

MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

February 12, 2014
MINUTES OF MEETING

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday, February 12, 2014. Academic Senate Chair William Jacob presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Senate Director Martha Winnacker called the roll of Assembly members and confirmed a quorum. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of the June 12, 2013 meeting as noticed.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

- o *William Jacob*

Chair Jacob introduced UC Davis Professor George Matthey, the Assembly's new parliamentarian, and summarized the agenda for the meeting, which was called in part to give Assembly members an opportunity to engage with the new UC President, Janet Napolitano, on issues facing the university.

Board of Regents Meetings: Chair Jacob and Provost Dorr's joint presentation on doctoral education to the Board of Regents in November 2013 highlighted financial issues that impair UC's ability to compete with other universities for the best graduate students in the world. At the January 2014 Regents meeting, Provost Dorr discussed UC's online education efforts, including the courses faculty are developing through the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative and the development of a pilot system to facilitate cross-campus enrollment in online courses. President Napolitano and the heads of the California State University and California Community Colleges also made a joint presentation at that meeting about the need to strengthen the Master Plan for Higher Education, in which they outlined plans to work together on initiatives of common interest to the higher education segments.

Capital Outlay Letter: The Academic Council recently [endorsed](#) a memo from the UC Committee on Planning and Budget outlining principles to guide the allocation of state general funds for capital projects under the new capital outlay process approved in the 2013-14 state budget.

Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs: Following a systemwide Senate review, the Academic Council sent the Provost a [letter](#) summarizing the faculty's views and concerns about a proposed revision to the policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs.

UC Path and Composite Benefit Rates: The Senate is concerned about rising costs associated with UC Path, a new systemwide payroll system that will modernize and replace aging campus systems, and about plans for a composite benefit rate (CBR) system to align with UC Path. The Senate is concerned that the CBR models under consideration will treat some faculty unfairly; in particular, faculty on summer salary whose grants would be charged additional costs for health benefits not received. Chair Jacob's position, shared by many faculty, is that no research grant should be charged for benefits that do not accrue to the salary component funded by the grant.

UCOP Stakeholder Survey: The President has announced an efficiency review of the Office of the President and is surveying campus stakeholders about the extent to which various UCOP functions and services add value for the campuses.

Open Access Policy: The open access policy approved by the Senate in July 2013 is in effect on a pilot basis at UCI, UCLA, and UCSF. The Academic Planning Council is developing a "presidential policy" for open access that will extend the provisions of the policy, which currently apply only to tenure-track faculty and their publications, to all faculty, postdocs, and students.

Campus Climate Survey: The results of the systemwide UC Campus Climate Survey will be released at the March Regents meeting. A central UCOP website will compile survey results for each campus, and campus-specific data will be available locally.

UC Care: The Academic Council [has expressed concern](#) about a lack of consultation with the Senate in the development of UC Care, a new self-funded medical insurance program for UC employees. The Council also highlighted the expertise of faculty on the UCFW Health Care Task Force (HCTF) in health care policy and delivery systems, and urged the President to ensure close consultation with UCFW and the HCTF in the evaluation of UC Care and other benefit options.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST

○ *Aimée Dorr*

Online Education: The Provost's Office is working with the Senate to advance UC's systemwide online education activities. The [Innovative Learning Technology Initiative](#) (ILTI) is UC's plan to use \$10 million in state funding the Governor asked UC to set aside to promote online learning technologies. UCOP has issued two RFPs to faculty for the development of online or hybrid courses for ILTI, and has so far approved a total of 27 courses, including submissions from every campus. ILTI is also developing a "communications hub" to facilitate and streamline student registration in systemwide online courses. 20 courses are now available to UC students at all campuses through the hub. To receive ILTI resources, the department/campus proposing to host the course will be expected to offer it multiple times over several academic years and to make it available to students at other UC campuses. Campuses are encouraged to identify ILTI courses hosted at other campuses that can meet general education or major requirements, but it will remain up to faculty on individual campuses to decide how to use a course. The Provost wants to merge the activities of ILTI and UCOE into a single organization and is considering which activities should be based centrally and which should be based on campuses.

Campus Climate Survey: The results of the Climate Surveys conducted at 13 UC locations will be presented at the March Regents meeting. A systemwide report aggregating the results will be available on the UCOP website, along with links to campus reports, which will include the full findings, as well as a statement from each chancellor identifying a process for additional analysis of the issues identified and an implementation plan to address the problems.

