

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



MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Wednesday, February 12, 2020

10:00 am - 4:00 pm

**UC Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street, Oakland
Lobby 1 Conference Room**

I.	ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS	1
II.	MINUTES [ACTION]	
	Approval of the Draft Minutes of the Meeting of June 12, 2019	2-6
	Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, June 12, 2019	7
III.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR	
	▪ Kum-Kum Bhavnani	
	1. Working Group on Comprehensive Access Chair's Report	
	2. Status of Implementation of Assembly Revisions to Senate Bylaw 336	
	3. Status of Assembly Policy on Awarding Degrees Posthumously	
	4. Status of Divestment from Fossil Fuels/Other Senate Sustainability Initiatives	
	5. Faculty Diversity Task Force	
IV.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT	
	▪ Janet Napolitano (joining by videoconference)	
V.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST	
	▪ Michael T. Brown	
VI.	STATUS OF THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET	
	▪ David Alcocer, Associate Vice President, Budget Analysis and Planning	
VII.	REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES [INFORMATION/DISCUSSION/ACTION]	
	A. Academic Council	
	▪ Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair, Academic Council	
	1. Status of the UC Presidential Search [INFORMATION/DISCUSSION]	8
	2. Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (Area D)	9-11
	[INFORMATION/DISCUSSION/ACTION]	

3.	Report of the Academic Council Standardized Testing Task Force [INFORMATION/DISCUSSION] https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/ files/underreview/sttf-report.pdf	11
4.	The Operation and Engagement of the Assembly of the Academic Senate [DISCUSSION]	12
VIII.	UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT	
	▪ Jean-Daniel Saphores, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare	
1.	Faculty Salaries	
2.	Health Care Benefits	
3.	Other UCFW Initiatives and Concerns	
IX.	SPECIAL ORDERS	
A.	Consent Calendar [NONE]	
B.	Annual Reports [2018-19]	
	Academic Council (Council)	13
	Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC)	23
	Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI)	28
	Academic Freedom (UCAF)	32
	Academic Personnel (UCAP)	34
	Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE)	37
	Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)	41
	Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)	45
	Committees (UCOC)	51
	Educational Policy (UCEP)	54
	Faculty Welfare (UCFW)	58
	International Education (UCIE)	63
	Libraries and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC)	67
	Planning and Budget (UCPB)	70
	Preparatory Education (UCOPE)	78
	Research Policy (UCORP)	81
	Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ)	88
X.	REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]	
XI.	PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]	
XII.	UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]	
XIII.	NEW BUSINESS	

I. Roll Call

2029-20 Assembly Roll Call February 12, 2020

President of the University:

Janet Napolitano

Andrej Luptak

Nancy McLoughlin

Academic Council Members:

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair

Mary Gauvain, Vice Chair

Oliver O'Reilly, Chair, UCB

Kristin Lagattuta, Chair, UCD

James Steintrager, Chair, UCI

Michael Meranze, Chair, UCLA

Thomas Hansford, Chair, UCM

Dylan Rodriguez, Chair, UCR

Maripat Corr, Chair, UCSD

Sharmila Majumdar, Chair, UCSF

Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB

Grant McGuire, (alt for Kimberly Lau,
Chair, UCSC)

Eddie Comeaux, Chair, BOARS

Ramesh Balasubramaniam, Chair, CCGA

Mona Lynch, Chair, UCAADE

Susan Tapert, Vice Chair, UCAP (alt for
Chair John Gilbert)

John Serences, Chair, UCEP

Jean-Daniel Saphores, Chair, UCFW

Andrew Baird, Chair, UCORP

Sean Malloy, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (5)

Daniel Boyarin

Cathryn Carson

Fai Ma

John Ngai

Richard Scheffler

Davis (6)

Anne Britt

Richard Grotjahn

Joel Hass

George Mattay

Jeffrey Williams

TBD (1)

Irvine (4)

Jacob Avery

Elliott Currie

Los Angeles (7)

Hiram Beltran-Sanchez

Nicholas Brecha

Jessica Cattelino

Mansoureh Eghbali

Kym F. Faull

William Marotti

Peter Tontono

Merced (1)

Josue Medellin-Azuara

Riverside (2)

Thomas Cogswell

Isgouhi Kaloshian

San Diego (5)

Amy Bridges

Seana Coulson

Igor Grant

Tara Javidi

Stephanie Mel

San Francisco (5)

Linda Centore

Steven Cheung

Elena Flowers

Bo Huang

Leah Karliner

Jacqueline Leung

Santa Barbara (3)

Charles Akemann

Claudio Fogu

Nuha Khoury

Santa Cruz (2)

Janette Dinishak

David Brundage

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Andrew Dickson

MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

June 12, 2019

MINUTES OF VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday, June 12, 2019. Academic Senate Chair Robert May presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Senate Director Hilary Baxter 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 April 10, 2018.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**▪ Robert C. May**

UC Budget: The Governor's May budget revision did not include significant changes to his funding plan for UC relative to January. Earlier this week, the Legislature's Budget Conference Committee adopted a final budget that is largely consistent with the Governor's plan. Particularly problematic is that the \$95 million in one-time funds provided in the 2018-19 budget to support a tuition buy-out and enrollment growth was not converted into permanent funding.

Faculty Salaries: The 2019-2020 UC budget tentatively funds a 5% increase to the faculty salary scales, to support the second of a three-year plan to close the faculty salary gap. President Napolitano has stated that she intends to fund the second year of the plan, but full implementation depends on the final state budget and the three-year plan may need to extend to four or five years, depending on the outcome.

Memorial to the Regents: The proposed Academic Senate Memorial to the Regents to divest UC of investments in fossil fuel companies, met the threshold set in [Senate Bylaw 90](#), and has moved to a mail ballot of all voting members of the Senate.

Retiree Health: The new Advisory Committee on UC Employee Health Plans will be considering potential changes to the structure and offerings of UC's retiree healthcare benefit programs that help maintain retiree health as a financially viable benefit. Specifically, the Advisory Committee will be evaluating an RFP for a Medicare Advantage PPO.

Elsevier Negotiations: Following UC's announcement that it will not sign a new contract with Elsevier until it meets the requirements of UC's open access proposal, Elsevier is expected to begin limiting access to new journal articles, which will affect how UC scholars access certain journals. The libraries have contingency plans in place for ensuring alternative access. The crisis has established open access as a fundamental value of the University.

Herbicide Task Force: President Napolitano recently issued an interim ban on the use of glyphosate-based herbicides on UC campuses. (The ban does not apply to research that requires glyphosate-based herbicides), and has empaneled a Task Force to advise her about the future use of those herbicides.

Fetal Tissue Research: Last week, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services cancelled a contract with UCSF for medical research involving fetal tissue from abortions. The Academic Council released a statement expressing support for scientists at UCSF and elsewhere who conduct fetal tissue research that is critical to the development of new medical treatments, and expressing strong concerns about the politically-motivated attacks on science and academic freedom.

Transfer Guarantee: Following a systemwide Senate review, the Academic Council approved a BOARS proposal for a systemwide transfer admission guarantee for California Community College students. The University must have the structure of the guarantee in place this fall. Implementation of the policy is mostly an administrative issue, but the Senate is sending letters to departments offering the 21 Transfer Pathways majors asking faculty to reassess the Pathways and confirm that the courses in the Pathways still provide the preparation that is expected for the major.

UCSF/Dignity: UCSF has decided not to move forward with a proposed affiliation with Dignity Health, following widespread concerns that the affiliation would restrict some patient care services in ways that do not align with the UC mission.

Apportionment of 2019-20 Assembly: The apportionment of Assembly representatives for the 2019-20 academic year is enclosed in the agenda. Campus representation did not change relative to 2018-19.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY UNIVERSITY SENIOR MANAGERS

▪ Susan Carlson, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, and Acting Provost

New Chancellors: After a national search, the Regents appointed UC Riverside Provost Cynthia Larive to replace retiring UC Santa Cruz Chancellor George Blumenthal, and systemwide CFO Nathan Brostrom to replace UC Merced Chancellor Dorothy Leland on an interim basis when she retires in August, while a national search is conducted.

State Budget: The Conference Committee released its 2019-20 State budget bill on Sunday. The Legislature has until June 15 to pass the budget; the Governor has two weeks to approve it, and/or exercise his line item veto authority. The University expects to receive a \$462 million (or 7%) increase to its overall State-funded budget. However, \$214 million of the increase is provided as one-time funding. The budget replaces new ongoing money set aside in the Governor's budget to support student success with funding for enrollment increases. The budget includes new permanent funding for enrollment increases as well as a promise to include funding in the 2020-21 budget to replace out-of-state students with California residents. The budget also includes one-time funding for specific priorities like student homelessness and dyslexia research, faculty diversity, and research into firearms violence.

SVSH: President Napolitano is convening a working group to review policies and procedures related to sexual misconduct in UC medical centers and student health centers. The group will be co-chaired by the Systemwide Title IX Coordinator and the UCSF vice dean for clinical affairs,

and will include the incoming UCPT chair as Senate representative. In the meantime, President Napolitano has directed the chancellors to confirm that they have processes in place to ensure the immediate escalation of any patient report of sexual misconduct, and to determine if a report should result in immediate removal of a physician or care provider, pending investigation.

Huawei Ban: In light of the recent federal executive order banning US companies from using telecommunications equipment made by the Chinese telecommunications company Huawei, the UC Vice Chancellors for Research are working on a statement addressing UC's research and contractual connections with Huawei. The statement will ask campuses to establish a moratorium on future funding from the company and its international affiliates, and also wind down existing funding, with a review of what affiliate funding may still be allowable. There will also be language encouraging campuses to identify bridge funding for affected researchers and remind faculty to pay attention to policies on conflict of commitment and interest.

Admissions Audit: In response to the national SAT cheating scandal, the University initiated an internal audit to review current admissions processes and controls, local policies and processes governing undergraduate admissions, particularly protocols for Admission by Exception, Special Admissions, and athletic admissions. The University is expecting a State audit as a follow-up.

Faculty Diversity RFPs: UCOP recently released RFPs for two programs aimed at supporting campus projects that enhance faculty diversity. The first is the 2019-20 "Advancing Faculty Diversity through Improved Climate and Retention" program. The second is the 2019-20 "Advancing Faculty Diversity Recruitment" program. President Napolitano is funding the programs as a part of her support of pathways to a diverse professoriate.

- An Assembly member encouraged UCOP to consider including faculty researchers from gender and sexuality studies departments on the working group considering policies related to sexual misconduct in UC medical centers and student health centers

V. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT

▪ Sean Malloy, UCFW Chair

Non-Discrimination in Healthcare Task Force: The UCFW Non-Discrimination in Healthcare Task Force is led by former Academic Council Chair Shane White and charged to explore the University's relationships with external healthcare providers that may potentially conflict with UC's values, public trust, mission, and/or policies on non-discrimination. The Academic Council endorsed the Task Force's Interim Report, which recommends that the University avoid affiliations with entities whose values conflict with UC's public mission and values. The recommendations are particularly relevant in the context of the proposed affiliation between UCSF and Dignity Healthcare, which generated opposition based on concerns about its alignment with the UC mission. The recommendations should be applied in an analysis of UC's other existing and potential relationships with health care providers.

Retiree Health: Two principles guide UCFW and its Health Care Task Force in discussions about retiree healthcare benefits. The first is the need to protect retirees, who are UC's most vulnerable population, most in need of healthcare, and most susceptible to premium increases. The second principle is to ensure that any changes to retiree healthcare benefits take place only after substantial consultation, and are not rushed or forced through without consideration of their possible effects.

Faculty Salaries: UCFW remains focused on the goal of closing the gap between UC faculty salaries and faculty salaries at UC's "Comparison 8" institutions, by fixing the UC faculty salary scales.

Composite Benefit Rates: UCFW and UCORP investigated reports that Composite Benefit Rates (CBRs) have been implemented incorrectly in some campus departments, charging existing faculty grants higher rates than had been approved under the original grant budget. Council endorsed the recommendation that UCOP adopt a formal mitigation plan to redress the research funding shortfall of faculty affected by the implementation of new CBRs.

Title IX: With regard to implementation of the University's policies on sexual harassment and sexual violence, UCFW is pushing for clearer and more uniform guidelines for disciplinary action and more consistent application of policies and discipline across campuses to help ensure the integrity of the process for all parties

- An Assembly member noted that Regents policy prohibits discrimination on the basis of religion; the decision not to affiliate with Dignity, a faith-based organization, amounts to discrimination solely on the basis of religious doctrine. A systemwide Academic Senate Health Sciences committee could help address issues in a much more pro-active way.

VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

1. Election of the UCOC Vice Chair

ACTION: The Assembly elected Professor Cynthia Passmore (UC Davis) 2019-20 UCOC Vice Chair by unanimous consent.

2. Modifications to Senate Regulation 636.E

Following a systemwide Senate review, the Academic Council at its May 22, 2019 meeting approved a set of revisions to Senate Regulation 636.E, proposed by the Santa Barbara Division and endorsed by the University Committee on Preparatory Education, to address equity concerns related to how UC students are allowed to satisfy the University's Entry Level Writing Requirement. The revision adds language stating that the Senate Division of the student's campus may approve an exception to 636.E in cases where a student has earned transferable credit while on an approved leave of absence.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the modifications to SR 636.E. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

VII. SPECIAL ORDERS

A. Consent Calendar

1. Variance to Senate Regulation 630.D Requested by Santa Cruz Division

2. Variance to Systemwide Senate Regulation 782 Requested by San Diego Division

ACTION: The Assembly approved the variances by unanimous consent.

VIII. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [None]

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [None]

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [None]

XI. NEW BUSINESS [None]

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 am

Minutes Prepared by: Michael LaBriola, Academic Senate Analyst

Attest: Robert May, Academic Senate Chair

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of June 12, 2019

Appendix A – 2018-2019 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of June 12, 2019

President of the University:

Janet Napolitano

Academic Council Members:

Robert May, Chair
Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair
Barbara Spackman, Chair, UCB (absent)
Kristin Lagattuta, Chair, UCD
Linda Cohen, Chair, UCI
Michael Meranze, Vice Chair, UCLA (alt for Joseph Bristow, Chair, UCLA)
Kurt Schnier, Chair, UCM
Dylan Rodriguez, Chair, UCR
Robert Horwitz, Chair UCSD
David Teitel, Chair, UCSF
Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB
Kimberly Lau, Chair, UCSC
Eddie Comeaux, Chair, BOARS (absent)
Onyebuchi Arah, Chair, CCGA
Lok Siu, Chair, UCAADE
Daniel Farber, Chair, UCAP (absent)
Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, UCEP (absent)
Sean Malloy, Chair, UCFW
Andrew Baird, Chair, UCORP
James Steintrager, Chair, UCPB (absent)

Berkeley (5)

Fai Ma
Suzanne Fleiszig
Oliver O'Reilly (alt for Richard Scheffler)
Danica Chen (alt for R. Jay Wallace)
Victoria Frede-Montemayor (absent)

Davis (6)

Anne Britt
Richard Grotjahn
Jeffrey Williams (absent)
S.J. Ben Yoo (absent)
TBD (2)

Irvine (4)

Jacob Avery
Elliott Currie
Masashi Kitazawa
Amy Powell

Los Angeles (7)

William Hsu (alt for Noel Boyle)
Jessica Cattelino
Sandra Loo
Ann Karagozian (alt for William Marotti)
Peter Tontono
Mansoureh Eghbali (absent)
Kym F. Faull (absent)

Merced (1)

Shawn Newsam

Riverside (2)

Thomas Cogswell
Manuela Martins-Green (absent)

San Diego (5)

Amy Bridges
Seth Cohen (absent)
Robert Kluender
Elizabeth Komives (absent)
Joseph Pogliano

San Francisco (5)

Elena Flowers (absent)
Marek Brzezinski (absent)
Steven Cheung
Jacqueline Leung
Vineeta Singh

Santa Barbara (3)

Charles Akemann
Eric Matthys
F. Winddance Twine (absent)

Santa Cruz (2)

David Brundage
Janette Dinishak

Secretary/Parliamentarian

George Mattay (alt for Andrew Dickson)

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

- **Kum-Kum-Bhavnani**

1. [Working Group on Comprehensive Access Chair's Report](#)
2. Status of Implementation of Assembly's [Revisions to Senate Bylaw 336](#)
3. Status of Assembly [Policy on Awarding Degrees Posthumously](#)
4. Status of Divestment from Fossil Fuels/Other Academic Senate [Sustainability Initiatives](#)
5. Faculty Diversity Task Force

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

- **Janet Napolitano**

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST

- **Michael T. Brown**

VI. STATUS OF THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET

- **David Alcocer, Associate Vice President, Budget Analysis and Planning**

VIII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

- **Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair**

1. Status of the UC Presidential Search [INFORMATION/DISCUSSION]

Regents Policy 7101 outlines procedures for the UC presidential search. Per 7101, the Academic Council has appointed an [Academic Advisory Committee \(AAC\)](#) to assist the Regents Special Committee leading the search. The Academic Council also has sent [comments](#) on the Criteria for the Selection of the President. The Regents Special Committee for the Presidential Search has scheduled “town hall” meetings at several campuses. Assembly members will discuss the [Search Criteria](#) and the timeline for the Search.

2. Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (Area D)

Background and Justification: In February 2018, the Assembly approved [revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3](#), proposed by BOARS related to the Area D (laboratory science) requirement for freshman admission. The February 2018 policy had three components:

- Increase the minimum Area D requirement from two courses (three recommended) to three courses, while continuing to require that two courses “provide basic knowledge in at least two of the fundamental disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics”;
- Change the name of the requirement from “Laboratory Science” to “Science”; and
- Modify the A-G Guide to broaden the range of Science disciplines to be accepted for the third course not explicitly mentioned in the Senate regulations, such as engineering, and computer science.

The revisions were intended to align UC’s Area D expectations with the new expectations for high school science curricula based on California’s adoption of the Next Generation Science Standards for K-12, which broaden the set of courses and disciplines considered college preparatory science. However, the first component of the new policy was placed on hold due to the Provost’s concerns about its potential effect on the UC eligibility of students in high schools that do not offer three science courses. The Provost was concerned that those students are more likely to come from underrepresented backgrounds, and while it would be possible to admit such students under comprehensive review, the three-year requirement could discourage them from applying to UC. The Provost also noted that students who entered UC with two and three science courses exhibit no difference in first-year persistence. BOARS supported further study of these issues and concerns, but wanted to move ahead with approval of the other components of the proposal, and in April 2019 Council resubmitted proposed revisions as separate items for Assembly approval. This allowed for additional study while enabling renaming of the requirement and expansion of approved courses. The Assembly [approved these changes](#).

Currently, UC’s Area D requirement remains at two years of laboratory science coursework required; three years recommended. The core requirement of 2 years may be fulfilled by 2 of 3 single science subjects (biology, chemistry, or physics) OR 2 of 3 integrated science subjects (see list: <https://hs-articulation.ucop.edu/guide/news-resources/announcements/>). For the third recommended year, the expanded list – which now includes computer science, engineering, and applied science – gives students more options in addition to a single science or integrated science course not already counting for the 2 required years. The rationale behind expanding the science discipline options is to encourage more students to complete a third year of Area D, even if only recommended. (See also the A-G Policy Resource Guide & Area D webpage: <https://hs-articulation.ucop.edu/guide/a-g-subject-requirements/d-laboratory-science/>)

In January 2019, UC commissioned a study by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) to further analyze the proposed increase to the number of years of science coursework for Area D. In November 2019, the PPIC released its report, *[New Eligibility Rules for the University of California? The Effects of New Science Requirements](#)*. Key PPIC study findings revealed:

- 19% of A-G high school graduates may be affected by the proposed Area D increase.
- There are substantial racial/ethnic disparities: Asian American and white students are more likely to meet the new requirement than Latinx or African-American students.
- Affected students start the Area D course sequence late; most did not take a science course in the 9th grade.
- Although students who may be affected have a high probability of taking another year of Area D, many do not, partly because of institutional factors such as course placement, grading policy, course validation rules, course counseling, and scheduling.

In a separate data analysis on UC admissions rates based on science course counts, a UC research team found:

- As of 2019, **94% of all UC freshman applicants completed the three recommended Area D science courses**, above the required two courses. For underrepresented groups, the percentages were as follows:

Fall 2019	# of Applicants w/ 3 Science Courses	# of Applicants	%
African-American	6,519	7,151	91%
American Indian	528	563	94%
Chicanx/Latinx	43,761	39,856	91%

Note: Applicant counts include those who may not have completed the minimum 15 A-G courses.

- About 68% ($n = 2,598$) of the Fall 2019 UC applicants who completed only two Area D courses and no science electives were from underrepresented groups.
- Of all the applicants who completed only two Area D courses, 98% of them attended high schools with Area D courses in 3+ science disciplines. This suggests these UC applicants were aiming to complete the two required science courses and either were counseled, or opted on their own, not to complete the recommended three courses.
- Overall, **UC applicants who completed more than two years of science were admitted at a higher rate (63%) compared to those who completed only two years and no science electives (44%)**. This same pattern appeared for African-American and Chicanx/Latinx students:

Fall 2019	2 Years Only & No Science Electives			2 Years+ of Science		
	# of Applicants	# of Admits	% Admitted	# of Applicants	# of Admits	% Admitted
African-American	307	89	29%	6,519	3,203	49%
Native American	18	11	61%	528	316	60%
Chicanx/Latinx	2,273	955	42%	39,856	22,915	57%

Although both the PPIC report and UC data provide useful insight and guidance, BOARS recommends additional empirical research before any increase to the Area D subject requirement is made, including examining the effects of BOARS' January 2019 action to expand the range of science disciplines, as well as the role or impact that K-12 education and outreach can play.

In light of these findings, Academic Council recommends the following actions to the Assembly:

1. **Maintain the Area D subject requirement at 2 years of science required, 3 years recommended for UC undergraduate admissions.**
2. **Work with UC outreach and educational partnership programs to continue advising students and their families on the importance of rigorous science and math preparation.**
3. **Engage in vigorous education, outreach, and support via UCOP High School Articulation to encourage high schools to redesign Area G science elective courses and submit them for Area D approval. Doing so would increase the number of eligible students overall and increase the number of eligible URM students.**
4. **Leverage the online curriculum design and implementation expertise of UC Scout, whose mission is to reach educationally disadvantaged students across the state, raising achievement levels and**

closing educational opportunity gaps. All of Scout's online A-G courses are available at no charge to California public school teachers and students.

5. **Extend the reach of the UC California Science Project (CSP), which provides a statewide infrastructure for high-quality professional development for pre-K through university teachers. The CSP uses highly skilled teams of educators and scientists from universities, school districts, and other educational spaces working towards the common goal of improving science education for all California students, with a special focus on the needs of English learners and high-need schools.**
6. **Capitalize on the commitment from the Lawrence Hall of Science at UC Berkeley to conduct direct outreach to all public high schools in need of support with NGSS implementation. Programs and services from the Hall help teachers, schools, and districts with science course design as well as teacher professional development.**

The Academic Council also asks the Assembly to support the following points:

1. **Ask the President to convey to the state the Senate's dismay that some CA high schools are not offering at least three Science courses that meet Area D requirements, and urge the state to ensure that all high school offer at least three Area D Science courses.**
2. **The Academic Senate intends to reconsider within five years the issue of requiring three Science course, with the expectation that all CA high schools will by then be offering three courses.**
3. **The current underfunding of the University limits its capacity to increase outreach.**

ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly is asked to endorse the Council recommendation.

3. Report of the Academic Council Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF)
[INFORMATION/DISCUSSION]

- **Henry Sanchez, STTF Co-Chair**
- **Jonathan Glater, STTF Subcommittee Chair (Zoom)**

In early 2019, Council Chair May empaneled a Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF) to respond to President Napolitano's request to the Academic Senate to examine the University's current use of standardized testing for admission; review the [testing principles developed in 2002](#) BOARS and [revised by BOARS in 2010](#); and determine whether any changes in admission testing policies or practices are needed. Chair May asked the STTF to consider whether the University and its students are best served by UC's current testing practices, a modification of current practices, another testing approach, or the elimination of testing. The STTF met 12 times between February 2019 and January 2020, and empaneled a writing subcommittee to produce specific recommendations. The STTF [report and recommendations](#) were released for systemwide Senate review on February 3 and can be found at the following URL:

<https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/underreview/sttf-report.pdf>

An additional BOARS recommendation to eliminate the ACT/SAT Essay Requirement was released for systemwide review simultaneously with the STTF report.

