies to A̶students whose n̶a̶t̶i̶v̶e̶ language of instruction i̶s̶ was not English and who h̶a̶s̶ completed at least nine full years of education conducted in that n̶a̶t̶i̶v̶e̶ language that included a full year of course work equivalent to a year within grades 9-12 of the U.S. curriculum. These students may not receive credit for lower division language courses in i̶t̶ that language **unless** it is determined that the primary course focus

was the study of literature rather than language acquisition. ~~only if the courses are advanced courses at the upper division level.~~ College credit for literature in the native language is allowed ~~only~~ for courses taken in native institutions of college grade, or for upper division and graduate courses actually taken at the University of California or at another English-speaking institution of approved standing.

Proposed Revision Clean:

Proposed SR 480. This regulation refers to students whose pre-collegiate education was largely completed in a single language other than English and describes the conditions under which they may receive transfer credit for courses in that language. It applies to students whose language of instruction was not English and who completed at least nine full years of education conducted in that language that included a full year of course work equivalent to a year within grades 9-12 of the U.S. curriculum. These students may not receive credit for lower division language courses in that language **unless** it is determined that the primary course focus was the study of literature rather than language acquisition. College credit for literature in the native language is allowed for courses taken in native institutions of college grade, or for upper division and graduate courses actually taken at the University of California or at another English-speaking institution of approved standing.

2. Proposed Memorial to the Regents [ACTION]

At its February 1, 2012 teleconference meeting, the Academic Council voted to recommend to the Assembly of the Academic Senate that it approve, and, in accordance with Senate Bylaw 90, initiate a ballot on the following proposed Memorial to the UC Board of Regents. In accordance with section B, statements for and against the Memorial will be submitted to the Assembly at least seven days prior to the meeting. The proposed Memorial calls on the Regents to support specific measures that will increase state revenues and measures that will prioritize funding for public higher education.

Memorials to the Regents on matters of universitywide concern may be initiated by Assembly. Bylaw 90.E specifies that Memorials that have been approved by the Assembly shall, within sixty calendar days of approval, be submitted by the Secretary/Parliamentarian of the Senate to an electronic ballot of all voting members of the Senate. If a majority of the voting members approve of the proposed Memorial, the Assembly will forward it to the President for transmission to the Regents, as provided for in Standing Order of the Regents 105.2.e.

ACTION REQUESTED: In accordance with Senate Bylaw 90, approve initiating a ballot to Senate Faculty on the proposed Memorial to the Regents.

MEMORIAL TO THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

WHEREAS the series of budget cuts that began at the onset of the Great Recession has reduced total state funding to the University of California by 25% since 2008-09, continuing the two decade long trend of defunding higher education by the State;

WHEREAS diminishing support for the University is directly related to falling State revenues and the decreasing fraction of the State's budget allocated to higher education;

WHEREAS during this period California undergraduate resident students have suffered an 80% increase in tuition and are for the first time paying a higher proportion of the cost of their education than that supported by the State;

WHEREAS the university system provides intrinsic critical public benefit to all Californians by offering education to all qualified California residents;

WHEREAS increasingly damaging budgets have produced a downward spiral that threatens the survival of the University as the leading public university in the world as it experiences higher student-faculty ratios, larger class sizes, reduced depth and breadth in course offerings, staff layoffs, and lack of investment in infrastructure;

WHEREAS the faculty are prepared to advocate publicly, consistently, and forcefully for the future of the University; and

WHEREAS section 41.10 of the University's Policy on Use of University Properties prohibits the University from sponsoring political activities unless "authorized for University purposes by The Regents or the President or their designees,"

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

That the Assembly of the Academic Senate calls on The Regents of the University to exercise their power to authorize the faculty and all members of the University to advocate publicly on behalf of the University in support of specific measures that will increase state revenues and specific measures that will prioritize funding for public higher education.

3. Proposal for a Negotiated Salary Plan Pilot Project [DISCUSSION]

On December 21, 2011, the Academic Council opined on a proposal for a new section 668 of the APM that would allow academic departments to use non-state funds to provide additional salary for general campus faculty, similar to the health sciences compensation plan. Based on input from all ten divisions and five committees, Council concluded "that the proposal as written is fundamentally flawed and strongly opposed its implementation." Council's letter is printed below, and it, along with all of the systemwide responses, is available at: http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/RMA_CarlsonreAPM668_FINAL.pdf.

On January 31, 2012, the Senate Office received notice from Provost and EVP Pitts that he intends to proceed with a five-year Negotiated Salary Plan Pilot Project at Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, and San Diego beginning on July 1, 2012 and concluding June 30, 2017. The proposal for the pilot project is reprinted, below.