Performance Indicators: After Provost Dorr's May 2013 presentation to the Regents about faculty workload and student graduation outcomes, the Governor requested more information about the factors associated with bachelor degree completion rates and time-to-degree. UCOP is analyzing data and surveying campuses about strategies that are making a difference. UC has found that the vast majority of students graduate in four years; students who graduate in four years are more likely to enroll in 15 units per quarter; and students who attended low performing high schools or are the first in their family to attend college are more likely to take longer than four years to graduate.

Questions and Comments:

Q. How does the Governor's vision of online education align with or differ from what UC is doing?

A: Both UC and the Governor are interested in learning more about what is and what is not effective in advancing student learning and time-to-degree outcomes.

Q. Is there a timeline for making the online pilot project more broadly available to faculty?

A: UCOP will continue the RFP process this fall. Faculty who want to offer their course to students at more than one UC campus can apply. UCOP will use the ILTI funding to pay for any additional costs incurred by the host campus related to offering the course to non-host campus students.

Q. Will UCOP edit the individual campus climate survey results?

A: UCOP will not edit or alter the campus reports or executive summaries. Campuses will be free to frame the reports as they choose on their websites.

Q. On paper, you appear to be the President's only academic advisor. If so, does it concern you?

A: Although most administrative areas of the university considered "academic" report to me, the vice presidents who report to the president are also deeply engaged in academic issues. Some senior leaders have academic credentials and most have campus experience. It is more important that they are willing and able to consider and incorporate academic concerns into their discussions and decisions. Part of my job is to push them to do that, to ensure that decisions made by the administrative apparatus are orchestrated to benefit the academic enterprise and the university's educational goals.

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

- *Janet Napolitano, President*
- *Patrick Lenz, Vice President for Budget and Capital Resources*

President Napolitano: It is a great honor to meet with the Assembly as I embark on my fourth month as President of the University of California, the nation's premier public research institution, an embodiment of freedom of expression, tolerance, diversity, and excellence. One of my biggest learning experiences has been our shared governance system and the faculty's role in

the primacy of the academic and research missions of the university. We share common interests, issues, and goals that we must work together to address. I have had the opportunity to meet with the Academic Council several times as well as with faculty on my initial campus tours, which wrap-up tomorrow at Berkeley. I started my tour at UC Merced, the newest UC campus, to send a strong message about its importance to the overall UC mission.

I have announced several initiatives intended to enhance the university's mission. First, I want a more rational and predictable tuition policy that reduces pricing volatility during a student's tenure. We will be modeling a variety of scenarios and their implications as we develop preliminary recommendations for the Regents later this year. We have also identified one-time monies in an over-reserve that we intend to direct toward enhancing support for graduate students, the president's postdoctoral fellowship program, and undocumented students. Another initiative relates to technology transfer—how to enhance the transition of UC research and UC developed technologies to the market. I have also charged a Transfer Action Team with developing recommendations for simplifying and clarifying the transfer path and for expanding UC's reach into a broader range of community colleges. In addition, I want UC to achieve carbon neutrality by 2025 and believe UC can help develop the environmental technologies to make that possible. Finally, I want UC to do more for student veterans, and I want to build new connections and partnerships between UC and Mexico. To help achieve these initiatives, I have announced a cap on UCOP staffing, a 10% reduction in UCOP travel, and other efficiency measures to ensure that UCOP is run as efficiently as possible, adds value to the overall system, and has staffing that directly supports the faculty and students.

The President serves as a kind of CEO for the UC system, but the university is really the faculty and students. I see my job as one that ensures the system facilitates the work of the faculty, the teaching mission of the university and the research needs of the university and the state. I am here to support your work and bring the UC message to Sacramento, Washington DC, and the people of California.

Questions and Comments:

Q: Do you think UC is in a good position to leverage its basic research to further drug discovery?

A: I support basic research and the research cycle, but understand that the research cycle can take many years from discovery to FDA drug approval. We want to cultivate a research-rich environment by providing resources that support a broad variety of research. We also have to be careful as an academic institution to ensure that our research is credible and independent of its funding source.

Q: What is the timeline for addressing the UC faculty total remuneration competitiveness gap?

A: It depends in part on the state budget. The UC budget sets aside funding for miscellaneous areas that support academic excellence, including faculty salary increases, but there is a gap between the Governor's proposed budget and UC's budget request. It is important for UC to remain competitive at the highest levels, but we also have to be realistic.

Q: UC's scientific research has an obvious connection to economic prosperity, but you will also be asked why the state should continue to fund humanities. How will you respond to the marginalization of humanities in the general public?

A: UC is a Ph.D.-granting research university. We train the next set of great thinkers. Any program that focuses on the ability to think, communicate, and analyze has a great value, whether the student remains in academia or not. UC is not an “engineering school” or a “biology school.” It is a university, which means that we offer a variety of academic disciplines.