(<https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/underreview/kkb-review-boars-sat-act-writing.pdf>)

The Academic Council will discuss the results of the systemwide review on April 1, and send the Assembly a recommendation for action at its April 15 meeting. STTF Co-chair Sanchez and Writing Subcommittee Glater join Assembly for an initial discussion of the report and its recommendations.

4. The Operation and Engagement of the Assembly of the Academic Senate [DISCUSSION]

Academic Council members have voiced concerns about the role and effectiveness of the Assembly, noting that the Assembly is supposed to be a deliberative, legislative body, and the highest decision-making authority in the Academic Senate. The Assembly served these functions well for decades, when meetings were held in person; however, the Assembly has not met in person since 2014, in part due to financial constraints, and instead has conducted all business via videoconference. Council members have noted that in the past, while the Assembly often agreed with Council proposals, it discussed many items in depth, and it had the capacity to amend or reject them; however, many years have passed since the Assembly has rejected, or seriously amended a proposal, and today there is a perception that it mostly rubber-stamps action items. In addition, technical limitations of remote participation limits the effectiveness of policy discussion, engagement with senior administrators, and a sense of community.

Council members have also suggested ways to improve the effectiveness of the Assembly and its meetings. The suggestions included for Assembly meetings held in a videoconference format, abolishing the roll call and introducing electronic voting; encouraging more organized discussion and Q&A during meetings; using the listserv to facilitate pre-meeting discussions; and encouraging Assembly representatives to meet as a group at their respective divisions. In addition, the Senate office was encouraged to find funding for at least one in-person meeting of the Assembly each year, featuring a “State of the University” address by the President.

The Assembly is invited to contribute its views about how to increase engagement and effectiveness, particularly in the context of discussions by the Senate about how to transition more of its work from in person. (Many of the roles and authorities of the Assembly are outlined in Senate bylaws 105-120 <https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/bylaws/blpart2.html#blpart2-1>)

IX. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT

- **Jean-Daniel Saphores, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare**
 - 1. Faculty Salaries**
 - 2. Health Care Benefits**
 - 3. Other UCFW Initiatives and Concerns**

IV. SPECIAL ORDERS

- A. Consent Calendar [NONE]**
- B. Annual Reports [2018-19]**

ACADEMIC COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 2018-19

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Academic Council is the executive committee of the Assembly of the Academic Senate. It acts on behalf of the Assembly on non-legislative matters, 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 University-wide concern. The Academic Council held eleven regular meetings and additional informal videoconference calls during the 2018-19 year to consider multiple initiatives, proposals, and reports. Its final recommendations and reports can be found on the [Academic Senate website](#). Matters of particular importance for the year include:

BUDGETARY ISSUES

Monthly Budget Briefings: The President, Provost, Chief Operating Officer, and other senior UC leaders updated Council each month on the development of the 2019-20 State and University budgets and the progress of budget negotiations and advocacy efforts in Sacramento. These included efforts to make permanent the one-time funding provided by the State in the 2018-19 budget, and to secure full funding for undergraduate enrollments and for new graduate enrollments, mandatory cost increases, deferred maintenance, and other needs. Several Council members participated in monthly budget briefing video-conferences for faculty and senior administrators hosted by the Provost. Council Chair May and Immediate Past Chair White were members of the President's UCOP Executive Budget Committee.

Council was concerned about the effect of budgetary and enrollment pressures on academic quality. Members conveyed their campuses' concerns about overcrowded classrooms, increasing wait lists, and deteriorating facilities. They urged UC officials to resist unrealistic enrollment mandates, and to inform State officials about the importance of maintaining access to a quality degree and reinvesting in quality through measures such as reducing the student-faculty ratio; providing competitive faculty salaries; increasing graduate student support; and maintaining research excellence.

Multi-year Framework: Council followed the University's efforts to develop a multi-year budget and enrollment framework to guide and support budget negotiations with the Legislature and Governor-elect. The framework focused on full funding of the University's academic infrastructure, and emphasized UC's commitment to produce 200,000 more degrees by 2030, UC's role in promoting upward mobility, and the importance of faculty research. Council supported the framework's emphasis on increasing degree attainment, noting that it would help reduce pressure on overextended campuses lacking enrollment growth capacity. Council also encouraged UCOP to present a broad view of the University in the framework that stressed the value of the full range of disciplines and highlighted the need to increase graduate degree attainment, support faculty research, and expand and diversify the ladder-rank faculty.

Other Budget Issues: In addition, Council discussed the \$29 million gap in the UC budget that would have been created if the Regents' had rejected the proposed 2.6% increase in nonresident tuition. It received presentations on UCOP's efforts to meet the requirements of the 2017 audit of UCOP budget and accounting practices; asset optimization strategies to reduce UC's reliance on State funds; and proposed cohort-based tuition models. Council supported UC's efforts to place an \$8 billion General Obligation Bond on a 2020 statewide ballot to fund construction and maintenance of facilities at UC.

FACULTY WELFARE ISSUES

Non-Discrimination in Healthcare Task Force: The UCFW Non-Discrimination in Healthcare Task Force was led by former Council Chair White and charged to explore UC's relationships with external healthcare providers that may potentially conflict with its values, public trust, mission, and/or policies on non-discrimination. In May, Council endorsed the [Interim Report](#) of the Task Force, and its recommendation that UC avoid affiliations with entities whose values conflict with UC's. This recommendation was particularly relevant in the context of a proposed affiliation between UCSF and Dignity Healthcare, which generated opposition based on concerns about its alignment with the UC mission. In July, Council [endorsed](#) the final report of the Task Force, which explored strategies to avoid or minimize conflicts and their consequences, and proposed principles to avoid discrimination in healthcare and to guide the formation of relationships with sectarian organizations and institutions.

Faculty Salaries: Council was encouraged by the President's commitment to continue a multi-year plan to eliminate the 6.4% UC salary gap with a proposed 5% adjustment to the salary scales. After the final state budget made possible only a 4% increase to salaries, Council sent a [letter](#) to the President encouraging UCOP to make adjustments to the scales over the next two years to materially erode and eliminate the remaining gap; and to include adjustments to faculty salaries in the initial 2020-21 UC budget.

Retiree Health: In April, Council [endorsed](#) a request from UCFW and its Health Care Task Force (HCTF) for stronger shared governance consultation in the evaluation of an RFP for a Medicare Advantage PPO. In July, Council [endorsed](#) letters from HCTF asking UC to collect and analyze data related to the experience of the upcoming conversion of the Health Net Seniority Plus HMO Plan to a Medicare Advantage PPO Plan, and also to ensure that other changes to Medicare plans UC offers to retirees are accompanied by a targeted data collection effort.

Composite Benefit Rates: Council [endorsed](#) recommendations from UCFW and UCORP that UCOP adopt a mitigation plan to redress the research funding shortfall of faculty affected by the implementation of new Composite Benefit Rates (CBRs) that were implemented incorrectly in some campus departments, charging existing faculty grants higher rates than had been approved under the original grant budget.

APM 285: Council [asked](#) the Provost to issue guidelines clarifying the instructional workload of Lecturers with (Potential) Security of Employment (LSOEs). This was in response to reports that on certain campuses course workload for these faculty was comparable to that of Unit 18 lecturers. Council also recommended additional revisions to APM 285 clarifying that L(P)SOE faculty should have an upper limit on their instructional workload that places them below that of a Unit 18 lecturer.

UCRP: In August, Council [endorsed](#) a UCFW-TFIR letter supporting UCOP's recommendations for addressing revised actuarial assumptions for the UCRP liability through a 2% ramp-up of the UCRP employer contribution rate over four years. Council agreed with UCFW-TFIR that the University should implement the UCOP plan presented at the July Regents meeting, rather than erode employee compensation by increasing their contribution rates.

UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS ISSUES

Transfer Guarantee: The Senate devoted significant time to considering ways to implement an MOU between UC and the California Community Colleges to extend a guarantee of transfer admission to

all qualified CCC students. Following a systemwide review, Council approved a [BOARS proposal](#) for a systemwide transfer admission guarantee. Under the guarantee, CCC students who complete specified curricula in one of the UC Transfer Pathway majors, and who complete a Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) at one of six TAG-participating campuses, will be guaranteed transfer admission in the Transfer Pathway major at the TAG campus.

Standardized Testing Task Force: Council formed an Academic Senate Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF) to respond to the President’s request to the Senate to review the role of standardized tests in UC eligibility and admissions, their value in predicting academic success at UC, and their effect on access for different student populations. STTF Chair Sanchez joined Council in July to update the Council on the work of the task force thus far.

Area D: The Senate’s February 2018 [revisions](#) to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 were placed on hold, due to the Administration’s reservations about increasing the Area D (“Laboratory Science”) requirement for freshman admission to three required units (from the current two). Council and the Assembly both approved BOARS’ request to separate the three elements of the policy. This enabled the renaming of the requirement to “Science,” to reflect the broader range of science disciplines to be accepted for the third unit under Area D, while continuing to require two units of coursework that “provide basic knowledge in at least two of the fundamental disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics”. The Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) is undertaking a study to analyze the effects on eligibility of requiring a third required unit.

BOARS Reports: BOARS issued its [Annual Report](#) on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review and its [2018 Compare Favorably Report](#).

UNDERGRADUATE/PREPARATORY EDUCATION ISSUES

Online Education: Council decided that a proposal from the UCI School of Business for a fully online undergraduate Business degree was a “first of its kind” program for the UC system requiring approval by the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP). Council [endorsed](#) UCEP’s recommendation for a systemwide consideration of UCs engagement with fully online undergraduate degrees before approval of the UCI program, and its letter proposing themes, principles, and questions for a joint Senate-Administrative work group to consider regarding UC’s engagement with fully online degrees. Council also [endorsed](#) a UCEP letter offering insights and recommendations related to UC students’ ability to enroll in and gain credit for systemwide online courses offered at another UC campus.

Posthumous Degrees: Council and Assembly [approved](#) a systemwide policy proposed by UCEP for awarding undergraduate and graduate degrees to students who pass away close to the completion of the degree.

Infringement of Faculty Intellectual Property: In June, Council [endorsed](#) a UCEP letter offering options for addressing the illegal posting of copyrighted course materials via commercial websites that provide a venue for uploading those materials.

Modifications to Senate Regulation 636.E: Following a systemwide Senate review, Council and Assembly approved a set of revisions to SR 636.E, proposed by the UCSB Division and endorsed by UCOPE, to address equity concerns related to how UC students are allowed to satisfy the University’s Entry Level Writing Requirement.

Academic Integrity Oversight and Processes: Council reviewed a letter from UCEP summarizing

best practices and challenges associated with the administration and communication of academic integrity policy and oversight on each campus.

Course Evaluations Task Force: Chair May empaneled a task force involving members of UCAP, UCAADE, UCEP, and CCGA to discuss issues of reliability, validity, and bias in student course evaluations, determine the scope of any problems, and recommend possible remedies.

GRADUATE EDUCATION ISSUES

Degree and School Approvals: Following recommendations from CCGA and the other Compendium committees, Council approved the following degree programs, and School/College name changes. CCGA was responsive and efficient in its reviews, and worked closely with the campuses to hone and strengthen the proposals to ensure they met the University's standards for educational excellence prior to approval.

- [School of Public Health at UC San Diego](#) (6/19)
- [Master of Legal Studies at UC Los Angeles](#) (6/19)
- [Master of Design \(MDes\) at UC Berkeley](#) (5/19)
- [Discontinuance of UCD Textiles and Clothing/Fiber and Polymer Science Programs](#) (4/19)
- [Online Master of Business Administration at UC Davis](#) (4/19)
- [Seventh Undergraduate College at UC San Diego](#) (4/19)
- [Flexible Master of Social Welfare \("Flex-MSW"\) at UC Berkeley](#) (4/19)
- [Master of Bioprocess Engineering \(MBE\) at UC Berkeley](#) (4/19)
- [Master of Engineering \(MEng\) at UC Irvine](#) (4/19)

SSGPDPs: Chair May asked CCGA, UCPB, and UCAP to lead an evaluation of the self-supporting graduate and professional degree (SSGPDP) program, focused on its overall success and effectiveness; impact on educational goals, budgets, state-supported programs, faculty effort, diversity, and the academic personnel review process; the extent to which SSGPDPs are appropriate in a public university; and how the systemwide review process has improved proposed SSGPDPs. In July, committees sent Council an interim report on their efforts to date. The committees will continue and complete their review in the new academic year.

DIVERSITY AND EQUITY ISSUES

Expanding the PPFP: Council [endorsed](#) recommendations from the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE) for expanding the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP).

Use of DEI Statements: Council [endorsed](#) UCAADE's recommendations for the use of Statements on Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) for UC academic positions authored jointly by the UCAADE and the Systemwide Equal Employment/Affirmative Action Administrators Group.

Equity Advisor Programs: Council approved UCAADE's best practice [recommendations](#) for existing and developing campus Equity Advisor (EA) programs, which support UC's goal of advancing diversity in faculty recruitment and retention and graduate admissions and in promoting an inclusive and equitable campus environment.

Other Comments: Council noted that UC has an opportunity to diversify the faculty over the next decade as the older generation moves to retirement, and agreed that faculty and administrators should

share in accountability for diversity. Council also encouraged the University to move toward a common set of metrics for salary equity studies across campuses, to enable systemwide comparisons.

SVSH POLICY

Revisions to Senate Bylaw 336: Council charged a working group led by the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure (UCPT) chair to respond to the Regents' request to the Senate to implement several CA State Auditor recommendations for improving UC's responses to sexual violence and sexual harassment (SVSH) complaints. Following a systemwide review, Council and the Assembly [approved](#) UCPT's proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 336, which require: 1) hearings on SVSH complaints against faculty respondents to be scheduled before the P&T Committee no more than 60 days after the Chancellor files charges, unless an extension is granted for good cause; and 2) P&T to issue its recommendation to the Chancellor no more than 30 days after a hearing concludes. Council also endorsed a UCPT letter emphasizing that the changes will involve an increase in workload on some campuses that must be supported with additional resources.

Presidential Policy: Following a systemwide Senate review, Council submitted [comments](#) on revisions to the UC Presidential Policy on SVSH proposed in response to mandates from the Department of Education and CA State Auditor to clarify UC policy language around the informal resolution process, SVSH acts committed by and against third parties, prompt resolution timelines, the faculty discipline process, and investigation timeliness.

Revisions to SVSH Frameworks: Following a systemwide review, Council sent [comments](#) to UCOP on proposed revisions to UC's SVSH Investigation and Adjudication Frameworks for Senate and Non-Senate Faculty and for Staff and Non-Faculty Academic Personnel.

Disciplinary Standards Task Force: In response to a Council request, the administration established a joint task force that will meet in 2019-20 to develop clearer, more uniform guidelines for chancellors when assigning discipline to faculty for conduct violations and more consistent application of discipline across campuses. The Task Force will be co-chaired by UCLA Chancellor Block and Vice-Chair Bhavnani.

PUBLISHER NEGOTIATIONS AND OPEN ACCESS

Elsevier Negotiations: Council received regular briefings from the chair of UCOLASC and other members of the UC Publisher Negotiation team on UC's negotiations with Elsevier for subscription contracts that expired December 31. Council supported the University's negotiating position and its efforts to reduce costs and transition UC from a subscription-based model to an Open Access (OA) model. In February, after UC announced that it would not sign a new contract with Elsevier until it met the requirements of UC's OA proposal, the Academic Council joined with chairs of other systemwide Senate committees to issue a [statement](#) in support of UC's negotiating position.

Alternative Access: After Elsevier began limiting UC's access to new journal articles in July, the Council released a [statement](#) asking all UC stakeholders to support UC's negotiating position with Elsevier by not re-subscribing to journals on an individual basis and by supporting the UC libraries' plan for alternative access to Elsevier journals.

Open Access Principles: Council [approved](#) UCOLASC's *Declaration of Rights and Principles to Transform Scholarly Communication*, an aspirational document outlining a set of principles and an

ideal future state of scholarly publishing that gives faculty control over their publications and enables the broad dissemination of scholarship.

RESEARCH ISSUES

Federal Restrictions on Fetal Tissue Research: Council [endorsed](#) a letter from the UCSF Senate urging the systemwide Senate and UCOP to speak out against new federal-level restrictions on NIH funding for fetal tissue in biomedical research. In May, after the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services cancelled its contract with UCSF for medical research involving fetal tissue, Council released a [statement](#) supporting scientists at UCSF and elsewhere who conduct such research and condemning the politically-motivated attacks on science and academic freedom.

MRU Reviews: Council approved five-year reviews for two Multicampus Research Units: the UC Institute for Nuclear and Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology ([INPAC](#)) and the UC Humanities Research Institute ([UCHRI](#)). Following procedures in the Compendium, the review was performed by a Joint Senate Review Committee, led by UCORP with input from UCPB and CCGA. In addition, Chair May asked UCPB and UCORP to consider a possible alternative status for UCHRI, after Council members questioned whether UCHRI should continue to have an MRU status, given its unique mission in serving the research interests of an entire subset of humanities faculty.

International Research and Students: Council [responded](#) to recommendations from two systemwide tiger teams for protecting UC from potential risks from foreign entities, and an additional letter from the President concerning UC engagements with specific Chinese network equipment companies. Council expressed concern about 1) the broad nature of potential risks; 2) the role of faculty in balancing academic freedom with University and national security concerns; and 3) the implicit—and at times explicit—racialization of the issues. Later, Council [endorsed](#) a statement concerning the increasingly racialized ways scholars and students from specific countries and of specific ethnicities were being targeted as potential threats in national conversations about academic espionage.

Research Information Management Systems: Council [endorsed](#) a report and recommendations from the University Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) and the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) concerning administrators' use of research information management systems (RIMS) to assess faculty, that requested from the Provost a systemwide review of all RIMS currently being employed by UC academic units.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM ISSUES

APM 011: In October, Council received a briefing from the Office of Academic Personnel about a request from the represented librarians for academic freedom protections as part of their terms of employment. Council [supported](#) the development of a policy providing non-Senate academic appointees with protections for scholarship, research, and teaching conducted in the context of their appointments, along with attendant obligations and responsibilities. A Task Force on Scholarly Obligations and Protections for Non-Faculty Academic Appointees, co-chaired by Chair May and UCSC Chancellor Blumenthal, circulated a proposed APM-011 for systemwide review. The new APM section commits UC to recognizing the professional standards of non-faculty academic appointees, including the represented librarians, who contribute to the UC academic mission, and to ensuring they are respected. It clarifies also that the academic freedom protections outlined in APM-010 adhere to faculty who engage in teaching and research and who are obligated by the

commensurate responsibilities outlined in the Faculty Code of Conduct, and extends these protections and responsibilities to non-faculty academic appointees when they are engaged in teaching and research.

Politicization of Research: Council [endorsed](#) letters from UCAF and UCORP urging UC to take a stand against the ongoing politicization of research funding and attacks on academic freedom that extend to climate research, primate research, stem cell research, and other areas, and to monitor and document cases of interference that undermine scientific discovery and academic freedom. Of particular concern were politically motivated restrictions on federal funding of fetal tissue research.

Canary Mission: Council [endorsed](#) a letter from UCAF about the Canary Mission, expressing concern about the negative effects of the group and its activities on UC faculty and students as well as in creating a potential chilling effect on campuses. Council also [endorsed](#) a broader statement covering similar groups and websites that engage in harassment and asked the administration to join with the Academic Council in a joint public statement.

Chancellors' Statement on Academic Boycotts: Council issued a [letter](#) to the chancellors expressing concern about a letter in which the chancellors expressed collective opposition to an academic boycott of Israeli institutions, noting that the letter could appear to be an institutional position on a contentious issue affecting campus climate. Council invited further dialogue with the chancellors about the meaning of the statement and the process of making or clarifying university policy on academic boycotts.

MEMORIAL TO THE REGENTS

The Senate [approved](#) a Memorial to the Regents proposed by the UCSF Division requesting that the Regents divest the University's endowment portfolio of all investments in the 200 publicly traded fossil fuel companies with the largest carbon reserves. Balloting concluded on July 2. Of the 3,232 Senate members who voted, 77% voted in favor of the Memorial. Council also released a [statement](#) expressing appreciation for the serious reception from the administration and the Regents to the Memorial and encouraging the University to make a public statement in support of the Memorial and a clear timetable for the glide path to divestment.

UCOP RESTRUCTURING

Following systemwide Senate reviews, Council responded to several proposals inspired by the Huron Consulting Group to restructure or relocate systemwide UC programs, including UC's Mexico entities, the UC Center in Sacramento, the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and the Research Grants Program Office.

UC Mexico: Council [submitted](#) comments on the *State Assessment Report for Systemwide Mexico Entities*, a proposal to consolidate three systemwide UC programs related to educational and research activities with Mexico.

UC Center in Sacramento: Council submitted [comments](#) on the *State Assessment Report for the UC Center in Sacramento*, a plan to increase the financial health and sustainability of UCCS.

Agriculture and Natural Resources: Council submitted [comments](#) on the report of President Napolitano's UC ANR Advisory Committee and its recommended options for the structure, governance, and funding of the UC Division of ANR.

Research Grants Program Office: Following a systemwide review, Council submitted [comments](#) on the *State Assessment Report for the Research Grants Program Office* (RGPO).

150TH ANNIVERSARY SYMPOSIUM

The systemwide Senate organized a [symposium](#) in celebration of the 150th anniversary of the UC faculty. The event was held October 26 and 27 in Oakland and featured four lecture and panel discussion sessions focused on the mission, history, and goals of the University: 1) The Master Plan: Equity, Access, and the Social Contract for Higher Education; 2) The Evolution of Shared Governance; 3) Reflections on Free Speech and Academic Freedom; and 4) Growing UC: Past Successes and Future Challenges.

OTHER BRIEFINGS

SMG Briefings: President Napolitano, Provost Brown, and other senior managers joined Council each month to exchange views with faculty about budget issues, enrollment funding, faculty diversity, health care and benefits, alternative revenue sources, Regents agenda items and presentations, the University's efforts to protect undocumented students; student basic needs, SMG searches, and other issues.

Meeting with Chair Kieffer: Board Chair George Kieffer joined Council in October to discuss challenges facing the University related to state funding and relations with Sacramento; common aspirations and goals for access, affordability, diversity, and the long-term success of UC graduates; and the importance of the University's research and graduate education mission.

UC Path: Council received briefings about the implementation of UC Path on campuses, UCOP's efforts to address paycheck discrepancies and other errors, and processes for ensuring that graduate student employees and others are paid correctly during the transition to UC Path.

NAGPRA: Senior Counsel Auriti updated Council on the University's efforts to comply with requirements in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) that affect UC's policy/practice with respect to repatriation of Native American human remains and cultural items.

Title IX Regulations: Systemwide Title IX Coordinator Taylor briefed Council on proposed new rules the Department of Education had proposed regarding how colleges and universities handle Title IX complaints about campus sexual misconduct.

TF-ANR: The chair of UCPB's Task Force on Agriculture and Natural Resources briefed Council on TF-ANR's activities and its efforts to develop recommendations for changes and initiatives to enhance the effectiveness and reach of UC ANR.

Sustainability: UC Director of Sustainability St. Clair and UC Merced Professor Bales briefed Council on President Napolitano's Carbon Neutrality Initiative (CNI), and the role of the UC Global Climate Leadership Council to coordinate efforts and foster broader awareness of and participation in the CNI across UC.

Market Research Survey: Senior Vice President of External Relations & Communications Holmes and Director of Marketing Correa presented the results of a 2018 study focused on public perceptions of the University.

Cybersecurity Audit: In July, Senior Vice President Bustamante and UCACC Chair Martone discussed the SVP’s request for access to FireEye web portals on the ten campuses as a part of a cybersecurity “audit” of network traffic to assess risks to the system from outside intrusive and criminal activity, and evaluate options for preventing attacks.

Public Record Act Bill: UCOLASC Vice Chair Ventry briefed Council on proposed legislation to amend and modernize the CA Public Records Act in order to reduce harms to public university researchers while protecting transparency and accountability.

OTHER ISSUES

Faculty Morale: Council [endorsed](#) a request from the UCFW-HCTF that UC undertake a comprehensive study of faculty morale and turnover in the UC Health System.

Roth Plans: Council [endorsed](#) a request from UCFW and TFIR that UC add Roth 403(b) and 457(b) plans as investment options for the Defined Contribution (DC) Plan in UCRP.

Faculty Consultation on Library Space: Council [endorsed](#) UCOLASC’s letter emphasizing the importance of faculty consultation and open communication from campus libraries in decisions about the reallocation of library space, and/or the removal of books, journals, and other materials.