Robert M. Anderson
Telephone: (510) 987-9303
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: Robert.Anderson@ucop.edu

Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

December 21, 2011

SUSAN CARLSON, VICE PROVOST
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Re: Proposed new APM 668 (negotiated salary program)

Dear Susan:

In response to your request for review, I invited all divisions and committees to comment on the proposal for a new section 668 of the APM that would allow academic departments to use non-state funds to provide additional salary for general campus faculty, similar to the health sciences compensation plan. All ten divisions and five committees (CCGA, UCAP, UCFW, UCORP, UCPB) responded. Academic Council discussed the proposal at its meeting on December 14 and concluded that it cannot support adoption of the proposed APM 668. While many members expressed support for the goal of finding creative ways to better compensate faculty and improve retention, Council agreed that the proposal as written is fundamentally flawed and strongly opposed its implementation.

Any alternate proposal that addressed the Senate's many concerns would have to be constructed very differently. As a first step, a new proposal should more clearly articulate the problem being addressed and narrowly design a solution. An acceptable proposal would be more prescriptive, providing as much detailed operational direction as do other sections of the APM and specifying points at which the Senate must be involved in the implementation and decision making processes to extend current campus practices into the proposed new arena.

While a minority of individuals and two divisions (UCSD, UCSF) welcomed the proposal as a way to offer competitive salaries to retain faculty, the majority found it deficient because: 1) it undermines UC's tradition of setting salaries through peer review based on a common salary scale and cedes too much authority for setting salaries to deans and department chairs; 2) it exacerbates inequities by rewarding only those achievements that receive external funding; 3) it is likely to cause conflicts of interest and faculty effort; and 4) it does not anticipate or provide mechanisms for addressing unanticipated consequences. Each of these themes is addressed, below.

Favorable comments came from some divisions with medical centers and from individual faculty members familiar with the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP) model. UCSD opined that an effective implementation plan jointly developed by divisional Senates and campus

administrations would reduce potential inequities and issues of conflict of effort. UCI also agreed that the plan may be useful for a small group of faculty, but urged Senate oversight of both the implementation plan and determinations of good standing, as well as oversight by a campus-wide body. UCSF supports the proposal on condition that it be modified in specified ways to be consistent with the HSCP and that faculty members appointed in units where the HSCP applies not be eligible to participate. All other respondents raised the following significant concerns.

Undermine the Senate's Role in UC's Merit-Based Peer Review Process
- APM 668 would constitute a fundamental change in culture by undermining the concept that all faculty are evaluated under one, common review process, regardless of discipline and campus. Faculty oversight over academic personnel issues is a core part of the UC tradition.
- APM 668 would shift the determination of rewards for faculty merit from a shared governance process to an administrative one (UCM, UCR, UCORP, UCPB) and is inconsistent with APM 210's direction that faculty shall be evaluated primarily by their peers. It would also undermine the role of committees on academic personnel (CAPs), which already include success in securing extramural funds in their evaluation of merit by creating a parallel evaluation system that cannot be applied equally across departments (UCD, UCR, UCLA, UCPB). Off-scale salaries are not arbitrarily determined; they reward exceptional merit through the regular academic personnel review process (UCSB). If implemented, the policy should require that deans consult with CAP to validate salary decisions (UCI).
- APM 668 would undermine the power of the peer review merit process to protect the fairness and equity embodied in the salary scales (UCD, UCI, UCLA, UCR, UCSB, UCSC, UCFW, UCPB) in two ways: a) by awarding increases in salary based on the *availability* of research funds, rather than by the quality of the research (UCI, UCM, UCR, UCORP); and b) by assigning the determination of "good standing" to administrators rather than to CAP.
- The definition of "good standing" is vague and provides deans with too much power to set salaries (UCB, UCD, UCI, UCLA, UCM, UCR, UCFW).
- APM 668 does not discuss how it would coordinate with existing salary augmentation mechanisms or whether those mechanisms could be revised to address the problems identified by the proposed policy.
- The role the Senate would play in reviewing faculty salary negotiations is unclear (UCSD), and it is unclear how the criteria for such reviews would differ from regular academic reviews (UCB).
- The parallel process could add considerably to the oversight burden of Senate committees and to administrators' workload (UCB, UCD, UCLA, UCR).
- The proposed policy would exacerbate the growing irrelevance of the salary scales (UCPB).

Exacerbate/Create Salary Inequities
- APM 668 would exacerbate and institutionalize existing salary inequities among disciplines and research focus areas, and across campuses (UCB, UCD, UCI, UCLA, UCR, UCSB, UCSC, UCSC, UCAP, UCFW).
- It may worsen gender and racial salary equity issues (UCD, UCLA, UCAP).
- It would reward only some forms of faculty effort and accomplishment (UCPB).

