

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

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



VIDEOCONFERENCE OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Wednesday, December 13, 2017

10:00 am - 1:00 pm

To participate in the videoconference, contact your divisional Senate office for the location of a central meeting place. If you are off-campus, you may join the video and internet audio at

<https://UCOP.zoom.us/j/610803527>

Or by phone: 1.408.638.0968 Meeting ID: 610 803 527

| | | |
|--------------|--|------------|
| I. | ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS | 1 |
| II. | MINUTES [ACTION] | |
| | Approval of the Draft Minutes of the Meeting of June 14, 2017 | 2-6 |
| | Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, June 14, 2017 | 7 |
| III. | ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR | |
| | ▪ Shane N. White | |
| IV. | ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT | |
| | ▪ Janet Napolitano | |
| V. | ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST | |
| | ▪ Michael T. Brown | |
| VI. | STATUS OF THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET | |
| | ▪ Nathan Brostrom, Chief Financial Officer | |
| VII. | UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT | |
| | ▪ Roberta Rehm, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare | |
| VIII. | SPECIAL ORDERS | |
| A. | Consent Calendar [NONE] | |
| B. | Annual Reports [2016-17] | |
| | Academic Council (Council) | 8 |
| | Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) | 19 |
| | Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) | 23 |
| | Academic Freedom (UCAF) | 29 |
| | Academic Personnel (UCAP) | 31 |
| | Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE) | 34 |
| | Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) | 40 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) | 48 |
| Committees (UCOC) | 52 |
| Educational Policy (UCEP) | 54 |
| Faculty Welfare (UCFW) | 58 |
| International Education (UCIE) | 63 |
| Libraries and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) | 67 |
| Planning and Budget (UCPB) | 69 |
| Preparatory Education (UCOPE) | 73 |
| Privilege and Tenure (UCPT) | 76 |
| Research Policy (UCORP) | 78 |
| Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) | 83 |

IX. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES [INFORMATION/DISCUSSION]

A. Academic Council

▪ **Shane White, Chair Academic Council**

1. Discussion of Regents' Special Meeting of November 16, 2017 **85**

- a. <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/nov17/b2attach1.pdf>
- b. <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/nov17/b2attach2.pdf>
- c. <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/nov17/b2attach3.pdf>

X. SPECIAL ORDERS

A. Consent Calendar [NONE]

XI. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

XII. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

XIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XIV. NEW BUSINESS

I. Roll Call

2017-18 Assembly Roll Call December 13, 2017

President of the University:

Janet Napolitano

Amy Powell

Academic Council Members:

Shane White, Chair

Robert May, Vice Chair

Lisa Alvarez-Cohen, Chair, UCB

Rachael Goodhue, Chair, UCD

Maria Pantelia, Chair, UCI

Sandra Graham, Chair, UCLA

Susan Amussen, Chair, UCM

Dylan Rodriguez, Chair, UCR

Farrell Ackerman, Chair, UCSD

David Teitel, Chair, UCSF

Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB

Olof Einarsdottir, Chair, UCSC

Henry Sanchez, Chair, BOARS

Karen Duderstadt, Chair, CCGA

Tanya Golash-Boza, Chair, UCAAD

Michelle Yeh, Chair, UCAP

Edward Caswell-Chen, Chair, UCEP

Roberta Rehm, Chair, UCFW

Jeffrey Richman, Chair, UCORP

Joshua Schimel, Chair, UCPB

Los Angeles (8)

Noel Boyle

Mansoureh Eghbali

Kym F. Faull

Roman Koropecykj

Sandra Loo

William Marotti

Peter Tontonoz

Dorothy Wiley

Merced (1)

Shawn Newsam

Riverside (2)

Thomas Cogswell

Manula Martins-Green

San Diego (5)

Anna Joy Springer

Deborah Hertz

Robert Kluender

Elizabeth Komives

Joseph Pogliano

Berkeley (5)

Victoria Frede-Montemayor

Fai Ma

Daniel Boyarin

Christopher Kutz

Mark Richards

San Francisco (4)