Death of a Faculty Member with a Pending Promotion: Council [endorsed](#) UCAP’s recommendation for a systemwide policy clarifying that upon a faculty member’s death, the campus should complete any pending promotion or advancement action.

Expert Review of Surveys: Council [endorsed](#) UCFW’s letter recommending that UCOP convene an independent panel of in-house UC faculty experts to review systemwide surveys developed and administered by outside contractors to gather information about the UC community, before they are administered, to evaluate their design and content. President Napolitano responded with a request to the Council for a list of UC experts who could be consulted when surveys are being contemplated.

College Student Right to Access Act: Council [endorsed](#) UCFW’s letter urging UC to support the goals of California Senate Bill 24 – “The College Student Right to Access Act” – which ensures access to medical abortion on California public university campuses.

Support for Baki Tezcan: Council [issued](#) a statement in support of a UC Davis professor who had been arrested and detained in Turkey after signing a petition in 2016 criticizing the policies and actions of the government.

Mid-Career Leadership Award: A former Senate Chair endowed a new systemwide Academic Senate award to honor a mid-career faculty member who has demonstrated excellent service. Professors Onyebuchi Arah (UCLA) and Sean Malloy (UCM) were named the recipients of the 2019 Award for Mid-Career Leadership in the Academic Senate.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEWS

In addition to those mentioned already, Council also sent comments on the following policies and policy revisions circulated for systemwide Senate review:

- [Revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46 \(Use of Vehicles and Driver Selection\)](#)
- [Presidential Policy on Principles of Accountability with Respect to Financial Transactions](#)
- [Revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-RMP-7, Protection of Administrative Records Containing Personally Identifiable Information](#)

- [Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations](#)
- [Policy on Responding to Immigration Enforcement Involving Patients at UC Health Facilities](#)

RELATIONS WITH OTHER GOVERNING BODIES

Board of Regents: The Council Chair and Vice Chair executed their roles as faculty representatives to the Regents throughout the year, acting in that capacity on Regents’ Standing Committees, and to the Committee of the Whole. Chair May delivered remarks to the Regents at each meeting; these can be found on the [Senate website](#).

ICAS: The Council Chair and Vice Chair and the chairs of BOARS, UCOPE, and UCEP attended meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates, which represents the faculty Senates of the three segments of California public higher education. Chair May served as Chair of ICAS for 2018-19.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We express our gratitude to all members of the UC Office of the President for their hard work and productive collaboration with the Senate over the past year. In particular, we thank the senior UC managers who as consultants to the Academic Council were vital to our meetings: President Janet Napolitano; Provost and Executive Vice President Michael Brown; Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Nathan Brostrom; Vice Provost for Academic Personnel Susan Carlson; Associate Vice President for Budget Analysis and Planning David Alcocer, Director of State Government Relations Kieran Flaherty; Title IX Coordinator Suzanne Taylor; Executive Director & Deputy to the Vice Provost Pamela Peterson; Diversity, Labor, & Employee Relations Director Amy K. Lee; Senior Counsel Cynthia Vroom; and the UC Publisher Negotiation Team (Richard Schneider, Ivy Anderson, Güenter Waibel, and Jeffrey MacKie-Mason).

Robert May, Chair
Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair

Divisional Chairs:

Barbara Spackman, Berkeley
Kristin Lagattuta, Davis
Linda Cohen, Irvine
Joseph Bristow, Los Angeles
Kurt Schnier, Merced
Dylan Rodriguez, Riverside
Robert Horwitz, San Diego
David Teitel, San Francisco
Henning Bohn, Santa Barbara
Kimberly Lau, Santa Cruz

Senate Committee Chairs:

Eddie Comeaux, BOARS
Onyebuchi Arah, CCGA
Lok Siu, UCAADE
Daniel Farber, UCAP
Anne Zanzucchi, UCEP
Sean Malloy, UCFW
Andrew Baird, UCORP
James Steintrager, UCPB

Council Staff:

Hilary Baxter, Executive Director
Jocelyn Banaria, Assistant Director
Michael LaBriola, Principal Policy Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
ACADEMIC COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS
ANNUAL REPORT 2018-2019**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) is charged in Senate Bylaw 155 to represent the Senate in all matters involving the uses and impact of computing and communications technology and advise the President concerning the acquisition, usage and support of computing and communications technology and related policy issues. UCACC held three in-person meetings during the 2018-2019 academic year. This report highlights the committee's activities.

RESEARCH INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS (RIMS)

Early in the year, UCACC learned about efforts underway to catalog Research Information Management Systems (RIMS) in use on UC campuses. RIMS, also called academic analytics, are systems that aggregate and utilize information about research and other data. The Academic Senate is concerned about the use of data analytics for faculty evaluations, priority-setting, and resource allocation, the quality and transparency of the data and algorithms, and the ceding of university business to third party organizations without proper agreements and safeguards for UC's data assets.

UCACC Chair Maryann Martone and UCOLASC Chair Richard Schneider, in consultation with members of the Office of Scholarly Communications' RIMS Working Group, co-authored a report¹ that conveys the Academic Senate's concerns and offers recommendations for the appropriate use of RIMS for faculty analytics. The Report was approved by the Academic Council on March 20th and forwarded to President Napolitano and Provost Brown with a request for follow-up. As a result of the report, a high-level group will be formed to gather information on the use of academic analytics at UC.

UCOP'S OFFICE OF ETHICS COMPLIANCE AND AUDIT REQUEST

In April, UCACC met with SVP for Ethics, Compliance, and Audit Services (ECAS) Alexander Bustamante joined UCACC's April meeting to talk about a request from his office to conduct a cybersecurity audit. UCACC members were concerned about the audit request's lack of scope, purpose, and timeframe, and wanted to make sure there would be protections for data security and privacy. SVP Bustamante said that all audits are done in compliance with federal and state law, and abide by all UC policies. UCACC followed up with a letter to Academic Council Chair Robert May summarizing the discussion with Bustamante and conveying the committee's support for a written audit scope. In July, Bustamante and Chair Martone joined the Academic Council meeting for a follow up discussion about the audit request and how to increase engagement with the Academic Senate. UCACC intends to invite Bustamante and his team to upcoming UCACC meetings to ensure ongoing communication about relevant issues.

¹ https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/rm-jn-mb-rims.pdf

HEALTH DATA GOVERNANCE

CIO Tom Andriola updated UCACC members on the outcomes of the UC Health Data Task Force, which was appointed by the President to examine current practices and policies around UC's use and disclosure of its health data. The primary issue is how UC can balance its duty to safeguard patient health data with the emerging imperative to collect, analyze, and share data on a large scale. The Task Force came up with six principles around UC's mission and responsibility as a public institution and recommended that UC establish a system-level Health Data Office and a process for evaluating proposals that involve outside access to UC's health data. UCACC noted that it was important to be open, transparent, and engaged with patients whose data will be used, and recommended that any new structure include patient advocates.

UC DATA MANAGEMENT

In October and April, the committee heard updates on the "UC Data Network" (UCDN), a joint initiative of University Librarians, Chief Information Officers, and Vice Chancellors for Research that was developed to provide a platform for open data publication, preservation, sharing, and reuse of UC research data. The 18-month pilot ran on three campuses (UC Irvine, Riverside and San Francisco) and focused on data that does not have a logical domain repository and might otherwise be lost. The pilot led to a new partnership with Dryad, a data publishing service that was designed by research faculty to host the underlying data for peer reviewed articles. The DMPtool (<https://dmptool.org/>), which is used for creating data management plans, has boilerplate text and also campus-specific guidance. Committee members noted that communication with faculty will be important for increasing usage.

CONSULTATION WITH SYSTEMWIDE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES (ITS)

UCACC has worked closely with Systemwide IT Services since the inception of UCACC in 2015. The Chair and Vice Chair meet regularly with UC CIO Tom Andriola to set agendas and to coordinate communication between the Senate and UCOP on IT policy matters.

- ***Cybersecurity***

UCACC received regular updates on cybersecurity issues from UC CIO Tom Andriola and Chief Information Security Officer David Rusting. UCACC Chair Maryann Martone and/or Vice Chair Anthony Joseph attended the quarterly meetings of the Cyber-Risk Governance Committee throughout the year and gave presentations at each meeting. As faculty continue to be concerned about tradeoffs between privacy, surveillance, and security, UCACC spent time at each meeting to share information about various campus approaches and processes.

- ***Electronic Information Security Policy (IS-3)***

The revised Systemwide Electronic Information Security Policy (IS-3) was issued on Sept. 7, 2018, and the Academic Senate is designated in the policy as part of the governance structure. In the past year, UCACC provided input on the information security standards that function as the administrative, technical, and procedural controls for the policy.

- ***Faculty IT and Infrastructure Needs***

Throughout the year, members discussed ways to inventory and communicate systemwide and campus resources for IT support services for faculty, including services around multifactor authentication and data management for sensitive or protected data. The diverse IT needs of UC faculty make IT support a challenge. Faculty IT committees, whether led by the Academic

Senate or the administration should be consulted for all IT initiatives. At the May 8th ITLC meeting, UCACC Vice Chair Anthony Joseph recommended that ITLC work with UCACC to develop faculty profiles to help IT administrators understand the differing needs, skills, and resources of different types of faculty.

- ***IT Support for Researchers***

UCACC learned about the latest work of the Research Information Technology Committee (RITC), a subcommittee of the Information Technology Leadership Council (ITLC - the systemwide CIO group), which was created to focus on supporting the IT needs of the research community. The new group will share information and catalog campus services to then be conveyed to campus researchers so that they can potentially take advantage of services systemwide. The challenge will be the communication to a disparate faculty. UCACC members suggested that each campus RITC member consult with the campus academic Senate to find out which faculty committees might be engaged, and that divisional Senate IT and Research committees invite the local RITC member to their next committee meeting.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Multifactor Authentication (MFA) updates: UCACC continued to receive updates on the rollout of multifactor authentication software throughout the UC system. Each location was responsible for its own implementation for faculty and staff.

Learning Data Privacy Principles: UCACC first reviewed the Learning Data Privacy Principles in February, 2016. Educational institutions nationwide are now looking at the “UC Learning Data Principles” as examples for their own. The result of an iterative process involving input from faculty, students, privacy experts, and administrators, the lengthy early draft of the Principles was distilled down to two pages. One of the key ideas is an individual’s right to know how much of their data is being collected.

General Data Protection Regulation: The GDPR European legislation went into effect in May, and UCOP has prepared training and documentation for all UC locations that is shared systemwide. Campuses are looking at inventories of materials subject to GDPR. UCACC learned that the university has already received inquiries from students, applicants, and employees about their rights. UC’s Office of General Counsel has been working with Vice Chancellors for Research regarding additional guidance.

Information Technology Leadership Council (ITLC) update: The current Chair of the ITLC, UCSB CIO Matthew Hall, joined UCACC in February to talk about ITLC’s interest in greater faculty involvement and faculty IT committees on all campuses. Issues of security can overwhelm the time of information technology administrators, so ITLC has been revising its charter and narrowing its focus.

IS-12, UC Policy on Continuity Planning and Disaster Recovery: UCACC will advise on the revision of UC’s Continuity Planning and Disaster Recovery Policy, which was last updated in 2007.

Foreign Influence Concerns: Last year, President Napolitano convened two “tiger teams” at UC to discuss concerns about international agreements and international students. Recommendations

were forwarded in two letters from President Napolitano to the university community in February. There will likely be more cybersecurity requirements and additional prohibitions on certain technologies. Campuses will have to make informed decisions about accepting funding. UCACC is concerned about foreign students, especially, but UC continues to uphold its policy of not accepting funding that requires citizenship restrictions.

Systemwide and campus updates: UCACC devoted part of each regular meeting to discussing systemwide issues as reported by Academic Senate leadership and reports from campus representatives on individual campus activities and concerns.

CORRESPONDENCE AND REPORTS

- “Concerns Regarding the Use of Research Information Management Systems at the University of California,” Report prepared by Maryann E. Martone, Richard A. Schneider, Allegra Swift, Catherine Mitchell (March, 2019)
- UCACC Endorsement of UCOLASC’s Declaration of Rights and Principles to Transform Scholarly Communication, letter from Chair Martone to Richard Schneider, UCOLASC Chair (April, 2019)
- ECAS Cybersecurity Audit, letter from Chair Martone to Academic Council Chair Robert May (May, 2019)

PRESENTATIONS

- “Concerns Regarding the Use of Research Information Management Systems at the University of California,” Presentation to Academic Council (March 20, 2019) and Academic Senate Committee on Research Policy (April 8, 2019)
- “Update from Academic Senate Committee on Computing and Communications,” Presentations to CRGC (Nov. 27, 2018, March 11, 2019, and June 25, 2019) and ITLC (May 8, 2019)

REPRESENTATION

UCACC Chair Maryann Martone, served as a faculty representative to the Information Technology Leadership Council (ITLC) and as an *ex officio* member of the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications. Chair Martone and Vice Chair Anthony Joseph served as Senate representatives on the Cyber-Risk Governance Committee (CRGC).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

UCACC is grateful for the contributions made by the consultants and guests who attended meetings in 2018-19, including:

- Tom Andriola, CIO (Consultant to UCACC)
- Alexander Bustamante, Senior Vice President and Chief Compliance and Audit Officer
- John Chodacki, Director, UC Curation Center (CDL)
- Lourdes DeMattos Associate Director, UCOP Research Policy Analysis and Coordination
- Matthew Hall UCSB Associate Vice Chancellor & Chief Information Officer
- Matthew Hicks, Systemwide Deputy Audit Officer
- Greg Loge, Systemwide Cybersecurity Audit Director
- Jim Phillips, Director of Learning Technologies, UC Santa Cruz
- Valerie Polichar, Director, Academic Technology Services, UCSD
- Monte Ratzlaff, Cyber Risk Program Manager

- David Rusting, Chief Information Security Officer, UCOP
- Robert Smith, IT Policy Director, UCOP
- Günter Waibel, Executive Director, California Digital Library
- James Williamson, Director of Educational Technology Systems and Administration, UCLA

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Maryann Martone, Chair
Anthony Joseph, Vice Chair
Ethan Ligon (B)
Matt Bishop (D)
Russell Detwiler (I)
Sarah T. Roberts (LA)
Joseph Genereux (R)
Brett Stalbaum (SD)
David Robinowitz (SF)
Jianwen Su (SB)
Jose Renau (SC)
Robert May, Chair, Academic Senate (*Ex Officio*)
Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair, Academic Senate (*Ex Officio*)
Anne Zanzucchi, UCEP Chair (*Ex Officio*)
Richard Schneider, UCOLASC Chair (*Ex Officio*)
Valeri Vasquez, Graduate Student Representative
Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst

ACADEMIC COUNCIL SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON LAB ISSUES ANNUAL REPORT 2018-19

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL:

The Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) was established by the Academic Council to provide broad-based Senate oversight of UC's relationship with the National Laboratories – Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL, also called the Berkeley Lab). ACSCOLI advises the President and Regents on general policies relating to the National Laboratories, which includes the dispersal of UC's share of net fee monies, policies that affect the lab science management, and the quality of science being performed at the labs. ACSCOLI is also concerned with evaluating the benefits of UC's continued participation in the management of the labs and has been charged by the Academic Council with stimulating closer connections between the lab staff, faculty, and students.

UC is the prime contractor for the management and operation of Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL). The University is also a partner in the Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, (LLNS) that manages Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) and in Triad National Security, LLC, which is the new partnership that manages Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). LLNS and LANS are overseen by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), an agency within the U.S. Department of Energy.

ACSCOLI met three times during 2018-2019 academic year (AY). A summary of the committee's discussions is below.

UC Office of the National Laboratories Updates

At each meeting, ACSCOLI received updates on the status of the three national laboratories from the Vice President of the National Laboratories. In October, Vice President Kim Budil informed the committee that Craig Leasure had joined the Office of the National Labs as Associate Vice President. Later in the year, VP Budil announced that she was leaving UC to return to Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and that AVP Leasure would serve as Acting VP. Leasure spent 29 years at Los Alamos National Lab, primarily in the nuclear weapons program and afterwards in operations and business. He told ACSCOLI that he is interested in following VP Budil's lead in working with campuses and continuing to build relationships.

National Laboratories Updates

Los Alamos

On November 1, Triad National Security, LLC, took over the management and operations contract for Los Alamos National Laboratory. As a result of the new management structure, a new advisory board will have oversight of Los Alamos, with members that are distinct from the LLNL Board. Although a member of the UC Board of Regents has chaired the combined board for LANL and LLNL, the Regents are expected to vote to allow a non-Regent (but someone with domain knowledge who is appointed by the Regents) to Chair the Triad Board of Directors.

Lawrence Livermore

ACSCOLI was updated on the effort to revitalize the Hertz Hall complex at Lawrence Livermore National Lab and create a small conference center with room for researchers and K-12 engagement. UC staff visited the campuses to solicit input on the Hertz Hall space and heard that the southern campuses were interested in having their own local Southern California “hub” for laboratory-related work, similar to the plan for Hertz Hall. The Office of the National Labs is working with the UC Irvine administration to find a suitable space and propose a mission for such a potential hub.

ACSCOLI members learned that a joint Livermore/UC data science workshop filled 220 spots within a week.

Berkeley Lab

Construction is progressing at the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, which continues to receive very good grades from the Office of Science. The Lab received more federal funding than expected. The Lab’s “Cyclotron Road” is seen as a successful start-up incubator and the Department of Energy is now interested in trying it in other labs. LBL is focusing on energy storage, biology, and computing sciences. It is a leader in data transfer used for materials science, machine learning, and artificial intelligence (AI).

UC Lab Fees Research Program

Funding for the UC Lab Fees Research Program ([LFRP](#)) comes from the net fee income that UC receives for managing the Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos National Labs. Along with campuses and the labs, ACSCOLI members provided input into the new thematic focus areas for the 2019 competition. The chosen themes were: accelerator research, quantum information science, and wildfire-related research. The program also funds an in-residence graduate student fellowship at the labs for 2-3 years. With the support of the Vice Chancellors of Research, UC hosted three thematic workshops that attracted UC researchers as well as laboratory personnel. ACSCOLI recommended that the LFRP use success metrics to track projects while they are in progress as well as at the end of the funding term and beyond.

ACSCOLI provided feedback to Academic Council Chair Robert May on the RGPO Assessment Report, noting that any changes in the management and execution of the LFRP should include close consultation with ACSCOLI.

White Paper from Office of the National Laboratories

ACSCOLI members continued discussion from last year about the draft white paper on the relationship between UC and the national laboratories. Chair Michael Todd and member William Newman prepared a one page “Executive Summary” that was reviewed by the committee that may also be used as a stand-alone document.

Joint Appointments

The topic of joint appointments between UC and the labs has been discussed over the years by ACSCOLI and other Academic Senate committees. This year, a high-level framework for joint appointments was approved at UCOP and sent to LLNL and LANL for their approval. The idea is to have a template that would be maintained at UCOP and could be individualized for each

department or faculty member as needed. After the last meeting, LANL had shared a template for such joint appointments to UC Campus Offices of Research Affairs with Chair Todd, but it hasn't yet been fully vetted or considered by any Campus as of June 2019.

Checklist for Lab Updates

As part of its due diligence, the committee prepared and approved a checklist for the update sessions with the UC Office of National Laboratories.

Restricted research and UC policies

Historically, UC has rejected contracts and grants that have citizenship and publication requirements. Although UC gets a fundamental research exclusion, which helps with export control compliance, there is some loss of funding. A new policy on research funding will be brought back eventually for consideration. There are major compliance implications for ITAR ("International Traffic in Arms Regulations") work.

Member Updates

At each meeting, UC Davis Professor Robert Powell, Chair of the Science, Technology, and Engineering Committees for the two NNSA labs, provided updates from his perspective as Faculty Observer to LANL and LLNL Boards. UCSB Professor Ram Seshadri serves on the LBNL Advisory Board on behalf of the Academic Senate and also provided regular updates about the Berkeley Lab.

REPRESENTATION

Chair Michael Todd served on the search committee for AVP Craig Leasure. Robert Powell and Peggy O'Day served on the search committee for a new Vice President for the National Laboratories to replace Kim Budil.

CORRESPONDENCE

ACSCOLI provided input on the LFRP thematic areas that were nominated for the 2019 competition and sent feedback on the Research Grants Program Office (RGPO) Current State Assessment Report to the Academic Council.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ACSCOLI wishes to acknowledge the contributions of its consultants and guests: Kimberly Budil, (former) Vice President for the Office of the National Laboratories; Craig Leasure, Interim Vice President for the National Laboratories; Arthur Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies; June Yu, Executive Director, National Laboratory Programs; Kathleen Erwin, Director of UC Research Initiatives; Christopher Spitzer, UC Research Initiatives Program Officer; and Lourdes DeMattos, Associate Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination.

Respectfully submitted,

2018-19 ACSCOLI members:

Michael Todd, Chair (UCSD)

Robert May, Academic Council Chair

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Academic Council Vice Chair

Shane White, Academic Senate Past Chair, 2017-18
Andrew Baird, UCORP Chair
James Steintrager, UCPB Vice Chair
Eric Mjolsness, UCI
William Newman, UCLA
Peggy O'Day, UCM
Ivan Schuller, UCSD
Susannah Scott, UCSB
Ram Seshadri, UCSB
Joanne Miller, Academic Senate Committee Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM 2018-2019 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) met three times by videoconference in Academic Year 2018-2019 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.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FUNDING PRIORITIES AND POLICIES

Last year the committee monitored developments related to new screening policies for discretionary grants instituted by federal funding agencies which politicized decisions about science research funding and may have resulted in the denial of grant applications for political reasons. As delineated in [a memo to Academic Council](#), UCAF was concerned that this politicization has the potential to harm UC faculty who depend on federal grant funding to further their research. In December, UCAF learned that the National Institutes of Health (NIH) had notified the principal investigator of a UCSF HIV research lab that it would not renew the facility's contract in 2019. The researcher was informed that the decision had been made by high level political administrators, not by the NIH. UCAF agreed to restate its earlier concerns about this evident disregard for academic freedom. In [a new memo to Council](#), the committee again urged the University to take a strong stand against the ongoing politicization of research funding and to monitor and document cases of interference that undermine scientific discovery and academic freedom.

HARASSMENT OF UC FACULTY AND STUDENTS

UCAF discussed the tactics being employed to intimidate, disparage, and harass UC faculty. UC academics engaged in controversial research are being bombarded with California Public Records Act and Freedom of Information Act requests, which has reached an abusive level. The committee will track the drafting of legislation to protect faculty from the abusive use of these laws. The use of social media to attack faculty (and students) was also discussed by UCAF in March. Websites, often operated and funded anonymously, target people who are liberal scholars or politically active in support of Palestinian rights. At present, the University views online harassment as legally non-actionable but the committee agreed this activity is a threat to academic freedom. In [a memo endorsed by Council](#), UCAF outlined the potential negative ramifications of cyber abuse and Council subsequently [issued a broader statement](#) condemning these attacks. It should also be noted that interlopers identifying themselves as representatives of college-focused alternative right groups have engaged in intimidating behavior on UC campuses and within classrooms.

OTHER ISSUES AND ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

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

- Proposed new APM Section 011, Academic Freedom, Protection of Professional Standards, and Responsibilities of Non-Faculty Academic Appointees
- [Chancellors' Letter on Academic Boycotts](#)

Additionally, UCAF devoted part of each regular meeting to reports on issues facing local committees, including controversial speakers on campus and resources on academic freedom.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Rauchway, Chair (D)
George Dutton (LA)
Gabriel Sarah (SF)

Fabio Macciardi, Vice Chair (I)
Brian Soucek (D)
Mei Zhan (I)

Ty Alper (B)
Gail Hershatter (SC)
Sarah Schneewind (SD)
Violet Barton (Graduate Student-M)

Laura Hamilton (M)
Devra Weber (R)
Mary Furner (SB)
Frances Osran (Undergraduate Student-B)

Robert May ((D); Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Kum-Kum Bhavnani ((SB); Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Brenda Abrams, Principal Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

2018-2019 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) had four meetings during the Academic Year 2018-2019 (one at UCOP and three by videoconference) to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 135, which are 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:

EVALUATIONS OF LECTURERS WITH SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT SERIES

Following last year's [revisions to APMs 285 and 210-3](#), UCAP began considering potential guidelines for the evaluation of faculty in the LSOE series, now known as Teaching Professors. A number of factors emerged that will bear further discussion before any concrete recommendations are put forward. To ensure the effective and fair evaluation of Teaching Professors, CAPs may wish to utilize ad hoc review committees comprised of faculty in this series or to appoint them to serve on CAPs. A better understanding of how teaching should be assessed and about the distinction between these faculty and Assistant Professors are needed.