Cause Conflicts of Interest and/or Effort
- APM 668 could provide incentives for faculty to shift their effort toward revenue-producing research activities and away from other types of research and teaching and service, producing a "conflict of effort" (UCB, UCD, UCLA, UCR, UCSB, UCSD, UCAP). The policy does not indicate how its provision safeguarding the balance among UC's three missions would be

2

enforced, nor does it require deans or chairs to assess its impact on the performance of regular duties.

- It could divert research funds from graduate student support and other uses of funds for research and divert faculty effort from teaching and mentoring (UCB, UCD, UCI, UCLA, UCM, UCR, USCB, UCSD, CCGA, UCORP, UCPB), impacting UC excellence.
- The proposed policy is not accompanied by estimates of numbers of eligible faculty or likely participants, or analysis of its potential impact on the teaching and research missions (UCFW).
- It could increase the workload of faculty who do not raise external funds.
- It would deepen inequities stemming from UC's conflict of interest policies. Faculty are prohibited from teaching off-campus to increase their income, yet the policy on SSPs encourages them to do overload teaching on-campus. Similarly, the university allows faculty to consult with industry, yet those whose focus is on teaching are prohibited from doing so elsewhere (UCLA CAP).

Unintended Consequences

- APM 668 is inconsistent with its stated goals of encouraging faculty retention and offering consistent benefits to general campus faculty (UCLA, UCSB, UCFW). The salary increase would be only temporary and therefore would not ensure faculty retention (UCD, UCLA) and could even undermine it by damaging faculty morale and collegiality (UCSB, CCGA, UCAP).
- It could reduce pressure to align the salary scales with market rate salaries (UCB, UCI, UCR). Some worry that it will create an expectation that faculty are responsible for generating a portion of their own salaries (UCLA, UCR, UCSB, UCPB), which has occurred with the HSCP, and "is an ill-considered step toward increasing privatization of the University, absolving the state of its responsibility to support the institution in the name of entrepreneurship." (UCLA GSE&IS).
- By blurring public and private funding of salaries, it undercuts transparency (UCSB).
- The proposal does not mention the cost to UCRP of the negotiated salary (UCSB).
- The proposal is unclear about the purpose and functioning of the contingency fund. Principles and guidelines, rather than a single example, are necessary (UCD, UCI, UCLA, UCR, UCSB).
- Some divisions and committees suggested that APM 668 might violate the intent of federal research grant funding, regardless of measures to comply with the letter of the law, and that it raises questions of compliance and conflict of interest (UCI, UCLA, UCSB, UCORP).
- Some respondents pointed to two ways in which the proposed APM 668 could affect indirect cost recovery. First, since ICR does not fully cover the cost of research, an increased number of grants could worsen the university's fiscal situation (UCLA, UCSB). Second, ICR could be reduced due to the diversion of research funding to salaries (UCORP).
- Some fear that it would negatively impact the public character of the university by encouraging the creation of more high-fee, self-supporting programs that drain faculty resources from core programs (UCLA).
- Unlike the HSCP, in which revenues are partially shared and common effort is rewarded, the NSP privatizes salary negotiations and is not transparent (UCLA, UCM, UCPB). Guidelines for revenue sharing could mitigate resentment among faculty.

Council members agreed that the proposal may benefit a small number of faculty but that it will not solve systemic compensation problems. Council opined that both the problem and the solution should be more narrowly framed, echoing several suggestions for alternate approaches raised in the responses to the review. For instance, Berkeley suggested that allocating revenues, when available, to provide additional off-scale salary increments, would be a better way of funding increases,

without the problems associated with the proposed negotiated salary program. UCI's CPB advocated that the scales be rectified by school rather than by individual faculty member. UCPB recommended that if the proposed policy is intended to correct very large market lags in particular disciplines, such as biological sciences, it may be better to consider a special salary scale for that group based on market studies.

Given the numerous and serious reservations expressed by a majority of divisions and committees, we strongly recommend that the negotiated salary plan, as written, not be incorporated into the APM. Instead, we support continued discussions of alternate ways to better compensate faculty. Above all, we strongly advocate for adequate resources from the state and to redouble efforts to improve to restore competitive salary scales.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Anderson

Cc: Academic Council
       Executive Director Winnacker

Encl.

NEGOTIATED SALARY PLAN PILOT PROJECT

1/31/2012

The University of California will implement a Pilot compensation program for a five-year trial period, beginning July 1, 2012 and concluding June 30, 2017. The participating campuses are Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, and San Diego.