Elena Flowers

Marek Brzezinski

Leah Karliner

Vineeta Singh

Davis (6)

Stephanie Dungan

Robert L. Powell

Brenda Schildgen

Scott Stanley

S.J. Ben Yoo

TBD

Santa Barbara (3)

Bjorn Birnir

Susan Cassels

Eric Matthys

Santa Cruz (2)

Kimberly Lau

Dorian Bell

Irvine (4)

John Dobrian

Henry Weinstein

Masashi Kitazawa

Secretary/Parliamentarian

George J. Matthey

MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

June 14, 2017

MINUTES OF VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday, June 14, 2017. Academic Senate Chair James Chalfant presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Senate Assistant Director Jocelyn Surla Banaria called the roll of Assembly members and confirmed a quorum. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of the April 12, 2017 meeting as noticed.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

- **Jim Chalfant**

Apportionment of 2017-18 Assembly: The 2017-18 apportionment of Assembly representatives is enclosed in the agenda; campus representation did not change relative to 2016-17.

State Budget: The California Legislature responded to the recent California state audit report on the UC Office of the President's budget practices and administrative spending by adopting a budget bill that would directly appropriate the UCOP budget in 2017-18. The bill funds UCOP with \$300 million and UC Path with \$52 million, and puts an end to UCOP campus assessments for at least one year. Academic Senate leaders are concerned that the plan will harm campuses that rely more heavily on state funds by redirecting funds that normally support state-funded programs.

Proposed Revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133 and 740: Senate divisions and committees are reviewing proposed revisions to the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) faculty series (APMs 285, 210-3, 133 and 740), which propose a new name for the series, "Teaching Professor," and enhanced expectations for teaching excellence and professional and scholarly achievement. The Academic Council will discuss the policy on June 28.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY UNIVERSITY SENIOR MANAGERS

- **Aimée Dorr, Provost and Executive Vice President**
- **Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer**

Sexual Harassment Policy: Provost Dorr noted that the amendments to Senate Bylaw 336 before the Assembly today align Senate bylaws with the amendments to APMs 015 and 016 approved by the Assembly in February and by the Regents in March. The revisions help implement

stronger and clearer procedures for investigation, adjudication, and discipline in cases of sexual misconduct allegations involving faculty respondents.

Budget Framework Initiative: The University has completed nearly all of the 13 academic initiatives included in the 2015-16 budget framework agreement between President Napolitano and Governor Brown, including two initiatives that required the participation of the Academic Senate: 1) a review of local curricular requirements to reduce the number of upper division courses required for majors on campuses to the equivalent of one full year of academic work; and 2) the development of three-year degree pathways for the top 10 majors on each campus to increase the proportion of students who consider or use a three year pathway to 5%.

The state has criticized the University for failing to complete two initiatives: 1) the expansion of transfer enrollments to meet a 2:1 freshmen-to-transfer student ratio on all campuses except Merced, and 2) the implementation of an activity-based-costing (ABC) pilot study at UCR, and ABC scoping studies at UCD and UCM. The University emphasizes that it is meeting the 2:1 ratio target on a systemwide basis and at most campuses; however, UCR and UCSC are not attracting enough qualified transfer applicants and the yield rate of transfer admits on those campuses is low. The University also emphasizes that the ABC pilot study at UCR is ongoing, but that UCD and UCM found that implementation of a full pilot would be expensive and fail to yield data relevant to academic decision-making. The Budget Conference Committee recently approved a bill with compromise language that asks the University to demonstrate a “good faith effort” to satisfy expectations for the initiatives. UC appreciates the new flexibility and expects to reach an agreement with the state about what constitutes a good faith effort.