Q: There are large differences in quality among the community colleges. UC needs to serve transfer students, but we also want prepared students. How do we find a balance?

A: UC draws a large proportion of its transfer students from a small number of community colleges, and no transfers from others. This is troublesome because the community colleges serve the diversity of California and are supposed to be equivalent; and the colleges that send us small numbers of students are often concentrated in diverse communities. I believe there are ways UC can increase outreach to the community colleges and help transfers succeed once they arrive here.

Q: Do you anticipate providing incentives to help support more research centers at the campuses?

A: That depends a great deal on what the chancellors and faculty want to do, because such efforts need to be driven by the campuses. The sources of funding need to be diversified, and centers can be a good way to attract financial support.

Vice President Lenz: The annual budget cycle began in early January when the Governor submitted his proposed budget plan to the Legislature. The Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) has just released its analysis of the 2014-15 higher education budget to the State Senate and Assembly and their budget committees and subcommittees, which will deliberate in the months leading up to the May Budget Revision and the final stages of budget approval. President Napolitano, Chancellor White, and Chancellor Harris will discuss the 2014-15 higher education budget at a State Assembly Budget Subcommittee hearing on February 19. Provost Dorr will discuss the performance outcome measures codified in Senate Bill 94 at a joint hearing of the Education and Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittees on February 26.

The LAO report is encouraging in some respects and concerning in others. The report recommends that the Legislature reject the Governor’s proposed 5% increase for UC and focus on a “workload budget” that provides additional funding for inflation, pension costs, and retiree health, and includes a multi-year approach to enrollment funding. The LAO is also recommending that students and their families have a “share of cost” for the UC budget and is proposing a 2.5% net tuition increase or a 3.8% increase including return-to-aid. The LAO’s recommendation for 2% enrollment growth funding for CSU but no UC enrollment growth funding does not acknowledge that CSU cut enrollment by 20,000 during the budget crisis, while UC continued to amass 7,500 unfunded students. A fair enrollment plan would fund Merced enrollment growth up to 10,000 and then provide additional enrollment growth funding for the other campuses but allow UC to apply a portion to existing unfunded FTE on a glide path.

Q: Can you address the Master Plan’s lack of a funding obligation?

A: The lack of a funding commitment may be the biggest challenge to the continued relevance of the Master Plan. But UC hopes policymakers in Sacramento will recognize the opportunity presented by the budget surplus to fund additional enrollments.

Q: Is there any movement on UC's efforts to encourage the state to recognize its obligation to UCRP?

A: UC has made a lot of progress on this issue. The Governor's budget summary now includes UCRP and UC retiree health in its list of retirement obligations. And the LAO is now recommending that the state fund \$64.1 million for UCRP as part of the UC Regents' 2014-15 budget request and \$4.1 million for the increased cost of the retiree health benefits.

Q: How can we do a better job of highlighting the Master Plan's designation of UC as the state's sole Ph.D. granting research institution?

A: UC continues to educate and inform policymakers about the research mission of the University, and the three segment heads are working together to advocate for the Master Plan. UC expects more discussion about community colleges offering baccalaureate degrees, but does not expect graduate degrees to enter into the discussion.

Q: What is the latest news on rebenching and Funding Streams?

A: Rebenching is in its second year and is moving forward as planned. UCOP is close to a consensus about a new Funding Streams model that will adjust the methodology for the UCOP assessment to help ensure that a particular campus's assessment is proportionate to the benefits it receives from UCOP.

VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council: Performance Indicators

- o *Senate Chair Jacob*
- o *Associate Vice President Operating Budget and Facilities Management Debora Obley*

Outcome Measures: UCOP is discussing how to respond to new legislation requiring UC to report annually on the university's performance in the areas of degree and unit completion, transfer rates, and other outcomes. UC's annual [Accountability Report](#) already addresses many of these indicators.

Cost of Instruction: Another bill requires UC to produce a bi-annual study on the "cost of instruction" at the university. The first reporting cycle, due in October 2014, asks for a systemwide report disaggregating costs related to undergraduate, graduate academic, and graduate professional education, and research activities; by general campus compared to health sciences campus; and STEM compared to non-STEM majors. The second cycle, due in 2016, requires campus-by-campus reporting. A working group is considering several preliminary models based on different weightings for different student types that can describe as accurately as possible the amount UC needs to deliver a quality education to each type. The working group will also be reviewing data from CSU and UC's national peers and considering the extent to which research expenditures should be incorporated into cost of education for each kind of student. The request is complicated, if not impossible, to perform accurately because the expenditures for these areas are deeply intertwined. UC does not hide the fact that graduate education costs more than undergraduate education.