The specifics of what is required of an individual Teaching Professor should be documented and made available to CAPs. There is a persistent concern that hiring of Teaching Professors will continue to grow dramatically and that the involvement of ladder rank faculty in teaching will be minimized. Teaching Professors at some campuses have also expressed concerns about increasingly demanding workloads. Questions about the participation of Teaching Professors on CAPs were added to the CAP Practices survey this year and UCAP will monitor developments related to evaluation of these faculty.

STATEMENTS ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION

UCAP had several discussions about the Statements on Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) throughout the year. In addition, UCAP's Chair discussed this matter with the chairs of the Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE) and Faculty Welfare (UCFW) committees. The committee may eventually develop non-binding best practices or guidelines but campuses have differing views about which personnel actions would entail a statement. Clear definitions of DEI are needed to avoid confusion about the activities which count as contributions versus faculty members' routine job requirements. To make the statements useful and effective, CAPs may need to educate faculty about the meaning of DEI and the significance of the statement. UCAP will consider this topic again next year.

TEACHING BY FACULTY IN SELF-SUPPORTING GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

The Senate Chair asked UCAP to discuss how CAPs evaluate the teaching of faculty members in Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs (SSGDPs). The concern is how to count their teaching and whether it should be included in the evaluation for merits. While some CAPs consider teaching in SSGDPs to be outside activity which may not be counted at all, other CAPs view the teaching as equivalent and qualitative evaluations are part of the personnel file. UCAP might suggest that any teaching requiring a significant amount of time should be considered by CAPs. In general, CAPs may need more guidance about teaching. UCAP will continue to gather information and may ultimately make a recommendation about how this issue should be handled.

INAPPROPRIATE COMMENTS IN STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATIONS

UCAP and several other committees were asked by the Senate Chair to discuss inappropriate comments made by students in course evaluations. The information from students can offer valuable insight but research has raised questions about the reliability of these evaluations as a gauge of teaching and there is evidence that the evaluations can be discriminatory towards women and underrepresented minority groups. There is agreement that students should be educated about the purpose of the teaching evaluations and that CAP members and other faculty should also be educated about how to read the evaluations.

In February, UCAP's Chair recommended to Council that a task force should examine the issues surrounding course evaluations. The Chair subsequently worked with the chairs of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, the Committee on Educational Policy, UCAADE and UCFW to create a proposal for a Teaching Evaluation Task Force which was shared with Council in July. Although the specific goals of the task force need to be identified, it may re-envision the way student evaluations are used or explore ideas such as increasing the number of evaluations needed at various thresholds. From UCAP's perspective, it would be helpful to identify best practices for evaluating teaching and to increase CAPs' awareness of bias and other issues.

OTHER ISSUES AND ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

In response to requests for formal comments from the Academic Council, UCAP submitted views on the following:

- Proposed revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
- Management Review - Proposed Technical Revisions to APMs 710, 715, 730 and 760

The committee briefly discussed issues related to the evaluation of faculty in the Health Sciences series and this topic will be more closely examined next year.

CAMPUS REPORTS

UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to a discussion of issues facing local committees including the various software used by CAPs for personnel reviews, faculty in the medical centers, and recruitment of faculty to serve on CAPs. The committee also reviewed the information collected in the triennial CAP Practices Survey.

UCAP REPRESENTATION

UCAP Chair Farber represented the Committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate, and served on the Provost's Academic Planning Council.

COMMITTEE CONSULTATIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel; Pamela Peterson, Executive Director and Deputy to the Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Programs; and Kimberly Grant, Director, Academic Policy & Compensation, Academic Personnel and Programs. UCAP occasionally consulted the Academic Senate Chair Robert May and Vice Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani about issues facing the Senate and UC.

Respectfully submitted,
Daniel Farber, Chair (B)
John Kuriyan (B)
Reza Ahmadi (LA)
Marilyn Westerkamp (SC)
Sharon Block (I)
Sherryl Vint (R)

John Gilbert, Vice Chair (SB)
Susan Tapert (SD)
Charles Langley (D)
Jon Snyder (SB)
Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (M)
David Saloner (SF)

Robert May (Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (D))
Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (SB))
Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE)

Annual Report 2018-19

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE) met three times in person and twice via videoconference during the 2018-19 academic year. In accordance with its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 140, UCAADE consulted on policies bearing on affirmative action, diversity, and equity for academic personnel, students, and academic programs. Highlights of the committee's discussions and actions are described below.

Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

UCAADE's "Recommendations for Statements on Contributions to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion" (jointly authored by the systemwide EEO/AA/Diversity Administrators' Group) was endorsed by the Academic Council and distributed to the Provost and Academic Senate division chairs on February 25.¹ UCAADE spent much of the first part of the academic year refining the recommendations, including soliciting input from UCFW, UCAP, and other committees. Coordination between faculty diversity committees, CAPs, and campus academic personnel offices will be key in fostering a shared understanding of the uses for diversity statements and developing guidelines for assessment. "Contributions to diversity" is not meant to become the "fourth leg" of criteria used for promotion, but rather a thread that runs through a faculty member's teaching, research, and service.

Equity Advisors Program

UCAADE continued to refine the set of recommendations for the Equity Advisors Program. The committee worked with the systemwide EEO/AA/Diversity Administrators' Group to gather information on the different programs. Most, but not all, campuses have some sort of faculty equity advisor program, although there are significant differences among them. The Academic Council discussed the recommendations on June 26th and suggested changes for additional accountability, authority, reporting, and senate involvement. Due to timing issues and the lack of consensus on the revised recommendations with the AA/EEO/Diversity Administrators, UCAADE decided to move forward without that group's endorsement. The revised set of recommendations was endorsed with minor revisions by the Academic Council at the July 24th meeting.

Chief Diversity Officers

UCAADE has become concerned about the lack of consistency in the roles and responsibilities of the campus Chief Diversity Officers, and the committee discussed how a basic set of responsibilities might be achieved. On most campuses the CDO focuses on student issues and general campus climate. UCAADE is interested in how the CDO can play a role in advancing faculty diversity and retention. The committee met with members of the UCOP Office of Diversity and Engagement to exchange information, and it intends to continue discussions next year.

¹ https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/rm-mb-divchairs-use-of-dei-statements.pdf

President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program Initiative (PPFP)

Early in the fall, UCAADE's recommendation to expand the PPFP program was endorsed by Council and submitted to President Napolitano. The committee later learned that President Napolitano has already dedicated \$7.1 million in new, ongoing funding to faculty diversity efforts, including \$2 million for the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program dedicated primarily to fund new fellows. Also, more fellows are expected to be hired into UC ladder-rank positions due to last year's elimination of the cap on the number of PPFP hiring incentive awards.

Chancellors' Academic Boycott Statement

In February, UCAADE discussed a potential response to a statement signed by UC Chancellors that expressed their opposition to an academic boycott of Israeli academic institutions. UCAADE sent a letter to the Academic Council noting that the Chancellors' statement gave the appearance of issuing an institutional position on a contentious issue without Senate consultation. UCAADE pointed out the statement's chilling effect, which can negatively impact campus climate. The Committee also expressed concern for the lack of Senate consultation on a matter affecting academic freedom. Such actions undermine the principle of shared governance.

UCSF/Dignity Health Proposed Affiliation

UCAADE members discussed a potential affiliation between UCSF and Dignity Health during an extra videoconference meeting. In addition to being concerned about the lack of detail regarding the affiliation, UCAADE members underscored the gender discrimination that is embedded in the Catholic religious doctrine that governs the operations of Dignity Health. Members also noted the reputational risk of affiliating with a religious institution that is potentially discriminatory toward various populations.

Teaching Evaluations Task Force

UCAP Chair Dan Farber and UCAADE Chair Lok Siu, in consultation with the chairs of CCGA and UCEP, drafted a proposal for a Course Evaluations Task Force. UCAADE discussed the draft charge before it was approved by the Academic Council.

Advancing Faculty Diversity through Collective Excellence

Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies Art Ellis video-conferenced with UCAADE members to discuss the idea of setting up a rewards system based on collective performance to incentivize department-level efforts to advance faculty diversity. In the process of discussing the idea of "collective excellence," UCAADE members determined that department reviews can serve as an important site to assess each department's diversity efforts. UCAADE will continue to explore how department reviews can be made more consistent systemwide and how diversity and climate can be incorporated into the review process.

Consultation with Academic Personnel and Programs

Throughout the year, UCAADE received regular reports from Vice Provost Susan Carlson and her staff on various diversity topics, including the \$2 million provided by the state for a third year to support diversity efforts in faculty recruitment. Toward the end of the year, UCAADE learned that the next funding cycle will offer additional funding to improve campus climate and retention efforts, as well as recruitment. UCAADE members were invited to be part of the proposal review and selection committee.

Vice Provost Carlson also provided updates on the UC exit surveys, the NSF study to evaluate equity in STEM faculty hiring that is using data from UC Recruit (UC's academic recruitment system), and other activities.

Systemwide issues and campus reports

UCAADE devoted part of each meeting to member reports from each campus and from the student members. UCAADE was also informed about and discussed systemwide issues as provided by Academic Senate leadership.

REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Recommendations for the Expansion of the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (October 22, 2018)
- Recommendations for the Use of Contributions to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Statements for Academic Positions at the University of California (November 21, 2018 and February 19, 2019)
- UCAADE comments on the Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (December 5, 2018)
- UCAADE's Response to the Chancellors' Statement on Academic Boycotts (February 26, 2019)
- UCAADE's Feedback on Program Objectives of CSU/UC Anti-bias Pilot Program (February 26, 2019)
- UCAADE's Feedback on Additional Funding for Faculty Diversity (April 3, 2019)
- UCAADE's Feedback on Proposed UCSF Affiliation with Dignity Health (May 20, 2019)
- Recommendations for Equity Advisor Programs at the University of California (June 24, 2019 and July 22, 2019)

PRESENTATIONS

- Chair Siu spoke at the California State Assembly Committee on Higher Education Hearing on Faculty Diversity on Oct. 23, 2018.
- Vice Chair Lynch presented at the UC Workshop on Faculty Salary Equity Studies on Oct. 31, 2018.

REPRESENTATION

UCAADE Chair Lok Siu served on the Advancing Faculty Diversity Initiative Advisory Group and participated in the CSU/UC Anti-Bias Training Initiative Working Group, the Teaching Evaluations Task Force, the UC Transfer Task Force, and the Roundtable on Incarcerated Students. Chair Siu also represented UCAADE on the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). Chair Siu and UC Davis member Javier Arsuaga served on a workgroup to develop a systemwide California Hispanic-Serving Institutions Doctoral Diversity Initiative (CA-HSI-DDI).

Acknowledgements

UCAADE is grateful to have had valuable input from and exchange with the following UCOP and campus consultants and guests over the past year: Vice Provost Susan Carlson; Deputy to the Vice Provost Pamela Peterson; Diversity, Labor, & Employee Relations Director Amy K. Lee; PFPF Director Mark Lawson; Associate Vice Provost for Diversity and Engagement Elizabeth

Halimah; UC Strategic Diversity Initiatives Manager Tae-Sun Kim; and Director of UC Berkeley's Office for Faculty Equity and Welfare Karie Frasch, The committee also thanks the faculty members who served as alternates during the year.

Respectfully submitted,

Lok Siu, Chair
Mona Lynch, Vice Chair
Michael Nylan (B)
Javier Arsuaga (D)
Matthew Foreman (I)
Antoinette Gomes (LA)
Asmeret Berhe (M)
Boris Maciejovsky (R)
Michael Trigilio (SD)
Christine Glastonbury (SF)
Vickie Scott (SB)
Elizabeth Abrams (SC)
Monica Cornejo, Graduate Student Representative
Lennin Kuri, Undergraduate Student Representative
Robert May, Chair, Academic Senate (*Ex Officio*)
Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair, Academic Senate (*Ex Officio*)
Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS) ANNUAL REPORT 2018-19

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) met eleven times in Academic Year 2018-19 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 major activities of BOARS and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

ANNUAL REPORT TO THE REGENTS ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS AND COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

BOARS' annual [Report to the Regents on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review](#) discusses freshman and transfer application, admission, and enrollee outcomes under comprehensive review for the years 2013–2018; first-year UC performance outcomes for students who entered UC in fall 2017; efforts by BOARS to enhance the transfer admission path and to ensure that admitted nonresidents compare favorably to California residents; diversity outcomes; a summary of each UC campus's comprehensive review process; and challenges associated with the future of the referral guarantee. The report notes BOARS' concern that annually increasing enrollment expectations from the state, absent funding for additional academic facilities, could have deleterious educational outcomes in the long run.

- ***Policy on Augmented Review in Undergraduate Admissions***

[Regents Policy 2110](#) outlines guidelines and criteria for an additional review of select applicants who fall in the margins for admission, but whose initial application yields an incomplete picture of their qualifications or presents extraordinary circumstances that invite further comment. It outlines three types of supplemental information a campus may request from up to 15% of applicants in a given admissions review cycle: 1) a questionnaire inviting the candidate to elaborate on special talents, accomplishments, extraordinary circumstances, and their school/home environment; 2) 7th semester grades; and 3) up to two letters of recommendation. The policy states that campuses may solicit letters only from applicants selected for augmented review, applicants considered for admission by exception, or applicants given a special review in other specific situations.

BOARS received reports from the campuses that utilized augmented review, and encouraged those campuses to look closely at the information requested and perhaps find other ways of deriving that information, such as an additional or revised Personal Insight questions or another dimension of comprehensive review.

NONRESIDENT ADMISSION

- ***Annual Systemwide Compare Favorably Report***

BOARS issued its [annual "Compare Favorably" report](#) on 2018 nonresident admissions. The annual report summarizes systemwide and campus outcomes for the policy, focusing on comparisons of high school GPA, SAT score, and first-year UC GPA and persistence for residents, domestic nonresidents, and international nonresidents for each campus. The report notes that based

on those limited measures, the University is largely meeting the standard on a systemwide basis, although outcomes vary on specific campuses. The report emphasizes that GPA and test scores are narrow, imperfect measures for the assessment, given campuses' use of 14 comprehensive review factors.

AREA “d” WORK GROUP AND PROPOSED REVISIONS TO SENATE REGULATION 424

In January 2017, BOARS charged a UC faculty work group with proposing revisions to the area “d” (laboratory science) requirement for freshman admission ([Senate Regulation 424.A.3.d](#)), to better align UC’s expectations for high school science preparation with the expectations for high school science curricula based on California’s adoption of the Next Generation Science Standards for K-12, which include four science categories: Physical Sciences; Life Sciences; Earth and Space Sciences; and Engineering, Technology and Applications of Science.

The systemwide review conducted in 2018 revealed some areas of concern relating to access, equity, and under-represented minorities. Additional analysis, however, illustrated that only a handful of schools would not be able to meet the increased standards, but given UC’s multiple routes of admission, BOARS asserted that these obstacles should not impede the revision. Nonetheless, increased scrutiny from internal and external stakeholders focusing on diversity and equity concerns combined to delay advancing the change to Regents. BOARS will continue to advocate to improved science requirements through the area ‘d’ revisions next year. As well, the Public Policy Institute of California is undertaking a study commissioned by UCOP to examine the impact of new science requirements on college eligibility.

TRANSFER ADMISSIONS

BOARS helped lead the University’s response to a range of issues and concerns about community college transfer.

- ***Transfer Guarantee***

In spring of 2018, President Napolitano and CCC Chancellor Ortiz Oakley signed an MOU obligating UC to expand its transfer pathways and accept more CCC transfer students. Many in the Academic Senate raised significant objections to the lack of shared governance in the process that led to the MOU. Nevertheless, BOARS and the Senate agreed to work to realize the goals of the MOU. A joint administration-Senate task force was formed, and BOARS evaluated their recommendations in the fall. After extensive discussion focusing on academic preparation and student success, enrollment management, admissions staff workloads, and impacts to specific majors, BOARS recommended an expansion of the Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) program. The Academic Council endorsed the recommendation, which then received systemwide support through normal review procedures. External communications are being developed by the administration, and BOARS will closely monitor implementation in the coming year.

JOINT MEETINGS WITH THE UC ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS

The Admissions Directors and Associate Vice Chancellors for Admissions and Enrollment Management joined BOARS by videoconference in November 2018 to discuss the “Compare Favorably” policy implementation, augmented review implementation, and transfer issues. BOARS and the campus Admissions Directors also held their annual half-day joint meeting in June to discuss outcomes from the 2018 admissions cycle; issues and challenges associated with

nonresident admission; continuing transfer admissions issues, including achieving the 2:1 freshman-to-transfer enrollment ratio, transfer access to impacted majors, and the role of the UC Transfer Pathways in comprehensive review; implementation of the Augmented Review policy; strategies for expanding student diversity in the context of increasing selectivity; new tools for transfer students, such as UC ASSIST; and the work of the Standardized Testing Task Force.

STANDARDIZED TESTING TASK FORCE

Last spring, the Academic Council agreed to empanel a task force of subject matter experts to evaluate UC's use of standardized tests in the admission process. At the time, President Napolitano lauded the effort, and subsequent high-profile public scandals underlined the timeliness and goals of the effort. Former BOARS chair Henry Sánchez is chairing the task force, and BOARS is represented by Chair Comeaux and UCSF Representative Hasenstaub. The task force is charged with evaluating undergraduate admissions only, and will support any recommendations with compelling data. Task Force Chair Sánchez met with BOARS in May to brief the committee on work to date. BOARS will continue to receive reports as the Task Force continues their work, and BOARS will have the opportunity to assess any recommendations before they are sent for systemwide review.

ADMISSION AUDITS

BOARS, like the rest of the University, was taken aback by the admission scandal that broke nationwide during 2019. Multiple UC campuses were implicated by federal officials, and both the Office of the President and the state announced audits of UC admission procedures. BOARS encouraged campuses to increase transparency in Admission by Exception (ABE) processes, and standardize practices as much as possible. A first round of recommendations from the Office of the President was met with some skepticism since workloads do not seem to have been considered. The state audit is pending, but BOARS will carefully scrutinize their findings and recommendations when available.

OTHER BUSINESS AND BRIEFINGS

Campus Reports: BOARS set aside a portion of each meeting for updates from faculty representatives about issues being discussed on their admissions committees and campuses. These briefings touched on a wide range of topics, including local holistic review processes; best practices for increasing diversity and enhancing outreach to underrepresented populations; individual campus strategies for meeting the 2:1 freshman:transfer enrollment ratio; strategies for addressing impaction in majors and boosting enrollment in under-enrolled majors; the effects of the ongoing enrollment surge on campus infrastructure and faculty workload; local analyses of student success factors; the effect of potential new federal immigration policies on undocumented students; strategies to ensure strong English language skills in international admits; the role of athletics admissions committees and admission-by-exception; application fee usage policies; admissions staff turnover; and over-enrollment in STEM fields.

Senate Leadership Briefings: The Academic Council chair and vice chair attended a portion of each BOARS meeting to brief the committee on business from Council and Regents meetings, and other systemwide issues of particular interest to BOARS or of general interest to the faculty. These briefings included the status of negotiations with the state around the budget and enrollment

funding; proposed legislation affecting the University; the Regents' nonresident enrollment policy; and the impacts of the State and internal audits of UCOP and UC admissions.

Office of Student Affairs: The Office of Student Affairs provided regular briefings throughout the admissions cycle on application, admissions, and SIR outcomes for freshman and transfer students from different demographic groups and residency categories. They also provided valuable information to BOARS about transfer policies, initiatives, and legislation; admissions messaging; feedback from counselor conferences; high school and online “a-g” course accreditation issues; the Next Generation Science Standards; recruitment programs targeting the ELC cohort and other specific populations; the status of UC campus implementation of the UC Transfer Pathways; and other topics.

OTHER REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to the above, BOARS issued recommendations and opinions on other topics of interest, including changes to Senate Regulation 636.E, Senate Bylaw 336, Open Access for Theses and Dissertations, and revised Sexual Violence/Sexual Harassment policies.

BOARS REPRESENTATION

BOARS Chair Comeaux represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, the Assembly of the Academic Senate, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), the ICAS IGETC Standards Subcommittee, and participated on the Transfer Advising Innovations & Communications subcommittee of the Transfer Task Force, as well as on the Transfer Task Force itself. Chair Comeaux and UCSF Representative Hasenstaub represented BOARS on the Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF), and UCSB Representative Sorapure served as liaison to the University Committee on Preparatory Education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

BOARS collaborated closely with UCOP and benefited from regular consultations with Vice President for Student Affairs Robin Holmes-Sullivan, Director of Undergraduate Admissions Han Mi Yoon-Wu, and Director of Academic Preparation and Relations with Schools and Colleges Monica Lin. BOARS also received valuable support and advice from Institutional Research Coordinator Tongshan Chang and Institutional Research and Planning Analyst Matt Reed, who provided the committee with critical analyses and data related to the Report to the Regents and the Compare Favorably analyses.

Respectfully submitted,

Eddie Comeaux, Chair (R)	Nancy Kwak (SD)
Melissa Famulari, Vice Chair (SD)	Andrea Hasenstaub (SF)
Jill Berrick (B)	Madeleine Sorapure (SB)
Deborah Swenson (D)	David Smith (SC)
Laura O'Connor (I)	Jonathan Li, Undergraduate Student
Rene Ong (LA)	Kevin Heller, Graduate Student
Catherine Keske (M)	
Dave Volz (R)	Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
Annual Report 2018-19

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Per Senate bylaw 180, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) advises/ the University President and all agencies of the Senate on matters regarding research and learning related to graduate education. One of CCGA's chief responsibilities, as delegated by the Regents, is the authority to review and evaluate campus proposals for new graduate programs and schools that require approval of the President. In addition, CCGA establishes basic policies and procedures for coordinating the work of the various graduate councils and divisions, recommends to the Assembly minimum standards of admission for graduate students, reviews policies applied by graduate councils, reviews policies concerning relations with educational and research agencies, and approves UC graduate courses as system-wide courses to be listed in divisional catalogs.

Review of Proposed Graduate Degree Programs

During the 2018-19 Academic year, CCGA approved 25 program proposals, and declined one. Eight of the approved proposals were Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs (SSGPDPs), and one proposal was a PDST (Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition). Seven proposals are currently under review and will carry over to the 2019-20 year.

Programs Approved During the 2018-19 Year

Campus	Program	Date Received	Date Approved	SSGPDP?
UCB	Master of Bioprocess Engineering	5/17/18	2/6/19	Yes
UCB	Flexible Master of Social Welfare	10/30/18	3/6/19	Yes
UCB	Master of Design	1/2/19	5/1/19	Yes
UCD	Online MBA	8/16/18	4/3/19	Yes
UCD	Certificate in Future Undergraduate Science Educators	3/21/19	7/3/19	No
UCI	PhD in Language Science	7/24/18	4/3/19	No
UCI	Master of Engineering	7/24/18	2/6/19	Yes
UCI	MS in Public Health	1/15/18	3/6/19	No
UCLA	MS/PhD in Communication	5/9/18	11/7/18	No
UCLA	Master of Legal Studies	12/5/18	6/5/19	Yes
UCM	MS/PhD in Bioengineering	5/31/18	9/26/18	No
UCM	MS/PhD in Materials and Biomaterials Science and Engineering	6/9/18	9/26/18	No
UCM	MS/PhD in Management of Complex Systems	6/28/18	11/7/18	No
UCR	MS/PhD in Biophysics	7/12/18	12/5/18	No
UCR	Master in Supply Chain and Logistics Management	6/12/18	3/6/19 (not approved)	Yes
UCR	MS/PhD in Entomology	6/12/18	4/3/19	No
UCSB	Master of Environmental Data Science	5/1/19	8/9/19	No
UCSC	MS in Molecular, Cell, and Developmental Biology	5/21/18	11/7/18	No
UCSC	MFA in Environmental Art and Social Practice	7/16/18	8/9/19	No

UCSC	MS in Natural Language Processing	6/21/17	4/4/18	No
UCSD	MA in Global Health	3/26/18	12/5/18	No
UCSD	School of Public Health	2/20/19	6/5/19	No
UCSD	MS in Biostatistics	5/24/18	11/7/18	No
UCSD	BA/MPP in Economics	1/8/19	1/9/19	No
UCSF	MS in Genetic Counseling	12/18/18	6/5/19	No
UCSF	Certificate in Supplemental Studies in Advanced Practice in Nursing	11/8/18	3/6/19	Yes

The committee worked diligently with campuses and faculty throughout the year to help them craft and improve proposals that would meet the University's expectations of excellence.