UC Budget: The Governor’s budget withholds \$50 million from the University to signal dissatisfaction with UC’s progress on the 2:1 transfer and ABC initiatives, and pending UC’s implementation of the audit report recommendations. The budget bill approved by the Conference Committee includes a proposal to replace the existing UCOP assessment system with a state general fund line item appropriation that divides UC’s \$3.3 billion state appropriation into two sections: one to support the campuses directly, and \$348 million to support the UCOP budget and UC Path. The University believes the plan infringes on its constitutional autonomy, but more importantly, supplants funds that normally would be drawn from the medical centers, contracts and grants, and other auxiliary sources, and shifts the burden of support for UCOP from all campus sources to state-funded programs. To reduce the harm to state funded programs, campuses will need to conduct their own assessments on auxiliaries and implement local intra-campus fund transfers.

The budget bill also includes a \$5 million augmentation of state funding to support the enrollment of 500 new graduate students in 2017-18, and it proposes a plan to fund the enrollment of 1,500 new undergraduates in 2018-19 with UCOP budget redirections.

Discussion: The Santa Cruz division chair noted that UCSC would need to cut freshmen enrollments by at least 650 to meet the 2:1 ratio in a single year; reducing educational access and revenue. An Assembly member asked if the new UC Transfer Pathways requirements could be influencing the number of transfer applications to some campuses. Provost Dorr noted that the Transfer Pathways are systemwide recommendations, not requirements. Campuses may admit transfers who have not completed a Pathway; however, campuses have found that transfers with the appropriate lower division major preparation are better prepared for success at UC.

Several Assembly members expressed concern about activity-based costing, noting that the ABC model has limited applicability to university budgets with multiple fixed costs, says little or nothing about the quality of the educational experience, and has limited value for decision-making in a university setting where maintaining academic quality is more important than reducing costs. ABC provides no insight, for example, into the relative educational merits of lower-division undergraduate courses of different sizes.

Assembly members noted that the state's plan to directly allocate the UCOP budget using funds that normally support state-funded programs on the campuses would effectively impose a budget cut on those programs.

Finally, Assembly members noted that graduate student enrollment funding should not discriminate by geography. UC seeks the most qualified, promising students in the world for its graduate programs, and many nonresidents who come to California to attend graduate school remain in the state as key economic and intellectual contributors.

Chair Chalfant thanked Provost Dorr for her excellent service to the University of California and her support of the academic mission. Assembly members gave Provost Dorr a round of applause.

V. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

▪ Jim Chalfant, Chair

1. Nomination and Election of 2017-18 UCOC Vice Chair

ACTION: The Assembly elected Kevin Plaxco (UCSB) as 2017-18 UCOC Vice Chair.

2. Amendment to Academic Senate Bylaw 336

Following a systemwide Senate review, the Academic Council at its May meeting unanimously endorsed amendments to Senate Bylaw 336 describing the procedures and timelines for Privilege and Tenure proceedings in discipline cases. The amendments align the bylaw with new language in APM 015 (The Faculty Code of Conduct) and APM 016 (University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline) approved by the Assembly in February and by the Regents in March. The Academic Council is making plans to convene a joint work group to discuss additional revisions to APMs 015 and 016 and Bylaw 336 suggested during the systemwide review that were not directly related to the goals of the review.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to adopt the amendments. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Amendments to Academic Senate Bylaw 182

The Academic Council recommends amendments to Senate Bylaw 182 formally expanding the duties and responsibilities of the University Committee on International Education (UCIE) into a

broader range of international topics and activities. Council's recommendation follows a systemwide Senate review to the proposed amendments, and subsequent modifications to address comments raised in that review. A full justification for the proposed amendments is recorded in the Assembly Notice of Meeting for June 14, 2017.

The Berkeley division introduced an additional amendment, the deletion of the proposed second clause of the new sentence in section B.1.b. With the deletion, the sentence would read:

b. Initiate policy recommendations regarding international engagement programs and the status and welfare of international students and scholars at UC, ~~particularly policies that will better serve to integrate international education and research into UC academic programs.~~

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to adopt the amendments to Bylaw 182 with the revised language. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

4. UC Augmented Review Undergraduate Admissions Policy

The Academic Council is recommending a systemwide Augmented Review Undergraduate Admissions Policy to the Assembly. The policy originated with the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). BOARS Chair Sanchez noted that the policy outlines criteria for an additional admissions review of a select pool of 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 guidelines and criteria for the campus use of augmented review and three types of supplemental information a campus may request from up to 15% of applicants: 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. 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.