A. Rationale. The University of California has experienced long term success attaining competitive and market based salaries in the Health Sciences because of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (APM 670). Given the University of California's limited and dwindling state resources, remaining competitive in the marketplace can be partially achieved by developing a more flexible compensation plan model for general campus faculty as well, that, like the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, (1) uses non-State resources to compensate outstanding faculty where appropriate; (2) assures that the required mix of teaching, research and creative activities, and service remains; and (3) provides incentives for particular achievements while still recognizing academic merit through the rigorous peer review CAP process.

B. Pilot Goals and Objectives. This Pilot program will allow the participating campuses to leverage the existing campus expertise and experiences managing the Health Science Compensation Plan to test the concept of a general campus compensation plan in a small and controlled manner and with the specific purpose of reporting on the plan's impact, both positive and negative, to the UC Provost and to the Academic Senate. The results of this Pilot program will form the basis for a decision as to whether UC should fully implement a general campus compensation plan model.

To this end, participating campuses will be required to report data on faculty participation and negotiated salary outcomes, as well as provide annual written analysis of the campus' Pilot program implementation experiences as described in the Pilot Program Authority, Accountability and Reporting section below.

On or before the conclusion of the five-year trial period, and after consultation with the UC Academic Senate and campus administrations on the Pilot program study results, the UC Provost will determine whether to proceed with full scale implementation of a general campus compensation plan codified in Academic Personnel (APM) policy.

C. Pilot Program Guiding Principles

- This Pilot program is not a replacement for the merit-based CAP review process. The UC rank and step system is a central part of the UC system and it will retain its integral role in the determination of faculty quality and salary.

- Office of the President and campus administrative leaders remain firmly committed to looking for shared solutions to maintaining competitive faculty salaries, as is evidenced by the ongoing Joint Senate/Administration Task Force on Faculty Salaries. This Pilot program will not replace nor delay these important discussions and solutions.

- On Pilot campuses, the Divisional Academic Senate will be kept informed about campus implementation plans and procedures, will be advisory to the Chancellor and EVC, and will be provided campus reports on Pilot program participation.

- Participating faculty are expected to meet all teaching, research and service obligations and be in compliance with all applicable University policies, procedures and training requirements.

- The level of external funding provided for graduate student support, research equipment and supplies, and similar items will not be reduced due to a faculty member's participation in the Pilot program.

- This Pilot must be in compliance with federal regulations and thus this program has been designed with such regulations in mind.

- A sufficient contingency fund must be developed to assure the University does not incur unexpected costs to state funds due to this Pilot.

- Participation in the program is not intended to influence the academic review process and will not preclude the awarding of off-scale increases.

- The faculty member's salary (scale base plus off-scale) will not be permanently affected as a result of participating in this program.

- Participation in the Pilot program is a privilege, not a right.

- Full-time deans and faculty administrators as listed in APM 240 and APM 246, respectively, are not eligible to participate in this Pilot.

- All charges to contracts and grants must be compliant with Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-21.

- Effort must be reported according to established University and agency guidelines.

- No individual shall be paid more than 100%.

- A maximum of 2/9ths summer salary or the equivalent amount of academic year salary may be charged to NSF grants.

- Agency (e.g., NIH) salary caps must be observed and state funds may not be used to pay the cap gap.

Pilot Program Administrative Framework

Participating campuses: UC Davis, UC Irvine, UC Los Angeles, UC San Diego. All participating campuses will operate within the common administrative framework outlined in this Pilot document. In addition, campus implementation plans will provide detailed information on the negotiation and budget processes necessary to support the Pilot program. Participation and implementation plans are at the decanal unit. The EVC and Deans will make the final determination of the units that will be participating in the Pilot program. The Dean must approve his/her unit's participation, even though all departments in a unit may not be required to participate.

Eligibility. General campus ladder-rank and in-residence faculty members who have advanced in rank and step at the time of their last academic review are eligible to participate in accordance with the campus implementation procedures, provided the faculty member's department is participating in the Pilot program. Faculty are eligible to participate for renewable periods of one year, based upon an annual negotiation process and provided they meet the eligibility criteria each year.   Senior Management Group (SMG) members are ineligible to participate. Faculty members appointed in a Health Sciences department and/or participating in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan are not eligible to participate in this Pilot program.   If a faculty member transfers from one UC campus to another campus that is participating in the Pilot Program, s/he must renegotiate his/her salary according to the implementation plan at the new campus.