Proposals Under Review to be Carried Over to 2019-20

Campus	Program	Date Received	Status	SSGPDP?
UCI	Master of Presentation Design	7/24/18	Waiting on campus feedback	Yes
UCI	Master of Data Science	2/13/19	Under Review	Yes
UCI	Master of English	3/27/19	Under Review	Yes
UCI	School of Pharmacy	6/25/19	Under Review	No
UCI	PhD in Global Studies	4/5/19	Under Review	No
UCLA	Master of Applied Geospatial Information Systems and Technologies (Online)	5/14/19	Under Review	Yes
UCSC	MS in Human Computer Interaction	3/21/19	Under Review	No

Topics of Note During the 2018-19 Year

SSGPDP Review

The Academic Senate Chair requested that CCGA, UCPB, and UCAP undertake a program review of the self-supporting graduate professional degree programs (SSGPDPs) as a whole, not of particular programs. The review, led by CCGA, took a step back to see how successful the SSGPDP program has been relative to its stated goals and to gauge its impact on curricula and students, budget and faculty. Also, the Regents are very concerned about diversity, and it is unclear if SSGPDPs are working to address diversity goals in their programs. At the end of the year, CCGA, UCPB and UCAP sent an interim report to the Academic Council, noting what was done and learn so far and that the review is still ongoing and will be completed by the incoming CCGA, UCPB and UCAP slates. One of the things that was learned in the process of undertaking the evaluation is just how complicated the SSGPDP landscape is, how rapid the growth of self-supporting degree programs has been, and how difficult it is to track and assess certain aspects of self-supporting programs, including areas of greatest interest to the Academic Senate and the three committees mentioned above.

CCGA, UCPB and UCAP worked together to develop a set of questions to be distributed to individual campuses to begin to assess SSGPDPs in terms of academic quality, finances, contributions to the university mission, etc. It was soon realized that administering a single questionnaire would be difficult. Some questions might need to be answered by program directors, others by departmental staff, others by assistant deans, and so forth. As UCI had just put together two task forces looking at resource implications of SSGPDPs and

implementation issues, the joint review took advantage of this situation to pilot the questionnaire at Irvine with the help of staff in the office of the Vice Provost for Academic Planning. The latter had multiple in-person meetings with SSGPDP stakeholders on-campus and gathered considerable information relevant to the systemwide review. The systemwide committee then reviewed and discussed the information gathered, primarily at UCPB with a CCGA representative present and participating. CCGA also began to collate completed program reviews of approved SSGPDPs for further detailed analyses for aggregate and trend patterns without singling out any specific SSGPDP. With the support of Academic Affairs, CCGA also began to look at the existing UCOP data on SSGPDPs across the UC.

There is enormous variety in SSGPDP types, from entirely online programs, small programs aimed at niche clienteles, large ones providing fairly traditional professional training, those that draw locally, to those that draw internationally. There does appear to be a trend toward programs that look much like state-supported graduate programs (viz., fulltime programs with courses offered during the week and during usual working hours). Further, one can also roughly split SSGPDP types into two major categories: those that generate sufficient income to hire faculty who teach in the program on-load (most notably the case for business degrees); and those that draw entirely or mainly on faculty hired to staff state-supported programs and who teach on overload, whose courses are on-load and “bought out,” or a mixture of the two. Both UCI and UCLA have recently pushed in the direction of overload teaching as the default for SSGPDPs in order to mitigate impacts on state-supported programs. This is not a model that works for all programs, however, such as the business programs just mentioned. On the whole, there are few programs that currently generate more than relatively moderate revenues, and some are currently in the red. Most programs are still in the process of being phased in, so revenues may go up in the middle or longer term (except for those programs not designed as scalable or intended for niche clienteles—often one and the same).

One of the possible goals of SSGPDPs is to provide supplemental funding for state-supported programs and traditional university missions. UCPB was therefore particularly interested in finding out how the revenues are being used. It was discovered that it is actually very difficult to track this. Program directors do not usually know the answer to this question; they simply know, at best, how a given program is “taxed.” A department chair might know how the portion of revenues that remains in the department is employed, but not all programs are housed in departments. Most revenues, however, go into a general fund at the level of the dean, where they become by and large untraceable. Interestingly, when asked what revenues were used for, the most prevalent response of interviewees was “graduate support.” It is not known at this point whether this response names a truth or is simply an impression. Further, it is unclear that indirect costs are being adequately accounted.

Going forward, recipients of SSGPDP revenues should be asked to track their spending if there are to be concrete and reliable answers to the question. Assistant deans are generally the best-positioned for such tracking. (Note there is no suspicion that revenues are being used inappropriately. Rather, it would be useful not only to understand how SSGPDP revenues are supporting the university missions and perhaps even to showcase the good to which such revenues can be put. This might lead to the discovery that the generally modest income margins to date that self-supporting programs, which require significant faculty and staff time and effort to run, are an efficient way to supplement otherwise underfunded university missions.

There is a similar vagueness with the measurement of academic quality, a topic in which CCGA is particularly interested. Notably, UCI’s Graduate Council only recently began requiring that new SSGPDP proposals explicitly address student learning objectives/outcomes (SLOs). In itself, this is not unusual, as SLOs and other assessment tools have only barely begun to penetrate graduate degree programs, with the exception of those where accreditation is at stake. Potentially more troubling is that self-supporting programs have generally been treated as extraneous to the core teaching mission of schools and have thus largely escaped scrutiny during academic program reviews (where self-supporting programs have existed long enough to have been subject to such reviews in the first place). The UCOP mandated third-year review of all newly established SSGPDPs is vague in its intent but appears mainly aimed at measuring financial viability. The third year of operation may be premature to attempt to assess academic quality in any case. At present, all

Schools offering SSGPDPs will need to ensure that these programs are adequately addressed in periodic academic program reviews and that all programs develop SLOs and related assessment criteria. As part of this systemwide Senate review of the SSGPDP program, it may be wise to have a mandated review of academic quality after—for example—year five of operation of a given SSGPDP. This should be separate from regular academic program reviews. Of course, such a mandate would clearly place further burdens, both service and financial, on the Senate.

Another issue that needs closer monitoring and assessment is the ratio of teaching by ladder-rank faculty done on-load or overload. As noted, the trend on at least two campuses that have seen rapid growth in SSGPDPs over the past several years is toward requiring mainly overload teaching to mitigate impacts on state-supported programs. Overload will not work in all cases, however. Moreover, many programs have already been approved that allow for onload teaching (with buyout) and/or overload. Both options are stipulated as possible under current UCOP policy, although individual campuses can, of course, have more restrictive policies. Presumably, overload teaching is not without impact on state-supported programs or missions, as faculty have limited time and capacity. Teaching on overload would, for example, presumably cut into research time. Currently, compensation policies exist that limit the amount of work that can be done on overload. If SSGPDPs continue to grow, these policies will need revisiting. Further, given the wildly differing course loads among Schools on any given campus, impacts are not uniformly distributed. Indeed, because deans have the ability to set course loads, there is potential for abuse (i.e., course loads could be lowered to allow for more overload teaching and more compensation). There is no evidence that this has happened, but the potential is at least there and could lead to degradation of state-supported programs and pay/labor inequities.

The matter of onload versus overload teaching also introduces issues relevant to academic personnel review and the merit system. Overload teaching has usually been treated as outside of personnel review procedures (teaching in summer session, to take the most relevant case). In any SSGPDP in which faculty can teach either onload or on overload, the same course might be treated as either relevant to a faculty merit review or not. Since the intent is to maintain academic quality in SSGPDPs on par with state-supported programs, what would be the justification for not considering teaching performance in courses taught on overload but otherwise fully part of UC offerings? Similarly, it is not clear how service to SSGPDPs ought to be credited. Campus CAPs and CAPRAs will need to think these issues through with care, probably with central guidance from UCAP.

The picture with regard to diversity and accessibility is also complicated. Compared to the diversity statistics provided by UCOP in the fall of 2018 for all SSGPDPs across the system, UCI's programs on the whole seem to have made steps toward greater diversity measured in terms of gender and URM status. In the case of programs aimed primarily at international applicants, URM status becomes largely irrelevant, although there are other ways that such programs can contribute to the support of diversity on their campuses (e.g., by providing revenue for diversity-based fellowships in state-supported graduate programs). Accessibility is considerably harder to measure, as UCI does not ask for or track the socio-economic status of applicants to graduate programs. Systemwide, SSGPDPs have greatly varying return-to-aid percentages, and it is not clear how money in a return-to-aid pool can be appropriately or equitably distributed according to need given the dearth of information.

Ultimately, CCGA, UCPB and UCAP recommended that the SSGPDP program review be continued and completed in the new academic year. The incoming chairs of the three committees are aware of this need and will pursue this review to completion. As needed, the outgoing CCGA, UCPB and UCAP chairs will provide support to the incoming CCGA, UCPB and UCAP to ensure a smooth transfer and execution of the review.

Academic Council Chair May told the committee that the Senate has been asked by the President to look at standardized testing. GRE value is an issue that departments make on the campuses, and some are turning away from them. If UC decides to do away with the SAT it would have an incredible impact on the national educational scene. There are two areas – professional graduate student testing and undergraduate SAT testing. Grad admissions lies with the departments and undergrad is with the University. Executive Director Jennings voiced the hope that CCGA would look at the GRE; there is evidence that the exam disadvantages some groups and advantages others. It also been proven to not be a good indicator of student success. Chair May said that it would be useful for the committee to get a sense of methods of evaluation in different disciplines.

The committee was also asked to look at posthumous degrees for graduate students and education for incarcerated students.

Open Access Policy

CCGA members discussed the Open Access policy. The issue of revenue to publishers was important to the members and its implementation and impact on faculty and University library budgets. The committee discussed its experience, knowledge, and concerns about Open Access and how it is being implemented in parts of Europe. The committee endorsed a set of 18 principles and deferred to the Academic Council Chair to request further input from campus library committees and faculty prior to approval of the proposed policy.

The Council Chair told the committee that UC has “walked away” from the Elsevier contract. This is seen as an important Academic Freedom issue. This may result in some level of inconvenience for faculty, but the campus librarians are working to help alleviate that. In addition, libraries all over the country are ready to help with interlibrary loan. This was discussed at length by the committee.

APM 210

The COGD is working on revising APM to include graduate student supervision and mentoring as part of tenure promotion etc. They are looking at expanding it to include effective mentoring, accomplishments of mentees, degree completion, attention to completion of degrees by URM's, and successful transition to work after completion. The Vice Chair will circulate it when the draft is complete. There was considerable discussion among members about poor mentoring, lack of accountability, and lack of oversight in mentor/mentee relationships. It was suggested that perhaps mentorship teams would be a good idea. The student representative noted that it is intimidating to have one person with that much power over a student's future.

Redacting Data in Graduate Admissions

- Will redacting some information in graduate school applications increase diversity?
- If so, what information should be redacted?

The Chair said that the committee has been asked to consider this by the Senate leadership to ultimately bring forward to Council and to the Assembly. The concept would be to leave out socio-demographic information. The rationale is that the information might be used unfairly in graduate admissions. Committee members were largely opposed to this idea. The Chair asked members to bring forward any ideas they had for improving diversity in graduate admissions and also to share their concerns regarding redaction. Members said that UC is not competitive because it does not have financial rewards for diverse students. This is also true for faculty diversity.

Acknowledgements

CCGA is grateful to have had valuable input from - and exchange with- these UCOP and campus consultants and guests over the past year: Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies Art Ellis, Graduate Studies Executive

Director Pamela Jennings, Director of Academic Planning Todd Greenspan; Academic Planning and Research Analyst Chris Procello, and Council of Graduate Deans representative Marjorie Zatz (UCM). Thanks, too, to Academic Council Chair Robert May, Vice Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani, and Senate Executive Director Hilary Baxter. Finally, special thanks to our student representatives, Deyanira Nevarez Martinez and Nicole Taylor.

Respectfully submitted,

Onyebuchi Arah, Chair (UCLA)

Ramesh Balasubramaniam, Vice Chair (UCM)

Mark Wilson (UCB)

Carlson Arnett (UCD)

Priya Ranjan (UCI)

Caroline Streeter (UCLA)

LeRoy Westerling (UCM)

Hyle Park (UCR)

Lynn Russell (UCSD)

Beth Phoenix (UCSF)

Amr El Abbadi (UCSB)

Gina Dent (UCSC)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ANNUAL REPORT 2018-19

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Responsibilities and Duties

Pursuant to [Senate Bylaw 150](#), 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. UCOC met three times in person and three times by videoconference. Major issues and accomplishments are reported below.

Appointment of Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Senate's Standing Committees

At the October 2018 meeting, members chose their positions to serve as standing committee liaisons. The liaisons gathered information from the committee chairs, vice chairs, members, and analysts on the committee's effectiveness and possible vice chair candidates. In addition, the liaisons recommended individuals for 2019-20 chairs and vice chairs of their designated committees. UCOC reviewed and approved these recommendations from April to August 2019.

Appointment of 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 and to the Assembly. Subsequently, UCOC issued the appointment letters, which specified the term of appointment and the committee's charge. UCOC also was asked to consider members and consulted upon the following:

- Editorial Committee – UCOC appointed seven new members;
- University Committee of Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) – University Committee of Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) – reappointed the chair and 3 members and appointed 1 new member. UCOC also appointed two members mid-term to replace one committee member leaving for sabbatical and a second who was no longer willing to serve.
- University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) – appointed one at-large member;
- Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) – reappointed one member and reappointed the chair of the committee;
- University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) Task Force on Agriculture and Natural Resources (TF ANR) – vetted one appointment per the request of the UCPB leadership.
- Health Care Task Force (HCTF) – vetted five appointments per the request of the UCFW leadership.

Appointment of Senate Representatives to Special Committees & Task Forces, Search Committees, and Joint Senate/Administrative Task Forces and Committees

UCOC is responsible for appointing Senate representatives to various groups that are proposed by the President, Provost, and/or other senior administrators, including search committees of senior executives and chancellors. UCOC nominated and appointed representatives to serve on a number of joint Administration-Senate task forces and other groups. These included:

- The UCLA and UCSF Chancellor Ad Hoc Review Committees

- The UCSC Chancellor Search Committee
- The UC Merced Chancellor Search Committee
- The Knowledge Transfer Advisory Committee (KTAC)
- The Sustainability Steering Committee.

UCOC nominated and forwarded Senate representatives for the following councils:

- UC's National Center for Free Speech and Civic Engagement Academic Advisory Board – identified ten candidates for UCOP.
- UC Washington Center (UCDC) Governing Council – recommended two names to Senate leadership.
- Governing Council of the UC Agriculture and Natural Resources Division (UC ANR)
- UC Center for Free Speech and Civic Engagement Academic Advisory Board
- Cultural Repatriation Policy Advisory Workgroup – identified and vetted three subject matter experts
- Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) Advisory Board – identified and vetted three subject matter experts in each of three categories to UCOP.

UCOC was asked to suggest members for and/or consulted upon the following:

- Academic Council Standardized Testing Task Force
- Academic Council Task Force on Teaching Evaluations
- Scientific Review Panel (SRP) California Air Resources Board (CARB) – identified two subject matter experts in each of three categories: 1) academic administration, 2) biostatistics, and 3) biochemistry/ molecular biology.
- Herbicides/Glyphosate Task Force – identified one primary and one secondary subject matter expert.

Academic Council Chairs Award for Mid-Career Leadership in the Academic Senate

This new award in the Academic Senate will be presented every two years to a mid-career (Associate Professor to Professor V) member of the UC faculty who has demonstrated exceptional academic senate leadership. Funded through gifts from former Academic Council Chairs, the award carries a small honorarium.

UCOC nominated Sean Malloy (UCM) and Onyebuchi A. Arah (UCLA) for the Mid-Career Leadership Award. Both have extraordinary service on both the systemwide and divisional level, as well as stellar records of academic achievement. Academic Council subsequently selected both nominations for this Mid-Career Leadership Award.

Other UCOC activities

- UCOC discussed the increased requests to UCOC for Senate representation. For most of these requests, UCOC only suggests names, not appoint people.
- With the Editorial Committee, members are not fully aware of the expectations and that there is a high level of absenteeism. UCOC shared strategies for how to address this.
- Staff members from the UCOP Office of Research and Graduate Studies explained to UCOC that UC is required to adhere to legal minimums of appointing to state-level review panels. State agencies see this as UC providing direct service to the state, and the state relies on these expert committees.
- UCOC discussed that there are divisional Task Forces on Teaching Evaluations and questioned the need for a systemwide task force.

Respectfully submitted:

Kevin Plaxco, Chair (UCSB)	Wendy Campana (UCSD)
Pamela Ling, Vice Chair (UCSF)	Jacqueline Leung (UCSF)
Teresa Head-Gordon (UCB)	Bassam Bamieh (UCSB)
Cynthia Passmore (UCD)	Patricia Gallagher (UCSC)
Veronica Vieira (UCI)	Robert May (Council Chair, ex-officio)
Nicolas Brecha (UCLA)	Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Council Vice Chair, ex-officio)
Linda Hirst (UCM)	Jocelyn Banaria (Committee Analyst)
Jennifer Najera (UCR)	

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
EDUCATIONAL POLICY
2018-2019 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) met nine times in Academic Year 2018-2019 (including five videoconferences) 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 TRANSFER INITIATIVE

The 2017-2018 Transfer Task Force and the April 2018 [memorandum of understanding](#) between UC and the California Community Colleges (CCC) set the stage for UCEP’s participation in the development of a systemwide Transfer Guarantee over the course of this year. While the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools was responsible for devising a way to implement the Guarantee, UCEP examined and weighed in on myriad issues related to the enrollment, persistence and retention of transfer students. Committee members served on the Transfer Implementation Steering Committee and three associated workgroups: Transfer Guarantee; Transfer Advising Innovations and Communication; and Transfer Pathways and Articulation.

Overarching concerns for UCEP included identifying a strategy that would increase access for a diverse transfer student population as well as the transfer readiness of UC campuses, student success and what happens to transfer students after admission. In addition, the committee began investigating questions related to the governance and review of the [Transfer Pathways](#) and [Transfer Admission Guarantee agreements](#). In the spring, committee members collected basic information about the processes for review and approval of transfer criteria at the department and division levels. A synopsis which highlighted the strengths and shortcomings of current procedures was shared with the divisional Senate chairs and educational policy committees in June. In the near future, the committee may focus attention on the effectiveness of the Pathways and how their utilization contributes to student access and success.

INNOVATIVE LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE (ILTI)

The year began with the formal appointment of the ILTI Coordinator as a consultant to UCEP, a step designed to facilitate communication and strengthen the collaboration between the committee and the systemwide program for online education. Following [the committee’s recommendation to Council](#) that campuses institute a flexible petition process to increase access to ILTI courses, UCEP continued to investigate the Cross Campus Enrollment System (CCES) in an ongoing effort to uncover practices and policies that may inadvertently hinder students’ ability to take advantage of the Initiative’s online course offerings. Central to this investigation was the committee’s review of approximately two years’ worth of data from the CCES, close to 6,000 individual enrollments.

Following UCEP’s recommendation, ILTI began to organize the data into common categories to form the basis for a taxonomy, and it quickly emerged that the majority of enrollment problems stem from communication and timeline issues rather than policy. In conjunction with this analysis, ILTI surveyed academic advisors about the CCES and the preliminary results suggest that a petition process would not necessarily address obstacles to enrollment. UCEP shared these findings in [a letter to Academic Council in June](#), recommending that ILTI prioritize the creation of a taxonomy to standardize the organization of enrollment data.

FULLY ONLINE UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES

In accordance with the Compendium, in January Academic Council determined that a proposal from UCI's Paul Merage School of Business to pilot a fully online Bachelor of Arts degree in Business Administration constituted a first of its kind degree requiring review and approval of the systemwide Senate. Starting in February, UCEP began to carefully scrutinize the proposal and supplemental materials, and held multiple, in-depth discussions about the proposed pilot. UCEP received a presentation from an Associate Dean from the School of Business and UCEP's Chair kept Council, along with the Irvine Division Chair, apprised of the committee's deliberations.

By May, members concluded that the online degree program could not be approved as proposed. The committee agreed that the School of Business had not thoroughly considered or addressed fundamental operational issues related to admissions, financial aid, catalog rights, and access to resources. A [June memo from Council to the Provost's Office](#) outlined UCEP's two recommendations for next steps. The School of Business has agreed with the committee's recommendation to expand its offering of online courses in tandem with face-to-face courses in the existing BA to gather data about online student success and experience, and to clarify future decisions about moving to an online-only degree. Academic Council supported UCEP's second recommendation for a systemwide exploration of UC's engagement with fully online undergraduate degrees, with particular attention to the experiential and intellectual implications of non-residency. This effort will commence in the fall with the involvement of relevant Senate committees and administrators.

TRAINING FOR TEACHING ASSISTANTS/GRADUATE STUDENT INSTRUCTORS

UCEP's [July memo to Council](#) was shared with the directors of campus Centers for Teaching and Learning (CTL) or Offices of Instructional Development (OIDs) through the Provost's Office. The CTLs and OIDs took the lead on studying the available training in an effort to determine its effectiveness and identify best practices and potential solutions for improving the offerings. Two representatives from the CTL/OID project joined the committee in June to briefly discuss key findings, indicating that a report on their effort would be shared with the Academic Planning Council and UCEP. The committee will review this report and monitor developments related to TA and GSI training.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The committee considered several issues related to academic integrity over the course of the year, including dishonesty and plagiarism, posting course materials on websites, and inappropriate comments on student course evaluations. Previous conversations about dishonesty, plagiarism and other forms of cheating have been general in nature, but this year UCEP compiled specific information about campus policies and practices which was reported to Council. Another aspect of academic integrity pertained to students illegally posting course materials on commercial social learning websites. The committee's concerns about this activity and appeal for a systemwide response to this complicated matter were delineated in [an April memorandum to Council](#) which was shared with Academic Personnel. Finally, UCEP is one of five committees Council has tasked with studying issues related to inappropriate comments made by students on course evaluations. UCEP will consider this matter from the educational quality perspective.

STANDARDIZED TESTING TASK FORCE

In July 2018, President Napolitano requested that the Senate evaluate the use of standardized tests for UC admissions and determine whether any changes in admission testing policies or practices are necessary to ensure that the University continues to use standardized tests in an appropriate way. It is worth noting that more than 1,000 universities in the U.S. have stopped requiring the SAT and ACT in recent years and that nine UC campuses are among the 13 colleges that currently still require the ACT Writing or SAT Essay for freshman admission. UCEP's Chair, the UCSD representative and the graduate student representative agreed to serve on [Academic Council's Standardized Testing Task Force](#) (STTF), which held its first

meeting in February. The STTF's investigation will continue into the new Academic Year, with the expectation that recommendations will be forthcoming in early 2020.

INCARCERATED STUDENTS

In April, the Senate Chair called for UCEP, the Committee on Graduate Affairs, and the Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity to determine if policies or a set of best practices are needed to support working with students who are incarcerated or whose circumstances limit their ability to interface with a campus. As a first step, UCEP invited the director of the [Berkeley Underground Scholars](#) program to discuss the challenges facing both currently and formerly incarcerated students and the academic needs of this population. In August, Senate leadership and representatives from UCEP and the other two Senate committees participated in a roundtable that brought together UC faculty working with or planning programs for incarcerated students as well as representatives from the CCC and California State University systems. The process of information gathering and identifying pertinent Senate policies that need to be reconsidered to accommodate working with these students will be ongoing.

OTHER ISSUES AND ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

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

- Restructuring of systemwide UC Mexico programs
- UCSD School of Public Health
- Amendment to UCSC Division Regulation 10.1.3
- UCSD Variance Request to Senate Regulation 782
- Revision to Senate Regulation 636.E
- UCSD's Seventh College
- Discontinuation of UCD's Textiles and Clothing degree and Fiber and Polymer Science degree
- Restructuring of UC Sacramento
- UCLA Bachelor of Music in Music Performance degree

UCEP touched on a variety of other issues related to the business of the Academic Council, Academic Assembly, ICAS, and the work of campus Committees on Educational Policy/Undergraduate Councils.