The policy responds to President Napolitano's September 2016 request to the Senate for a systemwide policy on the use of letters of recommendation in undergraduate admissions that is uniform across campuses. The request was prompted by a 2015 proposal from the Berkeley campus to seek letters from all applicants, and concerns from faculty, administrators, Regents, and others that allowing one campus to require letters as a condition of admission would be inconsistent with the principle of maintaining a single undergraduate admissions policy and consistent application requirements for all UC campuses. The proposal also raised concerns about the extent to which a letters requirement could unintentionally disadvantage vulnerable student populations.

Based on input from campus admissions committees, admissions directors, high school counselors, and the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity, BOARS decided against recommending a systemwide policy that requires LORs from all UC applicants, and developed the current policy as a compromise that allows letters on a limited basis. BOARS views the policy as a starting point it can revisit if relevant new information comes to light.

Berkeley Division Chair Powell noted that Berkeley made six changes to its admissions policy in 2015 to address a doubling of its applicant pool over several years. Berkeley's proposal to invite letters from all applicants was intended to help it make finer distinctions among applicants. Chair Powell felt that the proposed systemwide policy would weaken these efforts and the putative autonomy of campuses to set their own admissions policies. It was claimed that 70% of Berkeley applicants already get letters as part of applications to other universities.

Assembly representatives from the Berkeley campus added that Berkeley Professor Jesse Rothstein's study of fall 2016 Berkeley admissions found that the request for letters from applicants who received the ranking of "possible" based on their application materials or later in the review process had no differential effect on disadvantaged and underrepresented applicants. Moreover, Professor Rothstein's expanded study of letters in the 2017 Berkeley admissions cycle will be available in July, and they felt it was premature for the Assembly to act on the proposed policy before the results of that study are available.

Other Assembly members noted that it is likely that students who attend under-resourced schools will find it more difficult to obtain high-quality letters of recommendation. Even if 70% of Berkeley applicants are already requesting LORs, then 30% are not. It was noted that the Academic Council viewed data on students who applied to both Berkeley and UCLA showing substantially better diversity outcomes at UCLA for the same applicant pool. The expanded study will not answer all questions about the effect of the LORs request on diversity because it focuses only on students who responded to the request, and excludes the group of students who may have had difficulty securing LORs or did not believe that it would be possible for them to secure a LOR. The proposed augmented review policy is a defensible approach to gathering more information that provides flexibility for campuses and allows schools to advocate for students who have been identified as having gaps in their applications and who may be on the border of admissibility.

ACTION: A roll call vote was taken and the Assembly adopted the policy 28-10.

VI. NEW BUSINESS [None]

VII. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [None]

VIII. SPECIAL ORDERS

A. Consent Calendar [None]

IX. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [None]

X. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [None]

XI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [None]

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 pm

Minutes Prepared by: Michael LaBriola, Academic Senate Analyst

Attest: Jim Chalfant, Academic Senate Chair

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of June 14, 2017

Appendix A – 2016-2017 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of June 14, 2017

President of the University:

Janet Napolitano

Academic Council Members:

James Chalfant, Chair
Shane White, Vice Chair
Robert Powell, Chair, UCB
Rachael Goodhue, Chair, UCD
William Parker, Chair, UCI
Susan Cochran, Chair, UCLA
Susan Amussen, Chair, UCM
Dylan Rodriguez, Chair, UCR
Farrell Ackerman (alt for Kaustuv Roy, Chair, UCSD)
Ruth Greenblatt, Chair, UCSF (absent)
Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB
Olof Einarsdottir, Chair, UCSC
Henry Sanchez, Chair, BOARS
Kwai Ng, Chair, CCGA
Amani Nuru-Jeter, Chair, UCAAD (absent)
Theofanis Tsoulouhas, Chair, UCAP
Barbara Knowlton, Chair, UCEP
Lori Lubin, Chair, UCFW
Isaac Martin, Chair, UCORP (absent)
Bernard Sadoulet, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (5)