Long-Range Enrollment Plan: UCOP is updating UC's systemwide long-range enrollment plan for the first time since 2008. The Budget Office is reviewing individual campus plans, which

project modest California resident undergraduate growth, more substantial nonresident undergraduate growth, and large graduate enrollment growth between now and 2020-21, and evaluating them in the context of UC's Master Plan commitment, academic, financial, access, diversity, space, political, and other considerations. To define how UC should approach enrollment as a system, it will be necessary to accurately project the number of CA high school graduates and UC-eligible applicants expected between now and 2021, and then to model the results against campus plans and UC's systemwide obligation. UC will also need to determine how to address campuses that chose to enroll unfunded students compared to campuses that chose to restrict enrollment.

Q: Is there is a performance measure for diversity?

A: UC compares demographic indicators for enrolled students with California high school graduates and California residents to see how closely the university reflects the population. UC is doing well in some areas, but not as well in others, although UC diversity outcomes look very good in comparison to many of UC's AAU peers.

Q: Is UC concerned that adherence to strict performance measures could lead to lower academic standards?

A: UC has pointed out that linking funding to the strict achievement of performance outcome measures could create incentives to enroll a different kind of student, and perhaps reduce the emphasis on serving underserved communities.

Q: Could the cost of instruction exercise be an opportunity to inform policymakers about the UC funding gap?

A: UCOP intends to use the report to draw attention to the gap between what UC is spending and the real cost of instruction. The danger is what the report is likely to show about the high cost of graduate education, since policymakers do not tend to understand or value UC's graduate education mission as much as they do undergraduate education. Term limits and the resulting high turnover in state government work against UC's efforts to create informed and committed advocates for higher education.

Q: How does the legislature react to the increasing number of international and national nonresidents on campuses?

A: The legislature is interested in knowing how many additional residents and fewer nonresidents UC will enroll with additional enrollment funding. UC notes that nonresident tuition revenue made it possible through the budget crisis for UC to enroll more unfunded California residents. Campuses will continue to ramp-up nonresident enrollment until they have assurances that the state returns to enrollment funding.

Comment: It presents a false choice to suggest that the pursuit of diversity and the pursuit of academic quality are not compatible.

Comment: The funding crisis has forced some colleges to double the Teaching Assistant-to-student ratio from 44 to 1 to 88 to 1, which in some cases has caused TAs to change assessment methods and teaching techniques.

Comment: UC needs more faculty and graduate students in Sacramento to help inform and educate policymakers about UC's graduate education and research mission, and the way teaching is intertwined in that mission and goes beyond podium time.

B. Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs: Doctoral Education

- *Senate Vice Chair Mary Gilly*
- *CCGA Chair Donald Mastronarde*

Two recent reports from a joint Senate-Administration workgroup and a special Academic Senate committee made recommendations for enhancing UC's ability to compete for the best Ph.D. students in the world. Chair Jacob and Provost Dorr's presentation to the Regents on doctoral education in November drew on those reports and inspired the Regents to ask for specific, actionable recommendations for improving UC's competitiveness. A small team of Senate representatives is now planning a UC-wide conference on doctoral education that will be held at UC Irvine on April 15 and co-chaired by Provost Dorr and Senate Vice Chair Gilly. The conference will focus on best practices and a formal systemwide proposal to better support graduate students.

Chair Mastronarde and Vice Chair Gilly described some of the main areas of concern related to doctoral student funding. First, the net stipends UC offers Ph.D. students are significantly lower than those offered by UC's competitors. Second, UC's practice of charging the full nonresident supplemental tuition (NRST) for academic graduate students to faculty grants is out of line with what other universities do and has caused UC faculty to reduce the number of international graduate students they support. Addressing these issues and increasing the competitiveness of UC's support for graduate students is critical to ensuring that UC continues to attract the best in the world.

It was noted that it will be critical to address the economic disincentive that makes it more expensive to hire a graduate student than a postdoctoral fellow. It was noted that individual campuses have taken steps to minimize the effect of NRST by, for example, establishing endowments to support graduate students, although some campuses oppose a systemwide policy to abolish NRST.

C. Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools: Transfer Issues

- *BOARS Chair George Johnson*

Chair Johnson co-chairs a Transfer Action Team charged by the President with recommending strategies for streamlining the transfer process, increasing the transfer graduation rate and possibly increasing the number of transfer students, and expanding UC's reach into a broader range of community colleges.