UCEP REPRESENTATION

UCEP Chair Anne Zanzucchi represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Academic Assembly. Chair Zanzucchi also participated on the Provost's monthly budget briefing teleconferences, the Academic Planning Council and represented UCEP on ICAS, and the UC Washington D.C. Center's Academic Advisory Council. Chair Anne Zanzucchi represented UCEP on the Transfer Implementation Steering Committee and the Transfer Guarantee and Transfer Advising Innovations and Communication subcommittees. Finally, UCEP was represented by Vice Chair Serences on the Office of the President's Education Financing Model Steering Committee and by Daniel Potter (UCD) on the UC Education Abroad Program Advisory.

COMMITTEE CONSULTATIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

UCEP benefited from consultation and reports from; Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning Institutional Research and Academic Planning; Ellen Osmundson, ILTI Project Coordinator, UCOP; Mary-Ellen Kreher, ILTI Course Development Director; and Paul Montoya, ILTI CFO and Marketing Director, UCOP.

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,

Anne Zanzucchi, Chair (M)

Katherine Snyder (B-fall)

Daniel Potter (D)

Adriana Galvan (LA)

Owen Long (R)

Deborah Johnson (SF)

Onuttom Narayan (SC)

Wendy Rummerfield (Graduate Student-I)

John Serences, Vice Chair (SD)

Tony Keaveny (B-spring)

Hugh Roberts (I)

Jay Sharping (M)

Haim Weizman (SD)

Trevor Hayton (UCSB)

Kimia Akbari (Undergraduate Student-D)

Robert May ((D), Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)

Kum-Kum Bhavnani ((SB), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)

Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW) 2018-19 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 eight in-person meetings and two videoconferences during the 2018-19 academic year, and the major actions and discussions of ongoing issues are highlighted in this report.

UCFW has two key task forces with memberships independent of UCFW and with particular expertise in: (1) the University of California 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 task forces monitor developments and carry out detailed analyses of questions and issues in their respective areas and report back to UCFW for further action. UCFW is indebted to the extraordinary commitment and skills of our task force leadership, David Brownstone (TFIR) and Lori Lubin (HCTF). These two task forces spend a great deal of time in consultation with systemwide Human Resources (HR). Many of these consultants, along with Academic Personnel and Programs and others from the Office of the President, 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.

FACULTY WELFARE

Following revision of the faculty code of conduct sections involving sexual harassment and sexual violence, UCFW met with the systemwide Title IX officer to discuss investigation protocols, differences in standards between Title IX investigations and faculty Privilege and Tenure investigations, privacy expectations of complainants and respondents at all phases of the process, and standardizing disciplinary actions.

UCFW has raised concerns about cybersecurity and identity theft through university mechanisms, such as payroll or pension systems. Inconsistent campus practices reveal a need for systemwide minimum standards. The staggered launch of campuses in UC Path leaves some employees vulnerable to legacy system weaknesses. The rapid pace of change in the cybersecurity arena leaves many employees especially vulnerable to technological victimization, and UCFW urges the University to adopt industry standard security practices, if not a higher bar.

The necessity of such actions was illustrated by pension payment thefts. In response, the Senate called for not only enhanced cybersecurity and fail-safe protocols for retirees, but also called for creation of a reimbursement fund to make whole those who may be victimized through a failing of institutional protections. Eventually, UC created a self-funded program under its Fiat Lux risk pool for this purpose as no market option exists.

UCFW met with the Chief Financial Officer and the Office of Loan Programs to discuss housing issues at many campuses. A lack of affordable housing proximate to UC campuses is pricing many employees out of working for the university. Planned projects

at some campuses will open slowly and not fully address the needs. Affordable student housing is a similar issue. Affordable child care continues to be a concern systemwide.

UCFW also discussed issues of on-going concern, such as campus climate and faculty morale, faculty and staff diversity, disparate Stop-the-Clock impacts, and hiring procedures and background searches.

CASH COMPENSATION ISSUES

Last year, UCFW spent significant time and effort this year devising and proposing a salary plan for Senate faculty that would raise the salary scales back to a competitive level with the Comparison 8. UCFW met frequently with Vice Provost Carlson from Academic Personnel and Programs to discuss options and data projections. UCFW met with Provost Brown and President Napolitano to hold dedicated discussions on raising the faculty salary scales. In the end, the UCFW proposal was accepted by the Academic Council, and President Napolitano agreed to its principles. However, after meeting the goals of the first year (last year), this year, the plan was scaled back following underinvestment by the state and other budgetary concerns. It is now expected that the plan to close the salary gap will be extended by at least one more year, if not two.

Further, administration of the salary plan has been hampered by on-going concerns with the UC Path facility. Several campuses reported significant payroll errors, especially for graduate students. Some campuses have even opened back-up facilities to triage complaints. Despite assurances from Office of the President project leads that the error rate and resolution time-frame is with industry norms, UCFW called for more user-friendly responses and even more rapid resolutions. As the rest of the system joins UC Path, UCFW will continue to monitor implementation and advocate for secure, accurate, and rapid pay issuance.

HEALTH AND WELFARE BENEFITS:

UCFW and HCTF continued to monitor the operations of UC Care. Issues surrounding billing transparency and continuity of care following changes in external vendors were the most common concerns.

Last year, in response to concerns that the retiree health obligation would become too expensive for the University to maintain in the long run, a working group was formed to make recommendations on the future sustainability of the benefit. The Senate was afforded several participants who provided considerable subject-matter expertise and helped to keep the focus of the working group on immediate expenses. Because medical inflation was lower than expected, though, the group recommended no changes for 2019.

This year, the retiree health work group was morphed into the Health Benefits Advisory Committee and charged to assess the University's entire insurance portfolio and how well it meets employees' needs. Part of their work will include surveying the employee base, and the Senate has scrutinized both the recruitment of external parties as well as the efficacy of the proposed survey. Because HBAC will be supported by external vendors not just for survey administration but also for financial projections and various design modeling exercises, the Senate has called for and been granted participation in the vendor selection process. The Senate also successfully lobbied the administration to allow faculty academic and methodological oversight of internal and external surveys targeting

the entire UC population. HCTF will closely monitor HBAC's work and findings in the coming year.

HCTF empaneled a task force to investigate religious/conscience objections to the provision of health care, whether by systems, institutions, or individuals. The method and timing of registering such objections, and their communication to health care consumers, were among the issues assessed, as were impacts to medical education since students could be placed in hospitals that do not perform certain services. The rights of students to refuse some education was also impacted. Expectations regarding affiliate compliance with UC's commitment to diversity and Principles of Community, among other UC values, should be clarified publicly. The final task force report was received by the Academic Council and shared with the University community.

This work coincided with an effort from the San Francisco campus to affiliate itself on a co-ownership basis with a group of Catholic hospitals. Critics cited issues regarding Shared Governance, as well as the justifications being offered by proponents. Public outcry and the need for a more deliberate process caused the effort to be tabled.

HCTF for the first time this year started scrutinizing the Student Health Insurance Plan (SHIP) and its efficacy, focusing on student access to mental health services and access to abortion services. Preliminary meetings with SHIP representatives showed an expectation gap regarding oversight and reporting. Changes in SHIP administration within the Office of the President complicate fostering a good working relationship.

INVESTMENT

TFIR continued its close work with the administration to make more user-friendly the Fidelity brokerage window investment options, an effort led by the Office of the Chief Investment Officer, in conjunction with Human Resources. TFIR also supported an OCIO initiative to investigate adding Roth 403(b)s, which carry certain tax advantages for those with projected income growth, and Qualified Longevity Annuity Contracts (QLACs) to the investment window.

TFIR engaged with OCIO to better understand the vetting their office conducts prior to investing in new stocks. OCIO regularly eschews investing in, for example, gun manufacturers and corporate prisons, in addition to Regentally mandated exclusions of companies that conduct business with Sudan and tobacco companies. TFIR encouraged OCIO to make these processes more apparent, especially as the Senate considered and advanced a Memorial to the Regents calling for divestment of the endowment from leading carbon-extraction corporations.

TFIR continued discussions with OCIO and others regarding the UCRP discount rate, and how and when it might need to be changed, especially in light of the experience study conducted this year. The experience study, a periodic actuarial review of inflation, rate of return, purchasing power, and longevity assumptions, indeed did call for changes. The largest change reflects a change to generational longevity cohorts, which gives more accurate predictions. Combined with slowing markets and uncertainty in the federal inflation rate, a reduction to the assumed rate of return was also recommended. To off-set the resulting growth the actuarial determined contributions, it was proposed that the employer increase its contributions to the pension plan. Several Regents, however, balked at the notion of placing the entire increase on the employer, and asked for models of greater employee contributions, too. The Senate will argue from the perspectives of Total

Remuneration and macro-economics that increasing employer contributions is a more sound strategy.

OTHER POLICY ISSUES AND SYSTEMWIDE REVIEWS:

Academic Personnel Manual Revisions: Several sections of the APM were up for review, and some new sections were proposed. UCFW opined on or discussed each of the following:

- 011, Academic Freedom, Protection of Professional Standards, and Responsibilities of Non-Faculty Academic Employees
- 285, Teaching Professors/LSOEs

CORRESPONDENCE:

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

- Proposed Open Access Principles proposed by the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications
- Canary Mission and the blackballing of liberal faculty
- Medicare Plan Changes
- Senate Bylaw 336
- Revised Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policies

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

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

Academic Affairs: Provost Michael Brown;

Academic Personnel and Programs: Vice Provost Susan Carlson, Executive Director Pamela Peterson, and Academic Policy and Compensation Data Analyst Gregory Sykes;

Finance: Executive Vice President Nathan Brostrom;

UC Health: Executive Vice President Jack Stobo; Executive Director of UC Self-Funded Health Plans Laura Tauber;

Human Resources: COO Rachael Nava, Vice President Dwaine Duckett, Executive Director of Retirement Programs and Services Gary Schlimgen, Executive Director of Benefits Programs and Strategy Michael Baptista, and Director of Benefits Programs Susan Pon-Gee;

Office of the Chief Investment Officer: CIO Jagdeep Bachher, Associate CIO Arthur Guimaraes, and Director of Defined Contributions Products Marco Merz;

External consultants from Mercer, Deloitte, and Segal.

We are particularly grateful for the involvement, support and guidance from the Senate leadership, Chair Robert May and Vice Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani, as well as the advice and perspective provided by Senate Executive Director Hilary Baxter. Finally, the committee is indebted to Kenneth Feer who has provided able staff support.

Respectfully yours, UCFW 2018-19

Sean Malloy, Chair

Jean-Daniel Saphores, Vice Chair

David Hollinger and David Steigmann, UCB
Greg Downs, UCD
Stephen Tucker, UCI
Julie Bower, UCLA
Dan Jeske, UCR
Shelley Halpain, UCSD
Jill Hollenbach, UCSF
Ahmad Atif Ahmad, UCSB
Grant McGuire and Su-Hua Wang, UCSC
David Brownstone, TFIR Chair
Lori Lubin, HCTF Chair
Caroline Kane, CUCEA Chair (ex officio)
Henning Bohn, UCRS Advisory Board Faculty Representative (ex officio)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION Annual Report 2018-19

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Charge of the Committee

According to Academic Senate Bylaw 182, the University Committee on International Education (UCIE) should fulfil the following roles in systemwide governance:

1. Consider and report, in consultation with other Academic Senate committees, on matters of international education and engagement referred to the Committee by the President of the University, the Academic Council, the Assembly, a Divisional or any Senate Committee.
 - a. Report to the Academic Council and other agencies of the Senate and confer with and advise the President and agencies of the University Administration on matters concerning international engagement.
 - b. Initiate policy recommendations regarding international engagement programs and the status and welfare of international students and scholars at UC.
 - c. Evaluate and advise on UC's international service learning or experiential learning programs, except programs whose authorization and supervision is performed independently by the campuses.
2. Provide Continuing review of the Education Abroad Program and its policies.
 - a. Consult with the University Office of Education Abroad Program on future program development, including modification of the programs of existing Study Centers, establishment of new Study Centers, and disestablishment of UCEAP Programs.
 - b. Represent the Senate in the selection of Study Center Directors.
 - c. Maintain liaison with the Council of Campus Directors.
 - d. Advise the University Office of Education Abroad Program Director on all matters of international education.
 - e. Have the responsibility for the final academic review of new Study Centers and Programs after the first three years, and for regular reviews of all centers and programs every ten years or as conditions may require.
 - f. Authorize and supervise all courses and curricula in the Education Abroad Program.

New UCEAP Programs Reviewed in 2018-19

Seoul National University - *Approved*

Business and Entrepreneurship in London - *Approved*

Python and Data Science - *Approved*

Summer Physics at Sapienza University – *Provisionally Approved*

Summer Physics and Rome Tre University – *Provisionally Approved*

Program Review Reports/Reviews

One Year Follow Up for the 2016-17 Thailand 10-Year Review - *Approved*

Follow Up Report for the 2016-17 Czech Republic Three -Year Review - *Approved*

Follow Up for the 2017-18 Argentina Three-Year Review — *Approved*
2017-18 Dominican Republic Three-Year Review – *Approved*
2017-18 Taiwan Three-Year Review – *Approved*
2017-18 Ireland Three-Year Review – *Approved*
2017-18 Brazil and Chile 10-Year Review – *Approved*
One Year Follow Up for the 2016-17 Germany 10-Year Review – *Approved*
2017-18 UK (Sotheby's) Three Year Review – *Approved*
2018-19 France (Lyon 3) Three Year Review - *Approved*
2018-19 Switzerland Three-Year Review – *Approved*

Program Discontinuances/Closures

Mediterranean Food Science and Diet
London – Chelsea, Camberwell, and Wimbledon
Tsuru University – Language and Culture
University of Hong Kong – Global Business in Asia
University of Michigan-Shanghai Jiao Tong University Joint Institute Engineering
Semester in Mumbai with Internship
Studies in English in Lyon

New Program Offerings

International Summer School at University College London
Summer Study in London Program at Sotheby's Institute of Art
Summer Physics (Cork and Edinburgh)
Exchange Program with University of Padova, Italy (Reopening)
Taiwan Summer Lab Research in Engineering and Science (Changes)

Topics of Note During the 2018-19 Year

As a fallout of the state audit, an outside organization (the Huron Group) was consulted to make recommendations about the “footprint” of OP. One of the recommendations it made was to relocate some programs to campuses. UCEAP had an existing MOU with Santa Barbara that has served quite well. Historically, the only money that has come to program from OP has been \$230K a year through tuition buyout from the state that flows through OP. However, it was decided that UCEAP should be removed entirely from the OP books. In addition, the Huron report stated that UCEAP needed a whole new charter and also an entirely new MOU. A new draft MOU was created (good only for one year) which had errors and did not seem to be based on the old MOU or the current organizational chart. There was almost no consultation with the Academic Senate in this process, and the shift was almost invisible.

Final enrollments for UCEAP were 5873, which was an 11 percent increase - mostly in summer STEM. However, there was no tuition increase for UCEAP this year. This was good for students, but problematic for UCEAP. As program costs continue to go up, tuition stagnation becomes concerning. The program has suggested to OP that UCEAP should be due some portion of the one-time funds the University has received through tuition buyout.

Questions were raised as to why students who are going abroad are paying all of the campus fees while they are away. It would seem that some portion of those should probably be excluded since the students are not on campus.

UCEAP is exploring allowing CSU students to come into UCEAP. CSU students would pay Cal State tuition, but everything would be taught to UC standards and syllabi. This will lower the cost for UC students in these programs as well as allow CSU Students to have semester abroad options.

UCEAP has more than 400 programs in 43 countries; about half of those programs are STEM-related. The Director is looking to strengthen UCEAP's connection with its campus partners. She was looking to find ways that UC can harness the power of 10 to leverage finances for everyone's benefit.

One of UCEAP's AI initiatives was compiling a database that can help students, faculty, and advisors see which courses taken abroad have been awarded credit toward major, minor, and GE requirements. The Associate Dean worked on this for four years with the registrars. Originally it was available only to faculty and staff, but later it became available to students. UCEAP also launched a reciprocity website, which was a long time in the coming.

For five years, UCEAP offered Integration Grants of \$5000 each to incentivize academic departments to integrate study abroad into their curricula and majors/minors. Deliverables from the past four years are on the UCEAP website. Departments are encouraged to put degree plans on their websites that show students exactly how/when study abroad can fit into their overall course of study.

In 2018, UCEAP restructured its 2008 business model. The business model was based on assumptions, some of which did not hold true over time. In addition, a variety of UCEAP fees were altered or abandoned. Three suppositions about the viability of the UCEAP business plan were built on tuition increases which did not happen and increased enrollment (which has changed to summer enrollment). UCEAP did get opportunity funds but it did not get a systemwide assessment. The Director said that the 2008 plan was "structurally defective" and that UCEAP was moving to change it. The new plan has two main assumptions:

1. UCEAP to collect and retain all tuition monies, including NRTS. Tuition in all its forms and in its entirety should be allocated to UCEAP when a student participates in its programs, i.e., tuition should follow the student. And
2. Exempt UCEAP participation and program specific fees from return-to-aid.

The Director said that this request would keep UCEAP's operational costs flat and would allow for more grants to the campuses to help pay for financial aid officers and other needs. It also would enable UCEAP to maybe increase the number or amount of scholarships.

There was some concern from the campuses about the launch of the UCEAP student information system. The product will launch on June 30 and will not have the potential that was originally envisioned. The campuses are concerned that the roll-out will not go well and have asked to postpone it to August, but it cannot be done. There will be daily fixes and weekly updates. There was a test group with students at UCSB and they suggested one change and this will be accomplished prior to the launch. From June to August is when UCEAP has about three percent of its applications come in; it is the prime time to test the system with the minimal amount of potential harm. Twice during the past year the student information system has gone down. It is very fragile.

Interim Chair Hourigan suggested a proposal for a systemwide internalization conference. This conference would involve faculty, administration, and staff and would include the development of white papers and best practices to develop a network across the University to facilitate work on international issues. The teaching of language and culture would also need to be addressed in this conference; many campuses have gutted their language programs. The topic of international student mental health and welfare were topics that surfaced frequently in this year's committee discussions and that will likely be addressed as part of the systemwide conference. It is hoped that this effort will be carried over into the 2019-20 year.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Academic Council Chair Robert May, Vice Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani, and Senate Executive Director Hilary Baxter. Thanks also to our UCEAP partners: Vivian- Lee Nyitray, Hsiu-Zu Ho, and Sarah Abraham. Special thanks, too, to our student representatives, who played an active role in this year's committee. We value the voices of our student representatives and hope that they continue to play an active role in the future.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeremy Hourigan, Interim Chair
Julian Schroeder, Vice Chair
Richard Kern (UCB)
Kathy Stuart (UCD)
Zuzana Bic(UCI)
Lothar Von Falkenhausen (UCLA)

Leslie Michelle (UCM)
Nicole Zur Nieden (UCR)
Hyunsun Kim (UCSD)
Gerald Dubowitz (UCSF)
Sathya Guruswamy (UCSB)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

2018-19 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

According to Senate Bylaw 185, the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) shall:

1. Advise the President concerning the administration of the libraries of the University in accordance with the Standing Orders of The Regents and issues related to innovations in forms of scholarly communication. (Am 9 May 2003; Am 9 May 2007)
2. Perform such other appropriate duties as may be committed to the Academic Senate by proper authority.

Principles of Scholarly Communication Document

In 2017-18, UCOLASC developed a declaration of rights and principles in consultation with several different groups – both within UC and at outside institutions - to guide UC in its journal license negotiations with publishers. He consulted multiple stakeholders including faculty, librarians, and administrators, and tried to address the needs of different constituencies. He presented and discussed the Principles document with other Senate committees, and the response was favorable. UCORP, UCAF, UCAP, UCORP, UCFW, UCACC, CCGA, and UCPB all endorsed the Principles, which were subsequently endorsed by Academic Council as a whole in 2018-19.

Transformative Publisher Negotiations

In 2018/19, the Academic Senate and UC Libraries partnered to pursue transformative open access agreements for systemwide journal contracts. The UCOLASC Chair and Vice Chair were invited by the Council of University Librarians (CoUL) to join a strategy and negotiation task force focused on developing sustainable and scalable transformative open access agreements, where subscription payments are converted into open access publishing payments and the widest possible access to scholarly content is secured. The Chair and Vice Chair were also members of the UC negotiation team for the Elsevier contract. UCOLASC and the Academic Senate vetted the task force's goals and participated in several major negotiation decisions, including the decision to reject Elsevier's winter 2019 counter-proposal as well as its informal spring 2019 proposal (both UC decisions received UCOLASC's unanimous support). UCOLASC discussed potential agreement terms, alternative access mechanisms, outreach and communication. UCOLASC and local COLASCs also partnered with the libraries throughout the year to carry out broader faculty engagement and consultation.

The faculty-library partnership that drives UC's principled open access stance has been applauded by the global open access community and is now being replicated at other institutions. UCOLASC will continue to play a key leadership role in major publisher negotiations for transformative open access, and the Chair and Vice Chair will continue to represent faculty on UC's negotiation team.

Consultation with the California Digital Library

Representatives from the California Digital Library (CDL) met with UCOLASC throughout 2018/19 to discuss a variety of topics. CDL gave regular updates on systemwide licensed content negotiations and successful efforts to reduce or contain licensed content costs. The committee also discussed the libraries

ongoing work with HathiTrust, a collaboration of top-tier research universities to archive and share digitized book collections. UC is a founding member and the UC Libraries are actively engaged in HathiTrust governance. In addition to providing access to more than 17 million resources (6.5 million of them in the public domain), HathiTrust also enables computational analysis of its corpus.

CDL received a budget augmentation to cover half of the systems cost and one FTE to support implementation of UC's open access policies; CDL has committed existing funds to cover the remaining systems costs as well as one existing developer FTE to advance this important effort.

CDL's open access publishing and repository platform, eScholarship, now holds over 200K publications, including 81 open access journals. In collaboration with UC Press and the Collaborative Knowledge Foundation, CDL co-developed Editoria, a monograph workflow tool for book production, and hopes to introduce an open access monograph publishing service through eScholarship in 2019/20. CDL is strategizing how to carry out potential platform and service upgrades so that eScholarship can provide a more competitive open access publishing alternative to commercial publishers.

In 2018, CDL and the Dryad Digital Repository announced their partnership to develop an open, community-supported data curation and publishing service. With funding from an IMLS National Infrastructure grant, CDL and Dryad facilitated discussions and workshops to engage community members and determine the services and features most needed. Throughout the year, CDL representatives kept UCOLASC apprised of these activities and engaged the committee for further feedback. The soon to be relaunched Dryad repository will utilize the front-end architecture of CDL's Dash.

Systemwide ILS (SILS) Project Update

Currently, each campus has its own distinct integrated library system (ILS) and a series of systems and services connect the distributed catalogs. The UC Libraries Systemwide ILS Project will move the libraries from ten independent ILSs to a single, shared state-of-the art system. UC is not the first to attempt such a migration; over 50 library consortia from across North America have already migrated to a shared ILS solution. A systemwide ILS will bring about many advantages for the university; discovery of print and electronic collections will be more efficient and accessible, and the interface will be more user friendly. A shared solution will also better enable the institution to leverage data in support of decision-making.

With unanimous support from UCOLASC and other systemwide committees and administrative groups, the libraries successfully secured UCOP funding support for the systemwide ILS project through the Major Projects & Initiatives (MPI) process. The CoUL Chair will continue to engage UCOLASC on this topic, particularly once implementation begins (which likely will not occur until 2020-21).

Office of Scholarly Communication

In 2018/19, the UC Office of Scholarly Communication focused its activity primarily in two areas of interest to UCOLASC:

- Conducting a survey of the use of Current Research Information Systems (CRIS) across the UC system.
- Creating a toolkit to support journal editors and publishers and the organizations or libraries that are working with them to transition subscription journals to open access.

In both cases, OSC worked closely with UCOLASC to gauge faculty interest in and needs related to this work. The CRIS survey seeded a larger discussion within UCACC and Academic Council about the data privacy and policy implications for faculty of CRIS implementations at UC. This discussion spawned a Senate report outlining faculty concerns and a specific set of requests to the Provost, including an expansion of the CRIS survey to gather more information systemwide. The OSC working group that developed the journal "flipping" toolkit (now available on the OSC website) consulted closely with faculty throughout the

process, to identify how best to frame the issues and give academic editors (and those working with them) the information they need to make informed choices about transitioning their journals to OA.

Campus Reports

UCOLASC devoted part of each regular meeting to member reports about issues facing divisional Senate library committees. In these discussions, divisional representatives noted ongoing library budget and space issues on their respective campuses in the context of rising enrollments and changing needs.