Alexis T. Bell
Kristie Boering
Peter R. Glazer
Christopher Kutz
Richard Kern (alt for Miryam Sas)

Davis (6)

Trish Berger (alt for William Casey)
Stephanie Dungan (absent)
Robert L. Powell (absent)
Brenda Schildgen
Scott Stanley
Richard Tucker

Irvine (4)

John Dobrian
Karamet Reiter
Timothy Tait

Abel Klein (alt for Henry Weinstein)

Los Angeles (8)

Roman Koropecjkj
Purnima Mankekar (absent)
Hanna Mikkola (absent)
Frank Petrigliano (absent)
David Geer alt Ninez Ponce
E. Richard Stiehm (absent)
Dorothy Wiley (absent)
Kym Faull

Merced (1)

Patricia LiWang

Riverside (2)

Thomas Cogswell
Jodi Kim (absent)

San Diego (5)

Lorraine Pillus (absent)
Anna Joy Springer
Nadine George
Gail Heyman
Gentry Patrick (absent)

San Francisco (4)

Marek Brzezinski (absent)
John Feiner
Stephen Cheung (alt for Leah Karliner)
Laura Wagner

Santa Barbara (3)

Bjorn Birnir
Julie Carlson
Andrew Norris (absent)

Santa Cruz (2)

Kimberly Lau
Dorian Bell

Secretary/Parliamentarian

George J. Matthey

**ACADEMIC COUNCIL
ANNUAL REPORT 2016-17**

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 Universitywide concern. The Academic Council held eleven regular meetings and additional conference calls during the 2016-17 year to consider multiple initiatives, proposals, and reports. Its final recommendations and reports can be found on the [Academic Senate website](#). Matters of particular import for the year include:

BUDGETARY ISSUES

Monthly Budget Briefings

The President, Provost, Chief Operating Officer, and other senior UC leaders updated Council each month about the progress of budget negotiations in Sacramento, the development of the 2017-18 state and University budgets, and proposed legislation affecting the University budget; a proposed tuition increase; the status of a Regents policy limiting nonresident undergraduate enrollments; efforts to secure full marginal cost funding for future undergraduate enrollments and funding for new graduate enrollments; new mechanisms to increase student housing and other facilities; efforts to ensure the health of UCRP; progress implementing the CA State Auditor report recommendations regarding UCOP budget and accounting policies and practices; and other budget matters. A subset of Council members also participated in monthly budget briefing teleconferences for faculty and senior administrators hosted by the Provost.

Council members urged UC officials to resist unrealistic enrollment mandates and to emphasize the impact of over-enrollment on educational quality. They urged administrators not to accept inadequate state funding as a “new normal,” and noted that the state is supporting UC with fewer resources just as the University expands access to more underrepresented students. They emphasized the need for UC to inform state officials about the importance of reinvesting in academic quality through measures such as reducing the student-faculty ratio; providing competitive total remuneration for faculty and staff; and increasing graduate student support. They emphasized that a nonresident enrollment cap would harm campus budgets and warned against creating a two-tier funding system through a differential cap across campuses.

Resolution on In-State Tuition

In December, Council unanimously passed a [resolution](#) supporting a proposed 2.5% tuition increase as an appropriate part of an overall budget strategy that meets the University’s needs, protects the interests of students, and provides new revenues that help restore and maintain UC’s quality. The resolution was informed by a University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) analysis estimating that the increase would generate \$53M of new revenue after 33% was redistributed to lower income students through return-to-aid.

Resolution on Nonresident Enrollment

In December, Council unanimously passed a [resolution](#) urging the Regents to reject any policy cap on nonresident enrollment expressed as a fixed limit on the number or percentage of nonresident undergraduates. The resolution asked the Regents to condition any policy limiting nonresident enrollment on first securing a budget with revenues sufficient to maintain UC’s three

goals of access, affordability, and quality. The resolution was informed by a UCPB analysis showing that a 20% cap on nonresident undergraduate enrollment would create a net loss of \$56M for the three campuses over 20% and a \$14M loss of return-to-aid for CA residents.