The Action Team will recommend that UC upgrade its transfer message with a new universitywide communications and technology strategy; improve UC's geographic, ethnic, and socio-economic diversity by creating a stronger presence at every CCC; welcome students to campus with a Transfer Success Kit and upgrade other support services to help transfers transition to and succeed at UC; organize for academic success by streamlining the transfer preparation process through greater involvement in the Course Identification Numbering system (C-ID) and by evaluating the UC Transfer Paths in light of the new Associates Degrees for Transfer; and reaffirm UC's commitment to transfer students on every campus by enrolling additional transfers to meet the Master Plan's 2:1 freshman-to transfer target ratio on every campus. The report also makes clear that UC cannot increase transfer enrollments at the expense of freshmen and without additional state funding. BOARS and the Senate have already taken

steps to recognize in UC transfer admission policy the Transfer AA degree pathways developed by the community colleges and mandated for CSU in Senate Bill 1440.

D. University Committee on Academic Personnel: Diversity Issues

- *UCAP Chair Harry Green*

APM 210: UCAP and the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity share an interest in diversity issues. The two committees have been working on a revised version of APM 210-1d that maintains its message about the university's commitment to diversity while resolving some ambiguities in the language. Some faculty and CAPs have interpreted the language as suggesting that diversity-related research activities should be preferred over others in the merit and promotion system, while others have interpreted the language to mean that such activities should be recognized and rewarded equally.

Moreno Report: Last fall, the president tasked a special Senate - Administration working group with responding to the Moreno Report's recommendations for addressing complaints of bias and discriminatory behavior involving UCLA faculty. The working group's [report](#) takes a systemwide view in summarizing local processes for bringing, collecting, and investigating complaints and imposing sanctions; discussing how UC should respond to the report's major recommendations; and recommending improvements to the faculty diversity pipeline. The report recommends better recordkeeping systems and a central discrimination office on each campus that can serve as a gateway for complaints and has authority to conduct investigations on a full range of issues affecting students, faculty, and staff. It also recommends that campuses maintain an Ombuds Office where students, faculty, and staff can discuss issues and complaints confidentially. It recommends that real consequences and corrective actions be imposed when allegations of harassment, discrimination, intolerance, and bias have merit, and makes recommendations related to increasing and recognizing diversity and fostering an inclusive campus climate.

VII. University Committee on Faculty Welfare Report

- *UCFW Chair J. Daniel Hare*

UCRP Funding: UCFW is concerned that the Regents' 2010 plan to fund UCRP's full Annual Required Contribution by 2018 will not be followed and the current planned funding trajectory is insufficient to meet the full funding needs of the plan over the long term. The Regents' plan calls for ramping up the employer contribution to 18% by 2018; however, it does not appear that UCOP intends to increase the employer contribution beyond the 14% level it will assume this July 1. This funding level will meet the Normal Cost of the plan, but will be insufficient to pay down the unfunded liability; in fact, it will increase the unfunded liability to \$20 billion by 2042. Maintaining the 14% ratio is effectively pushing the problem down the road to younger faculty whose grants are assessed an "employer contribution." These faculty might prefer to pay a higher employer cost on their grants for several years now, and then watch their employer contribution decline later, rather than pay a 14% contribution in perpetuity or see it increase. UCFW is developing a proposal that would use internal borrowing to meet the first two years of ARC that could be paid back with a payroll assessment that does not require the employer contribution to rise above 16%.

Total Remuneration: UCFW will be reviewing a preliminary version of an updated study of faculty total remuneration in April. The main question UCFW will be asking is whether UC's health and retirement benefits still compensate for cash salaries that are below the market.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

CCGA Chair Mastronarde stated that CCGA has approved a new Master of Finance (M.F.) degree in the Rady School of Management at UC San Diego. Because the M.F. is a new degree title on the campus, the Assembly must consider CCGA's recommendation and determine whether to transmit it to the President. Chair Mastronarde moved that the Assembly consider the new degree title. The motion was seconded and carried.

Per Bylaw 120.D.4, Chair Jacob asked for the Assembly's consent to add an item of new business to the agenda. The Assembly unanimously consented to the addition of the item brought by CCGA.

ACTION: By unanimous vote, the Assembly approved the addition of the M.F. as a degree title at UC San Diego.

IX. SPECIAL ORDERS

- A. Consent Calendar (none)
- B. Annual Reports (2012-13)

The meeting adjourned at 4:15

Attest: Bill Jacob, Academic Senate Chair

Minutes Prepared by: Michael LaBriola, Academic Senate Analyst

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of February 12, 2014