Endorsements and Letters of Support

UCOLASC voted unanimously (12-0) to endorse a statement asking all UC stakeholders to stand firm in their support of our negotiating position with Elsevier and in their commitment to open access publishing. This was subsequently endorsed by Academic Council, which then issued a similar statement.

UCOLASC voted unanimously (12-0) to endorse co-sponsoring an “Open Access Tipping Point Event” in Washington, DC with the CDL. This was endorsed by Academic Council.

UCOLASC provided feedback on the “Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Copyright Ownership.”

UCOLASC provided a statement to Academic Council on “Support for a Working Group/Task Force on Academic Freedom for Non-Senate Academic Employees.”

UCOLASC sent the *Rights and Principles for Transforming Scholarly Communication* to Academic Council. Council endorsed the UCOLASC Principles.

UCOLASC sent a statement to Academic Council on “Faculty consultation regarding library space and removal of print materials.”

UCOLASC collaborated with UCACC to develop a report on Research Information Management Systems (RIMS), which was endorsed by Academic Council and sent to President Napolitano.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Academic Council Chair Robert May, Vice Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani, and Senate Executive Director Hilary Baxter. Thanks also to the consultants who provided indispensable expertise and contributed so much of their valuable time to helping UCOLASC fulfill its mission.

Respectfully submitted:

Rich Schneider, Chair (UCSF)
Dennis Ventry, Vice Chair (UCD)
Geoffrey Koziol (UCB)
Katherine Olmstead (UCD)
Aaron Barth/Tim Bruckner (UCI)
Derjung Mimi Tarn (UCLA)

Maria DePrano (UCM)
Jiayu Liao (UCR)
Oumelbanine Nina Zhiri (UCSD)
Marta Margeta (UCSF)
Rene Weber (UCSB)
Karen M. Ottemann (UCSC)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB) ANNUAL REPORT 2018-19

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) met ten times in Academic Year 2018-19 to conduct business pursuant 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 *University-wide 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:

BUDGET, ENROLLMENT, STATE RELATIONS, AND ADVOCACY

The University’s Chief Financial Officer, Associate Vice President for Budget Analysis and Planning, State Government Relations Director, and other senior administrators, joined UCPB each month to discuss the development of the 2019-20 State and University budgets and the progress of budget negotiations and advocacy efforts in Sacramento, including efforts to make permanent the one-time funding provided by the State in the 2018-19 budget and to secure permanent new funding to support enrollment growth, mandatory cost increases, deferred maintenance, and other needs. The Committee also received regular briefings from UCOP on the development of the Multi-year Planning Framework, a proposed four-year budget and enrollment plan focused on increasing undergraduate degree attainment, closing the achievement gap between different student groups, and investing in the next generation of faculty and research. UCOP also made presentations on UC’s cost structure and cost drivers, the UCOP budget, and UCOP’s efforts to meet the requirements of the 2017 audit of UCOP budget and accounting practices.

UCPB was disappointed with the final state budget to the extent that it did not address the University’s requests for additional permanent funding. While UCPB appreciated the additional one-time funds provided, it emphasized that UC needs permanent revenue streams to continue providing a world-class educational experience. UCPB lamented the effect of past unfunded state enrollment mandates, and observed that campuses are constrained by a lack of classrooms, dorms, teaching labs, and other facilities, and that the student experience and the long-term value of the UC degree are enhanced by smaller class sizes, more frequent opportunities for personal interactions with faculty, and opportunities to engage in deeper learning. UCPB observed the large gap between the health of the state economy and the size of the UC budget, and noted that the University will need to fundamentally reframe its position with the state to stop losing ground. This will require UC to speak honestly about how budget cuts are affecting quality and to show evidence of declines. UC should not suggest that it can get by with less State funding.

UCPB encouraged administrators to highlight the campuses’ resource needs, to communicate the negative consequences of underfunding and over-enrollment on educational quality and the student experience, and to reflect on the limits or failures of current advocacy strategies to move the needle. UCPB called for meaningful planning that broadens the State’s exclusive focus on undergraduate affordability and access, to address the overall educational environment and academic quality, including operating budgets, capital projects, and research. It encouraged UCOP to develop metrics to showcase UC’s unique mission as a Research I University and how the research mission helps drive the state economy; and to engage faculty in developing stronger messages on these themes.

Finance Policy and Issues

UCOP leaders briefed UCPB on asset optimization initiatives and capital strategies that help UC manage liabilities, reduce administrative expenses, and generate additional unrestricted revenues for the campuses, including the reallocation of STIP funds to TRIP, and the use of STIP borrowing to fund the UCRP Annual Required Contribution. UCOP also discussed UC's use of systemwide debt to finance capital projects, its efforts to restructure debt to achieve cash flow savings, its use of Limited Project Revenue Bonds and public-private partnerships to fund new housing projects, and UC's plan to pursue a return to General Obligation bonds as a mechanism to fund capital growth and renewal. UCPB supported these strategies as means to help supplement unpredictable State funding. UCOP also briefed UCPB on a UCRP experience study that resulted in recommended changes to actuarial assumptions for UCRP. UCPB expects to be involved next year in the discussion of options for addressing the resulting increase in UCRP's accrued liability.

Cohort Tuition

UCPB reviewed several models for cohort-based tuition pricing scenarios that guarantee entering undergraduates a tuition level for the duration of their enrollment. UCPB expressed support for predictable tuition increases in principle, noting that regular, moderate, inflationary-based increases would be attractive to students and families looking for predictability and would also provide the University with a more stable revenue strategy. However, UCPB members did not uniformly support the cohort approach as a means to achieve predictable revenue. Members noted the challenge of ensuring stable and predictable state support, and were skeptical that the Regents or Legislature would support a cohort plan, given its assumption of 3% annual base tuition increases. They also noted that a cohort model locking in tuition revenue would not respond well to dramatic shifts in State funding, and that any cohort plan should be tied to a contractual agreement with the state that guarantees steady inflationary-based funding and that gives UC an out in case the state does not follow through.

Enhancing Budget Engagement

UCPB discussed the need to increase Academic Senate engagement in budget and planning discussions at both the campus and systemwide levels, particularly during the early stages of UC budget development in the summer. Chair Steintrager sent the Senate chair a plan for engaging UCPB on budget matters in summer. It was agreed that UCPB leadership (chair, vice chair, and incoming vice chair) would remain in contact with the UCOP budget office over the summer for information and consultation, and would brief and consult the full UCPB on budget developments via email and/or short videoconferences, as needed.

SELF-SUPPORTING GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS (SSGPDPs)

UCPB/CCGA/UCAP REVIEW

Chair May asked UCPB, CCGA, and UCAP to lead an evaluation of the self-supporting graduate and professional degree (SSGPDP) program, focused on the overarching program's success and effectiveness; impact on educational goals, campus budgets, state-supported programs, diversity, faculty effort and the evaluation of faculty advancement; the extent to which SSGPDPs are appropriate within a public university; and how the systemwide review process has improved proposed SSGPDPs. In November, administrators from the UC Budget Office and Office of Institutional Research & Academic Planning joined UCPB to present historical and demographic data on SSGPDPs, discuss the components of the UCOP cost analysis template campuses submit

with their initial SSGPDP proposals, and describe how UCOP calculates campus-specific indirect cost (IDC) rates used in the template. UCPB, CCGA, and UCAP then developed a survey about SSGPDPs for distribution to campuses. However, as UCI had just put together two task forces looking at SSGPDPs, the committees decided to pilot the survey at UCI with the help of staff there. After the survey results became available in June, the three committees reviewed the information gathered, and submitted an interim report to Council. The report outlined what is knowable and unknowable through current data collection processes, and recommended data points campuses should track to answer academic and financial questions about SSGPDPs, including: the use of SSGPDP revenues; how SSGPDPs maintain academic quality on par with state-supported programs; the ratio of ladder-rank faculty teaching done on-load or overload; diversity and access; student learning objectives and outcomes; and the role of SSGPDPs in the academic review and merit system. CCGA was also collating completed program reviews of approved SSGPDPs to further analyze trends. The committees will continue and complete their review in the new academic year.

REVIEW OF INDIVIDUAL SSGPDPs

Per the Compendium, CCGA leads the main systemwide review of proposed SSGPDPs, while UCPB provides financial analysis to CCGA after assigning a lead reviewer to assess the business plan and market analysis. UCPB reviewed 11 SSGPDPs this academic year, a significant increase in workload over past years. All UCPB members served as lead or co-lead reviewer for at least one SSGPDP.

- UCI Master of Presentation Design
- UCI Master of Engineering
- UCR Master of Supply Chain and Logistics Management
- UCB Flexible MSW
- UCD Online MBA
- UCB Master of Design
- UCLA Master of Legal Studies
- UCSF Master of Genetic Counseling
- UCI Master of Data Science
- UCSF School of Nursing Supplemental Studies in Advance Practice in Nursing Certificate
- UCI Conversation of MA in English to SSGPDP

UCPB's lead reviewers were thorough and thoughtful in their assessments. They noted when SSGPDP proposals included strong academic and market justifications, as well as well-documented academic, business, and facilities usage plans. When appropriate, they asked programs to clarify the following issues: accuracy of and support for the market analysis; contingency plans if enrollments fail to meet projections; the accounting of IDC to the campus for facilities usage; the teaching obligations of ladder rank faculty and the sustainability of overload teaching; return-to-aid and financial accessibility plans; and mechanisms for ensuring the separation of the state-funded and self-supporting components of mixed enrollment courses. UCPB also withheld endorsement of several specific proposals. It was particularly skeptical about a proposal for a UC campus to use a private Online Program Manager to handle services such as course development, student demand analysis, recruitment, and marketing, and suggested that the University first consider ILTI before outsourcing UC education to private, for-profit vendors.

UCPB has long been concerned that it has no way to assess the financial performance of SSGPDPs

after they have been established and was disinclined to approve more SSGPDPs without convincing budget projections showing meaningful net budget gains. Data on fiscal outcomes relative to projections would help inform UCPB about what comprises a realistic SSGPDP budget model. UCPB felt that its review would also benefit from improved data about how the SSGPDP plans to use revenues and state-funded resources; compensate the campus for its use of services and facilities; and how the campus calculates its IDC rates. UCPB was also concerned that the high cost of SSGPDPs makes them less accessible to underprivileged populations and was skeptical about the ethics of charging high tuition rates for reproductions of existing state programs. It encouraged programs to monitor access and diversity trends through an ongoing analysis of data on the socioeconomic, gender, and racial composition of SSGPDP applicants and enrollees. UCPB has expressed interest in working more closely with CCGA to coordinate SSGPDP reviews and to regularize and gain access to three-year divisional reviews of new SSGPDPs per the [2016 SSGPDP policy](#).

NEW UCPB SSGPDP REVIEW TEMPLATE

UCPB approved a revised template for the committee's review of SSGPDPs, which elaborates on questions in the current template to better align with the [2016 policy](#) and more completely address UCPB's concerns about topics such as the IDC rate proposed for SSGPDPs and how they are determined; the planned use of net revenues; the disposition and compensation of faculty serving the program; the program's impacts on state-funded programs and the research mission; and how it will ensure accessibility and diversity.

UCOP RESTRUCTURING

UCPB responded to several UCOP proposals inspired by the Huron Consulting Group to restructure or relocate systemwide programs, including UC's Mexico entities, the UC Center in Sacramento, the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and the Research Grants Program Office.

UC MEXICO

UCPB submitted comments on the *State Assessment Report for Systemwide Mexico Entities*, a proposal to consolidate three systemwide UC programs related to educational and research activities with Mexico. UCPB expressed support for consolidating the UC MEXUS MRU, the UC-Mexico Initiative, and Casa de California; phasing-out the UC Mexico Initiative; maintaining the MRU structure and UCR home for UC MEXUS; folding funding for the UC-Mexico Initiative into the new consolidated entity; expanding the scope of the new entity into a broader range of disciplines and research interests; and reimagining the mission of Casa de California to expand its availability to a wider range of UC constituencies.

UC DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

UCPB submitted comments on the draft report of President Napolitano's UC ANR Advisory Committee and its recommended options for the structure, governance, and funding of the Division of ANR (UC-ANR). The comments were authored by UCPB's Task Force on Agriculture and Natural Resources (TF-ANR). Professor Mary Gauvain joined UCPB in October to discuss her role as Senate representative on the UC ANR Advisory Committee. TF-ANR endorsed the recommendations to maintain UC ANR's status as a systemwide program within UCOP; to maintain campus oversight and responsibility for State AES funds; and to establish an ANR Governing Council as a means to enhance the Senate's role in shared governance and oversight of the ANR budget. TF-ANR also recommended a more fundamental rethinking of ANR's mission and relation

to the non-AES campuses, targeting the need for greater integration between ANR and all campuses.

UC CENTER IN SACRAMENTO

UCPB submitted comments on the *State Assessment Report for the UC Center in Sacramento* (UCCS), a plan to increase the financial health and sustainability of UCCS. UCPB endorsed most of the Report's financial recommendations, and agreed that UCCS must address its projected budget deficit to maintain and strengthen its high-quality education, research, and public engagement programs. UCPB also agreed that UC should promote more diverse and inclusive participation in UCCS to ensure that students and faculty from across the system and a variety of backgrounds have the chance to engage with policymakers and policy issues. It endorsed the Report's recommendation to increase philanthropic giving to support expanded outreach activities, and recommended that UCOP consider a development officer dedicated to systemwide programs such as UCCS.

RESEARCH GRANTS PROGRAM OFFICE

UCPB submitted comments on the *State Assessment Report for the Research Grants Program Office* (RGPO). UCPB expressed support for the Report's recommendation to maintain RGPO's administrative home at UCOP; identify new funding streams to counterbalance diminished research support, including expanding RGPO's scope to grant-making for non-research related activities; reorganize RGPO's internal organizational structure and staffing model to improve efficiency; and make other improvements to increase the accountability and transparency of RGPO's operations and finances. UCPB also supported the restoration of MRPI funding, and recommended that UCOP ramp-up its central development and fundraising functions to support RGPO and other central activities and initiatives.

PUBLISHER NEGOTIATIONS AND OPEN ACCESS

Members of the UC Publisher Negotiation Team (representing the California Digital Library, the UC Librarians, and the Academic Senate) joined UCPB to discuss the University's negotiations with scholarly journal publishers for journal subscription contract renewals. Team members described UC's efforts to reduce escalating and unsustainable costs, transition UC from a subscription-based model to an open access (OA) model, and implement as a medium-term sustainability strategy a multi-payer "publish and read" model agreement that moves all UC-authored articles to an OA model, with fees divided between authors and UC libraries. UCPB was persuaded that the "publish and read" model is a viable alternative to the current system, and financially sound.

The chair of UCOLASC returned to UCPB in May and asked the committee to endorse UCOLASC's *Declaration of Rights and Principles to Transform Scholarly Communication*, an aspirational document outlining a set of principles and an ideal future state of scholarly publishing that gives faculty control over their publications and enables the broad dissemination of scholarship. UCPB endorsed the Principles as ideals and expressed support for the progress UC is making in negotiations with publishers.

REVIEWS OF MULTI-CAMPUS RESEARCH UNITS (MRUs)

UCPB participated in the five-year reviews of two Multi-campus Research Units: the UC Institute for Nuclear and Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology (INPAC) and the UC Humanities Research Institute (UCHRI). Following procedures outlined in the Compendium, the reviews were performed

by a Joint Senate Review Committee, led by UCORP with input from UCPB and CCGA. UCORP's chair and vice chair joined UCPB's March meeting to discuss the reviews, which evaluated the systemwide value and quality of the MRUs. Asad Ahmed, and then Jessica Trounstone, represented UCPB on the UCHRI review subcommittee. Steven Constable represented UCPB on the INPAC review subcommittee. UCPB representatives conferred with UCPB members on budget-related questions, and UCPB also reviewed and commented on the final draft reports.

In addition, several UCPB and Academic Council members questioned whether UCHRI should continue to have an MRU status and expressed support for making its funding infrastructure permanent, given its unique mission in serving the research interests of an entire subset of faculty who work in the humanities. Chair May asked UCPB and UCORP to consider a possible alternative status for UCHRI. UCORP Chair Andrew Baird met with UCPB in June for a preliminary discussion of this issue.

UCPB TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES (TF-ANR)

Vice Chair Kaufman chaired TF-ANR, which met six times this year, by videoconference. TF-ANR first met in November to consider and respond to the report of the President's UC ANR Advisory Committee. At subsequent meetings, TF-ANR discussed Chair May's request to expand on a recommendation it made to further integrate non-AES campuses more fully into ANR's research and service missions, and as part of this, generated a list of recommendations, both modest and more ambitious, for changes and initiatives that would enhance the effectiveness and reach of ANR. In January, CFO Brostrom briefed TF-ANR on the hybrid funding model proposed for ANR, and former Senate Chair Dan Hare discussed potential ways TF-ANR might focus its work. In February, TF-ANR met with the three Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) deans for their individual perspectives on the AES funding model; the use of AES funds; and the potential for greater integration of non-AES campuses with the AES mission. ANR Vice President Humiston joined TF-ANR in March and June to discuss ANR's activities and priorities. The April and June meetings included the Academic Senate representatives to the new ANR Governing Council. Discussion with the representatives focused on opportunities for enhancing Senate engagement in ANR. It was agreed that the three representatives should have a formal connection to the larger Senate, and the representatives expressed a willingness to work with TF-ANR to communicate the Senate's views and goals. TF-ANR also discussed whether it should continue alongside the new Governing Council, and/or adopt another structure, possibly under the aegis of UCORP, or of UCORP-UCPB jointly, given TF-ANR's interest in research policy issues. Members expressed a preference for continuing alongside the new Governing Council and for retaining the current structure of a task force reporting solely to one parent committee. In April, Vice Chair Kaufman briefed the Academic Council on the status of TF-ANR.

OTHER BRIEFINGS AND ISSUES

Faculty Housing and Home Ownership: Director of Home Loan Programs Ruth Assily and Director of Capital Markets Finance Jean Yin joined UCPB to discuss the current status of the Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) and other University efforts to assist in homeownership for faculty. UCPB raised the possibility of using the University's debt capacity to facilitate home co-ownership between the University and faculty.

Online Education: Innovation Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Director Ellen Osmundson

briefed UCPB on ILTI's use of funding to support the development of online learning technologies and systemwide UC undergraduate courses available to students at any UC campus through a cross-campus enrollment system. UCPB supported ILTI as part of UC's larger strategy to enhance student access to high demand courses; improve learning and timely graduation; and support faculty innovations in online pedagogy. UCPB also encouraged ILTI to gather more data about the effectiveness of online courses, and their effect on access for different populations.

Proposed Online Major in Business Administration: UC Irvine's Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs and Senior Associate Dean in the School of Business joined UCPB to discuss the School's proposal to offer a BA in Business Administration as a fully online undergraduate degree program. The systemwide Senate deemed the BA a "first of its kind" program requiring systemwide Senate review. UCEP led the review.

UC Path: UCPB met with UC Path administrators to discuss concerns about the implementation of Path, including those from graduate students paid from multiple sources about the accuracy of paychecks, and concerns from students, faculty, and staff about a lack of effective communication in resolving problems. Administrators described processes in place to identify and correct technical and business problems; preventative measures to inform subsequent deployments; and improvements to programming and operations that have helped improve pay accuracy and customer service. UCPB expressed strong concerns that Path was bleeding money with no evidence of improved efficiency or service, and the committee felt that Path was getting an overly optimistic view of the rollout by communicating only with high level administration. They encouraged Path to communicate with front-line managers, and, when possible, to draw on established knowledge, behaviors, and processes.

Compendium Reviews: UCPB endorsed proposals for a new School of Public Health at UCSD and a Seventh Undergraduate College at UCSD.

Campus Reports: UCPB set aside a portion of each meeting for member updates about issues under discussion on campuses and local budget and planning committees. These briefings touched on a wide range of topics, including: faculty participation in long-term strategic academic planning groups and exercises; campus plans to accommodate enrollment growth; practices on UC campuses for preserving access to impacted majors; campus experiences with Responsibility Center Management (RCM) budget models; local academic and space planning issues; problems associated with the cost and implementation of UC Path; and the serious struggles campuses are having adjusting to the new normal of underfunding.

Survey of CPB Practices: UCPB compiled a survey of campus CPBs' structures, operations, and resources, including compensation for committee leadership, which was distributed to UCPB members as an informational resource.

Senate Leadership Briefings: The Academic Council chair and vice chair attended a portion of each UCPB meeting to brief the committee on business from Academic Council and Board of Regents meetings, and other systemwide issues of particular interest to UCPB or of general interest to the faculty. These briefings included the status of budget and enrollment negotiations with the state; proposed legislation affecting the University; a proposed affiliation between UCSF and Dignity Healthcare; Faculty Salaries; a proposed Memorial to the Regents; Retiree Healthcare issues, and efforts to extend academic freedom to non-Senate academic appointees.

Student Representatives: UCPB's undergraduate and graduate student representatives were active

participants in a wide range of committee discussions. They effectively conveyed their personal views and concerns, as well as those from their student peers and colleagues. They were particularly vocal in discussions about tuition and the importance of preserving middle-class affordability. They also emphasized the importance of preserving educational quality in several contexts, including the growth of SSGPDPs and their possible negative effects on state-supported programs and the connection of state disinvestment to reductions in available classroom space, reduced faculty office hours, and an increasing number of classes scheduled at irregular times.

UCPB REPRESENTATION

Chair James Steintrager represented UCPB at meetings of the Academic Council, the Assembly of the Academic Senate, the Academic Planning Council, the UC Education Abroad Program Advisory Committee, and its Finance Subcommittee, which he chaired; and the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues. Vice Chair Kaufman led the Task Force on Agriculture and Natural Resources. Steven Gross represented UCPB on the UCFW Task Force on Investments and Retirement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

UCPB benefited from regular consultations with Executive Vice President & CFO Nathan Brostrom; Associate Vice President for Budget Analysis and Planning David Alcocer, Director of State Government Relations Kieran Flaherty and Associate Director Seija Virtanen. UCPB is also grateful to the following committee consultants and guests for their valuable contributions: Director of Academic Planning Todd Greenspan; IRAP Analyst Chris Procello; Director of Operating Budget Cain Diaz; Chief Strategy Officer Zoanne Nelson; Vice President for Institutional Research and Academic Planning Pamela Brown; ILTI Director Ellen Osmundson; Director of Home Loan Programs Ruth Assily, Director of Capital Markets Finance Jean Yin; Associate Vice President for Operational Services Mark Cianca; UC Path Director Dan Russi; and the UC Publisher Negotiation Team (Richard Schneider, Ivy Anderson, Günter Waibel, Jeffrey MacKie-Mason, Mathew Willmott). UCPB also appreciates the contributions of the faculty who attended UCPB meetings as alternates for regular committee members: Tamara Afifi (UCSB), Bo Huang (UCSF), and James Earthman (UCI).

Respectfully submitted:

James Steintrager, Chair (UCI)	Steven Constable (UCSD)
Eleanor Kaufman, Vice Chair (UCLA)	Aditi Bhargava (UCSF)
Asad Ahmed (UCB-fall)	João Hespanha (UCSB-fall)
Richard Stanton (UCB-winter/spring)	Christopher Newfield (UCSB-winter/spring)
Robert Powell (UCD-fall)	Bruce Schumm (UCSC)
Ahmet Palazoglu (UCD-winter/spring)	Nikola Draganic (Undergraduate Student)
Steven Gross (UCI)	Chamroeunpaul Cheean (Graduate Student)
Jens Palsberg (UCLA)	Robert May, <i>ex officio</i>
Jessica Trounstone (UCM)	Kum-Kum Bhavnani, <i>ex officio</i>
Katherine Kinney (UCR)	Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the 2018-2019 Academic Year, the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) held two in-person meetings and two videoconferences and UCOPE's English for Multilingual Students Advisory Group met once. Both groups considered matters in accordance with their duties as set forth in Senate Bylaw 192, which states that UCOPE shall advise the President on matters relating to preparatory and remedial education (including the language needs of students from diverse linguistic backgrounds); monitor and conduct periodic reviews and evaluations of preparatory and remedial education; supervise the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR); monitor the development and use of placement examinations in mathematics; and work with the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) to communicate these standards to all high schools and colleges in California.

A summary of the committee's activities and accomplishments follows below:

REVIEW AND SELECTION OF AWPE ESSAY PROMPTS

Under the leadership of consultant Jon Lang, UCOPE members approved selected writing prompts to be used in the 2019 UC-Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) administration, in accord with Senate Regulation 636B.1. This annual event involved UCOPE members evaluating excerpts from a variety of publications for which the AWPE Committee has secured copyright permission. At the April meeting, under the guidance of AWPE Committee Chair Lang, samples of student exams were read and calibrated in advance of the May administration.