Budget Framework Initiative

Council discussed the University's implementation of academic initiatives contained in the 2015-16 budget framework initiative agreement with the Governor. The discussions focused on the specific initiatives for which Senate divisions and systemwide committees were responsible or closely involved, including the examination of policies on the University's acceptance of use of alternative credits. The Council also concentrated on two initiatives the University was not addressing to the State's satisfaction: 1) expanding transfer enrollments to meet a 2:1 freshman-to-transfer ratio target at all campuses except Merced; and 2) expanding the use of "activity-based-costing" to enhance understanding of the cost of instruction.

Concerns about 2017-18 State Budget Bill

In June, Council wrote to President Napolitano [expressing concerns](#) about the budget bill sent to the Governor by the Joint Legislative Budget Conference Committee. The letter criticized the bill's emphasis on withholding \$50 million from the UC budget based on an alleged lack of progress on the 2:1 freshman-to-transfer ratio target and "activity-based-costing," described how adherence to an arbitrary ratio at every undergraduate campus is not in the spirit of the Master Plan and would harm students, and noted how appropriating the UCOP budget separately from campus budgets could harm campuses that rely more heavily on state funds by disrupting the equitable flow of funds to campus departments.

Framework for UC's Growth and Support

Provost Dorr briefed Council at multiple meetings on the Framework for UC Growth and Support project, an effort to develop a long-range vision for the optimal growth and support of the University to the year 2040, and later her decision to suspend the project. Council members urged UCOP to involve faculty in the exercise to help ensure realistic and credible visioning scenarios. The Senate chair and vice chair and other faculty participated in a systemwide meeting about the Framework in April. The process highlighted the magnitudes of current capital liabilities at all campuses.

FACULTY WELFARE ISSUES

UCFW Report on Domestic Partner Benefit Equity

In February, Council endorsed a University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) [report](#) calling on UC to extend health and welfare benefits to the domestic partners of all active UC employees and retirees, regardless of gender or age. The report urges the University to increase the fairness of UC's benefits structure by changing current policy prohibiting opposite-sex domestic partners of UC employees from accessing the same health and welfare benefits as same-sex domestic partners unless one partner is 62 years or older. In contrast, there is no age requirement for opposite-sex domestic partner survivors to receive UC pension and retirement benefits.

Letters on Faculty Salaries and the Salary Scales

In May, Council [endorsed a joint letter](#) from UCFW, UCAP, and UCPB concerning the distribution of a 3% faculty salary increase program planned for 2017-18. Council's letter to President Napolitano conveys the high priority that should be placed on fixing the published

salary scales by bringing them closer to market reality, and attaches a white paper authored by the Senate chair and vice chair discussing the importance of maintaining competitive salary scales that have a meaningful connection to UC's merit review-driven academic salary scale and step system.

Retiree Health

In June, Council [endorsed](#) a UCFW letter opposing a proposed Regents item that would have removed the 70% floor for aggregate expenditures on retiree health, and allowed placement of a cap on the rate of growth of the maximum UC employer contribution to an individual retiree's health coverage at 3%. UCOP responded to the concerns expressed in the letter by postponing discussion of the item to November 2017. To date, the proposed cap of 3% has not been justified, nor have its impacts on retirees or on the University's operations been adequately explained.

Public Safety Task Force

Council endorsed UCFW's proposed charter for a temporary systemwide Academic Senate Public Safety Task Force charged with 1) reviewing the UC police policy manual (the "Gold Book") and other systemwide policies related to public safety and 2) determining the need for a permanent standing systemwide public safety advisory board that could advise UCOP on policing policy and review annual reports from campus public safety advisory boards. The task force is expected to meet in fall 2017 and complete its work by the end of the calendar year.