Total Negotiated Salary. The total negotiated salary will be comprised of the salary covered under the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP) (scale base plus off-scale components) and a negotiated salary component. Negotiations will be conducted annually to determine an individual's total negotiated salary for the following period. The salary covered under UCRP is up to the amount permissible under Internal Revenue Code provisions and in accordance with UCRP policy and provisions. The negotiated component of salary is not covered compensation under UCRP. All compensation paid by the University under the Pilot will be subject to Federal and State withholding and reported on a W-2 form as wages in accordance with IRS regulations and University policies and procedures.

External Funding. For the purposes of this Pilot, external funding refers to any non-State-appropriated funds, such as (but not limited to) endowment or gift income, professional degree fees, self-supporting degree fees, and contract and grant support. Funding must be derived from a stable source, paid in accordance with any related fund source restrictions, and sufficient to include the related benefits costs. The funding source(s) must be received by the campus by June 30 of the year prior to implementation of the total negotiated salary.

Maintenance of a Total Negotiated Salary. Total negotiated salaries are effective for a one-year period corresponding with the University fiscal cycle of July 1 - June 30. Once a total negotiated salary has been implemented it must be maintained for that period. No changes or retroactivity may be approved. Even when State funds are released and effort is supported by external funds, in no case will a faculty member's salary be permanently affected as a result of participation in this Program.

Restrictions.   Faculty participating in this Pilot remain subject to the requirements of other University policies including, but not limited to, Conflict of Interest, Conflict of Commitment, Faculty Code of Conduct, policy on the requirement to submit proposals and receive awards for grants and contracts through the University.

Contingency Fund. The EVC must establish a Contingency Fund to ensure the amount of negotiated salary is covered should something unexpected happen with the external funding source as stated in the faculty member's proposal. The Contingency Fund is set to ensure that there is no negative effect on State funds.

Authority. Chancellors must endorse the campus Pilot Implementation Plan. Chancellors may delegate authority for the remaining aspects of the Pilot implementation to the campus Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. This authority may not be re-delegated. The UC Provost must approve each campus implementation plan with campus specific details provided prior to initiation of the Pilot on that campus.

Campus Implementation Plans. Campuses must follow the established implementation procedures when completing the campus Implementation Plan. Campuses may be more restrictive in their Pilot implementation.

The Chancellor will consult with the Divisional Senate and provide its members, the campus Implementation Plan as well as other reports relating to other aspects of the Pilot program.

Consulting. External consulting and other externally compensated activities by participating faculty members are permitted in accordance with APM – 025, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members.

Compliance with federal regulations. The University recognizes that any salary program must be in compliance with federal regulations for faculty who receive federal funds, and the Pilot has been designed with such regulations in mind.

<u>**Pilot Program Authority, Accountability and Reporting**</u>

Authority. The UC Provost has authority for the Pilot program and will seek updates from the Executive Vice Chancellors of the participating campuses regularly during the year. The UC Provost may make changes to the scope of the Pilot program, and may cancel the Pilot program effective on June 30th of any year in the Pilot program. Responsibility for the excellence that generates non-State-appropriated funds rests with those administering the program at all levels, as well as with the faculty members participating.

 Chancellors must endorse the campus Pilot Implementation Plan. Chancellors may delegate authority for the remaining aspects of the Pilot implementation to the campus Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. This authority may not be re-delegated. The UC Provost must approve each campus Implementation Plan with campus-specific details provided prior to initiation of the Pilot on that campus.

Annual accountability reporting. No later than September 1 of each year, participating campuses will provide a detailed report on the campus Pilot to the Provost. Campuses should provide a copy of the report to their Divisional Academic Senate. The report will allow the UC Provost, in conjunction with the campus administrations and the Academic Senate, to assess the success of the Pilot program. Reporting templates will be developed by the UC Provost and will include the following:

- Rank, step and salary of faculty members participating (including salary base plus off-scale, summer salary ninths, and total negotiated salary amounts). Department and school or division. Gender and race/ethnicity.
- Percent of faculty participating in Pilot program.
- Description of how the contingency funds were utilized.
- Analysis of the preceding year, including potential issues to resolve and any formal grievances connected with the pilot, funding shortfalls, or other issues connected to the Pilot program.
- Comparison of the level of graduate student support prior to the implementation of the Pilot program and post implementation.
- Teaching loads of the faculty participating.

The Provost retains the option of conducting a qualitative survey of participating faculty during the course of the Pilot program.

Contact: Academic Personnel
Office of the President
510-987-9479
Susan.Carlson@ucop.edu

VIII.   **UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT** [NONE]

IX.   **PETITIONS OF STUDENTS** [NONE]

X.   **UNFINISHED BUSINESS** [NONE]

XI.   **NEW BUSINESS**