STANDARDIZED TESTING TASK FORCE

In July 2018, President Napolitano requested that the Senate evaluate the use of standardized tests for UC admissions and determine whether any changes in admission testing policies or practices are necessary to ensure that the University continues to use standardized tests in an appropriate way. It is worth noting that more than 1,000 universities in the U.S. have stopped requiring the SAT and ACT in recent years and that nine UC campuses are among the 13 colleges that currently still require the ACT Writing or SAT Essay for freshman admission. UCOPE's Chair has served on [Academic Council's Standardized Testing Task Force](#) (STTF), which held its first meeting in February. The STTF's investigation will continue into the new Academic Year, with the expectation that recommendations will be forthcoming in early 2020.

SENATE REGULATION 636.E

Last year, the committee had several discussions about [Senate Regulation 636.E](#), which limited the ways UC students could satisfy the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) and how transfer credit is granted. In January, the committee approved a revision proposed by UCSB designed to give campuses the discretion to allow students to petition to allow the credits from another institution's course to count. In May, Council considered clarifying suggestions from Senate reviewers, and settled on a modified version of the revisions put forward by the Committee on Educational Policy and the revision was approved by the Assembly in June.

SATISFACTION OF THE ELWR AT THE CAMPUSES

As a result of discussions last year, it became clear that differing policies for how students who fail the AWPE can satisfy the ELWR once at a UC campus may have contributed to some of the criticism of the Exam and Requirement. This year, the committee reviewed the processes at each campus and discussed practices and policies that may contribute to satisfaction of the ELWR or that may be problematic. Most campuses did not have data on the number of students who fail to satisfy the ELWR and the available

data did not suggest that the requirement is leading to the dismissal of significant numbers of students. An important point that may not be well understood is that Senate Regulation 636 affords campuses significant autonomy over the curriculum utilized for ELWR satisfying courses. These discussions will continue next year and the committee may propose that UCOPE partner with BOARS and UCEP to update a 2002 study of the ELWR.

CONCERNS ABOUT THE AWPE

UCOPE had in-depth discussions about the positive and negative aspects of the systemwide Analytical Writing Placement Exam throughout the year. The committee continued its measured approach to assessing the AWPE's efficacy and to determining if any components of the AWPE, such as the specifications or the instructions to students, should be updated. The committee was also interested in assessing if the AWPE disproportionately impacts students from Under Represented Groups (URGs). In the spring, UCOPE received a memo from some Vice Provosts and Deans for Undergraduate Education (VPDUEs) describing their concerns about the Exam and the ELWR. This memo led to continued robust discussion about the ELWR in subsequent UCOPE meetings. The VPDUE memo also prompted a written response from a number of Writing Program Administrators which addressed several inaccurate or incomplete statements from the memo. The memo often conflated the Academic Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) and the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). This VPDUE memo, lack of awareness of this memo by several (but not all) UCOPE Senate members and subsequent response from UC Writing Program Administrators, serve to highlight the lack of communication amongst interested parties on several of our campuses. Moving forward, it is essential for divisional committees to actively engage with their respective VPDUEs and for the Senate to have a broader discussion about how the ELWR is operationalized (which includes the use of the AWPE).

EMS ADVISORY GROUP

The campuses continue to actively manage issues related to the increased enrollment of students who are multilingual including international students as well as native students whose primary language is not English. During its meeting this year, the EMS Advisory Group discussed new and ongoing challenges related to placement, budget, and specific services/supports for this particular student population.

UCOPE REPRESENTATION

UCOPE Chair Francis represented the committee at meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

UCOPE gratefully acknowledges the contributions of these UCOP and campus consultants over the past year: AWPE Committee Chair and Chief Reader Jon Lang; EMS Advisory Group Chair Dana Ferris and all members of the EMS Advisory Group; AWPE Coordinator Julie Lind; Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions Laura Hardy; Interim Associate Vice President and Director of Undergraduate Admissions Han Mi Yoon-Wu; Institutional Research Analyst Matt Reed; and Tongshan Chang, Director, Institutional Research and Academic Planning. The committee also thanks the numerous faculty members who, as alternates, kindly represented their respective campuses at UCOPE meetings this year.

Respectfully submitted,

Darlene Francis, Chair (B)
Matthew Stratton (D)
Deborah Willis (R)
VyVy Young (SF)
Brandi Catanese (B)
David Casper (I)

Debra Lewis (SC)
Jesus Sandoval-Hernandez (M)
Eric Prietp (SB)
Jeff Gagnon (SD)
Breuce Cooperstine (SC)
Steven Clayman (LA)

Madeleine Sorapure (BOARS Representative)
Elena Koslova (Graduate Student Representative)

Robert May (Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (D))
Kum-Kum Bhavnano (Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (SB))
Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

University Committee on Research Policy

Annual Report 2018-19

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; formulating, coordinating, and revising general research policies and procedures; and advising the President on research. UCORP met nine times during the 2018-19 academic year, including two meetings held via videoconference. This report summarizes the committee's activities during the year.

MRU REVIEWS – UC HUMANITIES RESEARCH INSTITUTE (UCHRI) AND THE INSTITUTE FOR NUCLEAR AND PARTICLE ASTROPHYSICS AND COSMOLOGY (INPAC)

In 2018-19 UCORP led two five-year reviews for the Academic Senate. The committee split into two groups and, per the 2014 Compendium's "Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Multicampus Research Units," added representatives from CCGA and UCPB to conduct reviews of the UC Humanities Research Institute (UCHRI) and the Institute for Nuclear and Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology (INPAC). The two reports were completed in April and sent to the Academic Council for approval and transmittal to the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. At its May 22, 2019, meeting, the Academic Council approved the Five-Year Reviews.

The UCHRI Review Committee concluded that UCHRI facilitated and enhanced humanities research across the UC campuses, ensured vital support for graduate education, provided noteworthy public service, and brought distinction and national recognition to the UC system. The Committee recommended that UCHRI continue as an MRU and made suggestions regarding increased communication, transparency, participation and diversity.

The INPAC Review Committee found that the INPAC MRU played an important role in dark matter research even beyond UC. It used local and central funding to catalyze new research and training and, by providing different core capacities, helped its members to launch significant and extramural funding research projects. In recent years, however, the loss of central support has led to a waning of its activities. The Committee recommended that INPAC should reinvigorate its stakeholders by engaging in strategic planning for future governance and succession planning, revising its organizational framework, developing a sustainable funding plan, and organizing outreach.

MRUS AND OTHER SYSTEMWIDE RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Although there is an updated list of nine MRUs (multicampus research units) that have verified their interest in continuing as designated MRUs within the UC system, other multicampus activities exist outside of the formal MRU designation. UCORP was provided with list of these organizations and members discussed mechanisms to monitor the accomplishments of these units. Topics identified for future discussion included defining the requirements for MRU status and determining whether – and how – funding should be attached to formal designation as an MRU.

The committee also discussed the current MRU review process and potential changes to simplify the procedure for five-year MRU reviews.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONCERNS AROUND SENSITIVE INFORMATION IN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

UCORP members were briefed on the activities of two “Tiger Teams” convened by the President and Council of Chancellors to provide guidance and recommendations on vulnerabilities associated with international students and on sensitive information related to international agreements. UCORP members noted that as the landscape of research changes, effective communication will become even more critical within UC and nationally. Members offered several suggestions to improve the dissemination of information on campuses including better use of local campus CORs.

In June, UC’s Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Alexander Bustamante joined the meeting with Systemwide Research Compliance Officer Shanda Hunt to discuss UC’s compliance plans in response to the governments concerns on sensitive information and to seek UCORP’s input. UCORP members expressed concern about the February letters from President Napolitano and the potential of escalation procedures particularly in regards to potential racialization. UCORP was informed that compliance plans will focus on conflicts of commitment and conflicts of interest, not national origin, with an overarching goal of protecting research integrity. UCORP was supportive of activities that can preemptively prevent onerous and potentially over reaching governmental regulations on research, scholarly activities and academic freedom.

FETAL TISSUE RESEARCH AND THE INCREASED POLITICIZATION OF SCIENCE

UCORP discussed how the committee would respond to proposed restrictions from the federal government on the use of fetal tissue for research and expanded discussions to the much larger issue of increased politicization of science. UCORP and the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) wrote letters to the Academic Council urging the Academic Council and the University to take a strong stand against the ongoing politicization of research and research funding. The letters were endorsed by the Academic Council in February, and forwarded to President Napolitano on March 4.¹

COMPOSITE BENEFIT RATE

Last year, UCORP members were advised of problems in the implementation of the “Composite Benefit Rate” structure when it had been rolled out at some campuses. The change from actual benefits to composites was meant to provide a simplified and predictable way to forecast employee benefit costs throughout the UC system. However, it caused problems for some multi-year sponsored awards and research grants. UCORP, in conjunction with UCFW, brought the matter to the attention of the Academic Council, which sent a letter to President Napolitano.² As a result, additional mitigation efforts on the campuses were identified.

¹ https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/rm-jn-politicization-of-science.pdf

² https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/rm-jn-composite-benefit-rates.pdf

TOPICAL PRESENTATION: UC AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Last May, UC Berkeley Professor Daniel Kammen spoke at a UCORP meeting in the spring about innovations in carbon neutrality and climate stability. This year, UCORP followed up on its interest in UC's work on climate change with a presentation by some of UC's foremost experts: UC Davis Professor Ben Houlton, Professor V. "Ram" Ramanathan of UCSD/Scripps, and UC Merced Professor Roger Bales. They were joined by UCOP Associate Vice President for Energy and Sustainability David Phillips. Professors Houlton and Ramanathan are co-chairs of the California Collaborative for Climate Change Solutions (C4S), which was founded at UC but has expanded to include institutions throughout the state. Its mission is to "accelerate the translation of research findings into practical climate solutions, to test innovative technologies through high-impact pilot projects, and to rapidly scale promising solutions to the national and global level." An outcome of the "Bending the Curve" Report,³ the next steps for C4S are to establish a formal MOU, convene a scoping committee, institutionalize the organization within UC, and expand to other partners. The co-chairs asked UCORP for input on how to achieve this within the university structure.

Professor Ramanathan described a hybrid course⁴ based on "Bending the Curve" that was developed at UC and is now available for use worldwide. At UCOP, the UC Global Climate Leadership Council was formed in 2014 to advise on UC's carbon neutrality and sustainability goals. UCORP members learned that UC is an electricity service provider that uses solar and wind energy sources.

Professor Bales described a proposed resolution for UC faculty that asks campus leaders to acknowledge that achieving carbon neutrality is core to UC's mission and to prioritize activities to assure that the 2025 carbon neutrality goal is met. The resolution asks faculty at all levels get engaged to help address the challenge of climate change and for UC to develop mechanisms to address, describe, and communicate the urgency of climate change and the importance of sustainability. UCORP Chair Baird brought a version of the resolution to the Academic Council for discussion in June.

UC UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (DRONE) POLICY

In April, Brandon Stark, the Director of the UC Center of Excellence on Unmanned Aircraft System Safety and UCOP Environmental Health and Safety Executive Director Ken Smith provided UCORP with an update on the implementation of UC's Drone Policy. The UC Unmanned Aircraft System (Drone) Policy went into effect February 2018. The implementation included a web application that collects information from UC's drone users and goes into a central repository. UC has been collecting and analyzing the data to find out where there may be issues. The implementation is still fairly new, but UCORP was impressed with the work being done by and the follow-up to UCORP's recommendations from last year. In June, UCORP Chair Andrew Baird sent a letter to Academic Council Chair Robert May conveying the committee's findings.

OTHER TOPICS COVERED BY UCORP THIS YEAR INCLUDED:

³ <https://www.collabra.org/collections/special/bending-the-curve/>

⁴ <https://bendingthecurve.ucsd.edu>

Self-Supporting Programs – UCORP members expressed concern about the proliferation of self-supporting programs on some campuses and their impact on the research enterprise. UCORP learned that a comprehensive review of UC’s self-supporting programs is underway by other Academic Senate committees, and so committee members agreed to follow up next year.

RIMS – The committee learned about Research Information Management Systems (RIMS), which are software and services that aggregate, curate, and utilize information about research, generally for measurement purposes. For-profit companies are using UC data and marketing their commercial products to academic units and research administrators for use in faculty evaluations among other purposes. A new study from the office of the systemwide Provost will seek to catalog and understand the use of these systems on the campuses.

UC Affiliations – UCORP endorsed the summary of the “Interim Report of the UC Academic Senate UC Non-Discrimination in Healthcare Task Force” that the university should stand by its mission and values in its affiliations. At the behest of Academic Council Chair Robert May, UCORP members discussed a proposed affiliation between UCSF and Dignity Health that would greatly expand UCSF’s clinical catchment area. While UCORP recognized and supported UCSF’s need for more space, the proposed affiliation lacked detail and potentially did not align with UC’s stated values. UCORP also felt that the possibility of alternative means to the end had not been explored.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES – UPDATES AND CONSULTATION

As consultants to the committee, members of the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS) joined UCORPs meeting each month to provide updates and solicit feedback.

NAGPRA – UCORP learned that a bill passed by the legislature in September meant that UC had to prioritize the repatriation of Native American artifacts and remains over scientific and research value. Over the course of the year, UCOP established an advisory committee to oversee the big picture and make recommendations and a working group to review and revise the current UC policy.

Cannabis Research – UCOP continues to offer guidance for UC researchers and research administrators regarding funding and legal requirements around marijuana-related research.

Cal-ISIs – UCORP members were asked for input regarding a potential review of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal-ISIs) that were established under Governor Gray Davis twenty years ago. Members suggested that, using a campus ORU-review model, an ad-hoc group be convened to serve as a review committee for the Cal-ISIs. This would provide for a more rigorous review process, and enable UCORP members to participate as individuals.

UC Laboratory Fees Research Program – The UC Laboratory Fees Research Program is funded by a portion of the payment that the University receives for its management of the

Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Labs. Grants are used for enhancing collaboration, supporting undergraduate research opportunities, and promoting science and research at the labs. UCORP provided feedback on the proposed LFRP thematic areas for 2019. UCORP suggested using metrics to assess the success of the program and proposed that smaller awards be available for pilot projects. Three thematic areas that were selected after consultation with stakeholders at the campuses and the national laboratories were: accelerator research, quantum information science, and wildfire-related research.

Multicampus Research and Programs and Initiatives (MRPI) – UCORP received updates on the 2019 Multicampus Research Program Initiative (MRPI), which provides funding for planning/pilot projects and for larger collaborative projects (new or established). \$9 million, over two years, was awarded to sixteen proposals. Each awardee provides an annual progress report that includes information on students, publications, and intellectual property. Evaluation metrics for the program include how funding was leveraged.

Valley Fever Research RFP – The Office of Research provided regular updates on the new funding provided by the State for Valley Fever Research. UC was able to award \$3 million (combined) to two Valley Fever research projects.

New Reporting Requirements for Sexual Harassment, etc. – UCORP learned about proposed legislation in the wake of new requirements from NSF for reporting harassment and sexual assault. UCOP's Office of Legislative Analysis and Federal Government Relations provided input on UC's behalf. The NSF requirements took effect in October, and will mean that more communication will be needed between the campus reporting office (e.g., Title IX) and the Contracts and Grants Office.

RGPO Current State Assessment Report and Recommendations for the “Future State”
The “Current State Assessment” investigation was one of the outcomes of the State audit of UCOP in 2016, which suggested that UC take a closer look at some systemwide programs, including RGPO (Research Grants Program Office). The main areas of interest were where RGPO should be based and current and future funding streams. UCORP members discussed the role of the Academic Senate in oversight, the pros and cons of expanding RGPO, the rapidly changing landscape of science funding, and the need for metrics to evaluate success of the programs.

OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL LABORATORIES – UPDATE

Vice President for National Laboratories Kim Budil joined the November UCORP meeting to give an update on the status of the National Laboratories and UC's involvement. In October, UC, along with its Triad LLC partners Battelle and Texas A&M University, took over the management and operations contract for Los Alamos National Laboratories. The management contract for Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory could run until 2026 if the grades continue to be good. In February, UCORP members learned that VP Budil was leaving UCOP to return to Lawrence Livermore Lab. Her interim replacement is Craig Leasure, formerly a principal associate director at Los

Alamos National Lab, who was hired in November as Associate VP for the National Labs.

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES (ANR) – UPDATE

ANR Vice President Glenda Humiston joined UCORP twice in 2018-19 to provide updates on the latest work of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, including partnerships with UC campuses such as UCSF’s Global Health program the UC Merced School of Engineering. Associate Vice President for ANR Wendy Powers joined the June UCORP meeting via video in June.

ANR has a new Governing Council to provide oversight and promote a greater understanding of ANR across the university. Members of the Council include the systemwide Provost, CFO, a Vice Chancellor for Research, deans, three Academic Senate members, and representatives from the State. VP Humiston suggested that she or AVP Powers join UCORP meetings more frequently to promote better communication between the Academic Senate and ANR. It was agreed that more interactions could be useful in fostering relationships and spreading information. UCORP members mentioned that webinars or an “ambassador speaker” program might be useful for exposing more UC researchers to the work of ANR.

SYSTEMWIDE ISSUES AND CAMPUS REPORTS

UCORP devoted part of each regular meeting to discussing systemwide issues as reported by Academic Senate leadership and reports from members on campus COR issues.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW PARTICIPATION AND CORRESPONDENCE REPORT

- Current Assessment Report of Systemwide Mexico Entities (September 24, 2018)
- Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (December 5, 2018)
- Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy on Use of Vehicles and Driver Selection policy (BFB-BUS-46) (January 14, 2019)
- Restrictions on Fetal Tissue Research and the Politicization of Scientific Research (January 18, 2019)
- Composite Benefits Rates - Concern about Implementation on Some Campuses (March 26, 2019)
- Possible affiliation between UCSF and Dignity Health (May 16, 2019)
- Principles to address the climate change challenge (June 11, 2019)
- Drone Policy Follow-Up (June 28, 2019)
- Research Grants Program Office (RGPO) Review (July 17, 2019)

UCORP REPRESENTATION

As Chair of UCORP, Andrew Baird served on the Academic Assembly, Academic Council, and the Academic Planning Council. Chair Baird and Vice Chair Nasrin Rahimieh served on UC “tiger teams” on international students and international agreements. Chair Baird also represented UCORP on the Academic Council Special

Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) and the UCPB Task Force on Agriculture & Natural Resources (TFANR).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

UCORP is most grateful to its regular consultants who have provided invaluable information and perspective to the committee:

From the Office of Research and Graduate Studies:

- Arthur Ellis, Vice President
- Bart Aoki, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office
- Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives
- Wendy Streitz, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination
- Janna Tom, Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination
- Emily Rader, Portfolio Manager
- Lourdes DeMattos, Associate Director, Research Grants Program Office

From the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources:

- Vice President Glenda Humiston,
- Associate Vice President Wendy Powers

From the Office of the National Laboratories:

- Kimberly Budil, Vice President

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 2017-18:

Andrew Baird, Chair
 Nasrin Rahimieh, Vice Chair
 Irina Conboy, UCB
 Karen Bales, UCD
 Jeffrey Barrett, UCI
 Richard Desjardins, UCLA
 Michael Scheibner, UCM
 K.K. Ramakrishnan, UCR
 Brian Eliceiri, UCSD
 Stuart Gansky, UCSF
 Harry Nelson, UCSB
 Jarmila Pittermann, UCSC
 Tejasvinee Atul Mody, Graduate Student Representative
 Robert May, Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*
 Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*
 Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst (UCOP)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION (UCRJ) ANNUAL REPORT 2018-19

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Responsibilities and Duties

Pursuant to [Senate Bylaw 205](#), the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) is responsible for:

- examining and supervising all changes and additions, both substantive and editorial, in the Senate Bylaws and Regulations;
- examining all Divisional legislation that affects the system Bylaws and Regulations;
- preparing and reporting to the Assembly or to any of the Divisions such changes and additions to the Bylaws and Regulations as may seem to it advisable; and
- making editorial and conforming non-substantive changes in the Bylaws and Regulations with regard to numbering, headings, cross-references, organizational titles, details of style, and similar items.

Pursuant to Senate Bylaw 206, UCRJ shall respond to informal requests from Senate members for information concerning the *Code of the Academic Senate*, and shall file with the Secretary/Parliamentarian of the Senate, and summarize in its annual committee report, all correspondence containing committee response to such requests.

UCRJ conducted business over email, and major actions are reported below.

Legislative Ruling

Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(a) (SOR 105.2) – *Duties, Powers, and Privileges of the Academic Senate*

The Santa Cruz Division requested a legislative ruling for an interpretation of [Standing Order of the Regents 105.2\(a\) \(SOR 105.2\)](#), which states:

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.

UCRJ rendered the following Legislative Ruling in regard to the interpretation of [Standing Order of the Regents 105.2](#):

The university administration may not implement a change to admissions requirements until such change is approved by the Regents. Were the approval of the Regents not required, then the language calling for such approval would be superfluous; and were the language regarding setting of conditions for admission in [105.2\(a\)](#) intended to achieve such a result, then it should be identical to that for authorization and supervision of curriculum, described in the very next sentence in the Standing Order as well as in [Regents Bylaw 40.1](#). No approval from the Regents is called for there, suggesting that if the Regents Standing Order and Bylaw

regarding admissions were not intended to mandate approval of the Regents, they would have been written accordingly. Further, an alternative interpretation raises a policy concern because if approval of the Regents were not required to implement a change, then a Senate modification could subsequently be vetoed by the Regents, leading to multiple changes in admissions standards to the detriment of applicants.

In November 2018, the Academic Council concurred, and on December 12, 2018, it was reported to the Assembly for its information.

Variance

Regulation 782 – Grades

The San Diego division requested a variance to Senate Regulation 782 to allow the San Diego division to exempt the units earned in upper division independent study courses. The Assembly approved the variance

Evaluation of Proposed Bylaw Changes

Bylaw 336 – Privilege and Tenure: Divisional Committees -- Disciplinary Cases

At the request of the Academic Council Chair, UCR&J reviewed and evaluated proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 336. Academic Council agreed to authorize the release of the revisions for 90-day systemwide Senate review at its December 2018 meeting. The Academic Assembly approved the revisions at its April 2019 meeting.

Advice to Divisions and Committees

- The Los Angeles division requested advice on possibly suspending or amending Bylaw 335/336 requirements for composition of Hearing Committees.
- Advice was given to the Academic Council Chair regarding the minimum percentage appointment (FTE) that is necessary to have Academic Senate membership.
- Academic Council Chair asked about the procedures for amending or modifying an approval action taken by the Assembly
- The San Diego division requested clarification if Security of Employment is equivalent to tenure, under systemwide Senate Bylaw 55.
- Academic Council Chair asked about the procedures for changing Senate Regulations. The Santa Cruz division requested changes to the Senate Regulations that involved the reduction of 12-unit requirement to 10 units (i.e., SR 630.D, SR 614, SB 125.B.6).
- The Los Angeles division requested advice on academic units, specifically, are the NPI/Resnick entities are a single, integrated unit with the Department of Psychiatry.
- Academic Council Chair May asked UCRJ regarding the Memorial to the Regents process (Bylaw 90), specifically the last sentence of Bylaw 90.D.3.
- The Santa Barbara division requested a review and interpretation of Senate Regulation 636.
- Academic Council Chair asked about the systemwide in-resident requirement, specifically the possibility to petition for an exception to this requirement and tuition assessment.

- Advice was provided to the Academic Council Chair regarding the clarification of procedures of proposed variances submitted by the divisions.
- The University Committee on Committees (UCOC) Chair requested advice on (1) whether the position of AVP is "higher" than departmental chair? And (2) is the Editorial Committee an "Assembly Committee"?
- The Los Angeles division asked UCRJ which body has ultimate authority, their RJ Committee or Graduate Council on their division.

This UCR&J annual report was drafted by committee analyst and Assistant Director, Jocelyn Surla Banaria.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Glater, Chair (UCD)

Andrea Fascetti, Member At Large (UCD)

Gary Horowitz, Member At Large (UCSB)

Andrew Dickson, Ex Officio, Divisional R&J Chair (UCSD)

Christopher Viney, Ex Officio, Divisional R&J Chair (UCM)

Jason Nielsen, Ex Officio, Divisional R&J Chair (UCSC)

X. SPECIAL ORDERS [NONE]

A. Consent Calendar

XI. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

XII. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

XIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XIV. NEW BUSINESS