ADMISSIONS ISSUES

Policy on Augmented Review in Undergraduate Admissions

The Council chair asked BOARS to lead the Senate's response to a request from President Napolitano for a systemwide policy on the use of letters of recommendation in undergraduate admissions that is uniform across campuses. BOARS crafted a policy on Augmented Review in Undergraduate Admissions that allows letters on a limited basis. Following [approvals](#) by the Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate, the Regents voted unanimously in July to adopt the policy, now codified as [Regents Policy 2110](#). The policy outlines guidelines and criteria for an additional review of 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: 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. In the event letters of recommendation are requested, campuses can prompt for specific information desired, rather than asking for a broad-based letter of recommendation. BOARS will include experience with Augmented Review in its annual report on Comprehensive Review.

Compare Favorably Policy

The Council chair asked BOARS to lead the Senate's response to the President's request for a full evaluation of the "Compare Favorably" policy for nonresident admission. A 2016 State audit report criticized the policy and UC's nonresident admission and enrollment practices. In July, Council approved BOARS's [report to the President](#) that summarizes the Committee's work over the year to discuss issues associated with comparing residents and nonresidents and to analyze several alternative measures for the compare favorably evaluation. BOARS concludes in the report that the existing policy provides appropriate flexibility for campuses while maintaining the

University's primary responsibility to California students and ensuring that campuses are admitting nonresidents who perform at least as well as California residents.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY

Council was closely engaged in the University's efforts to update policies on sexual violence and sexual harassment, improve reporting procedures and resources for responding to prohibited conduct, and clarify processes for investigating and adjudicating cases in which faculty are accused. The Council consistently affirmed its support for maintaining strong and clear disciplinary processes for faculty misconduct.

Proposed Amendments to APM 015 and 016 and Senate Bylaw 336

Council facilitated a systemwide Senate review of proposed revisions to APM 015 and APM 016, implementing policy revisions recommended by the Administration-Senate Joint Committee on investigation and adjudication processes for sexual violence and harassment cases involving faculty. The systemwide review also included consideration of a set of conforming amendments to Senate Bylaw 336 addressing procedures and timelines for Privilege and Tenure proceedings in discipline cases. In a December 2016 [letter to the administration](#), Council requested additional amendments to APM 015 and 016 to address concerns raised by Senate reviewers. Council approved the final amended revisions in January. The Assembly approved [the APM revisions](#) in February, and [the Bylaw 336](#) revisions in June. Council also decided to establish a joint work group to discuss further revisions suggested during the systemwide reviews that were not directly related to the revisions proposed as a result of Joint Committee recommendations.

Meeting with Title IX Coordinator

In April, Council met with UC's systemwide Title IX Coordinator to discuss the systemwide implementation of the Joint Committee's recommendations; the expected composition, membership, and scope of local Peer Review Committees charged with advising chancellors on appropriate actions in cases of sexual harassment /violence involving members of the faculty.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION ISSUES

Council asked the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) to lead the Senate's response to a state Budget Framework Initiative that asked the University to review alternative means of earning credit that may reduce time to degree.

UCEP Report on Re-examination of Alternative Credit – Credit by Examination

In October, Council endorsed and forwarded to Provost Dorr a UCEP [report](#) on the Academic Senate's Credit by Examination policy ([Senate Regulation 620](#)), which provides a mechanism for students to earn credit for a course based on their performance on an exam. In the report, UCEP recommends best practices to eliminate inconsistencies in the application of Credit by Examination across UC campuses.

UCEP Report on Re-examination of Alternative Credit – Advanced Placement Exams

In November, Council endorsed and forwarded to Provost Dorr a UCEP [report](#) on campus policies for awarding UC credit for Advanced Placement (AP) exams taken prior to college matriculation, and for applying that credit to UC graduation requirements for specific majors and/or for general education requirements. In the report, UCEP recommends best practices for approaching AP units.

UCEP Investigation of Policies and Practices for Student-led Courses

The Council chair asked UCEP to lead the Senate’s response to a request from President Napolitano for a review of campus policies, procedures, and best practices for undergraduate student-led courses. In its February 2017 [report](#), UCEP summarizes each campus’s policies and notes that there is a high degree of policy uniformity in terms of faculty oversight. UCEP reports that campuses ensure quality by requiring a faculty mentor or supervisor to participate in the design—and often delivery—of the course, and campus curriculum committees provide additional oversight. Several campuses also require or encourage training in pedagogy for the student instructor to help ensure the quality of the course.

GRADUATE EDUCATION ISSUES

Degree and School Approvals

Following recommendations from CCGA, Council approved the following schools and degree programs. CCGA was responsive and efficient in its reviews, often approving proposals in sixty or fewer days. CCGA members 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.

- [Master of Real Estate Development and Design \(MRED+D\) at UC Berkeley](#) (8/17)
- [Master of Public Health \(MPH\) at UC San Diego](#) (7/17)
- [Master of Management \(M.M.\) at UC Merced](#) (6/17)
- [Master of Conservation and Restoration Science \(MCRS\) Degree at UC Irvine](#) (3/17)
- [Master of Science in Business Analytics \(MSBA\) at UC Irvine](#) (2/17)
- [Sue and Bill Gross School of Nursing at UC Irvine](#) (12/16)
- [Conservation of Material Culture Graduate Program at UC Los Angeles](#) (12/16)
- [Master of Finance \(M.F.\) Degree at UC Irvine](#) (12/16)
- [Master of Embedded and Cyber-Physical Systems \(MECPS\) at UC Irvine](#) (9/16)
- [Name Change: UC Santa Cruz College Eight to Rachel Carson College](#) (9/16)

Revised Policy on PDSTs

In January, Council sent a [letter](#) to Provost Dorr summarizing responses from the systemwide Senate review of proposed revisions to Regents Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST). The letter expressed support for the policy shift from justifications for PDSTs based on other programs’ charges, to justifications for PDSTs based on the needs of the program at UC, as well as other changes to the policy that clarify, streamline, and add flexibility.

Graduate Program Reviews

Council discussed the administration’s request to the Senate to expedite its review of new graduate programs and titles. Practice has been for Council to consider proposed new graduate programs when the Academic Assembly is not scheduled to meet for greater than 30 days. Rather than waiting for the next scheduled Council meeting, Council agreed that it could also help reduce the time between CCGA’s approval and the final Council/Assembly action by receiving new programs over email for one week “consent calendar” approval, while reserving the right to request discussion of any proposal at an in-person meeting.

DIVERSITY AND EQUITY ISSUES

UCAADE Recommendations for Future Faculty Salary Equity Analyses

In September, Council [endorsed best practice recommendations](#) from the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE) for future campus analyses of faculty salary equity on the basis of gender and ethnicity. Council asked UCOP to distribute the best practices to campus Executive Vice Chancellors, Vice Provosts for Academic Personnel, and other relevant administrators for review and feedback, noting that the recommendations will help illuminate factors contributing to and perpetuating inequities, as well as subsequent actions campuses may take to address them. Senate division chairs also circulated the recommendations to campus committees for discussion and feedback.

Support for Undocumented Students and Immigrants

Following the national election, Council was concerned about potential changes to immigration policies such as the Deferred Action on Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, and it strongly supported the University's efforts to protect the rights of undocumented students and other immigrants. Council was also concerned about the effect of new immigration restrictions on foreign students and scholars. In December, Council issued a [statement](#) endorsing the University's *Statement of Principles in Support of Undocumented Members of the UC Community*. It also [endorsed](#) a joint statement from UCFW, CCGA, UCAADE, UCEP, and UCORP in February opposing President Trump's Executive Order barring citizens of seven Muslim majority countries entry into the United States.

UCAADE Recommendations for Increasing Faculty Diversity

The UCAADE chair briefed Council about a set of best practice recommendations for enhancing UC faculty diversity the Committee discussed with President Napolitano at a special meeting. The recommendations include several strategies to better attract and retain diverse candidates: cluster hiring, Targets of Opportunity, increased use of pipeline programs such as the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship (PPFP), and other financial incentives. UCAADE also emphasized the importance of building and sustaining a critical mass of diverse faculty on a campus and in individual departments.

Faculty Diversity Project Advisory Group

Vice Provost Carlson briefed Council about a pool of state funding (\$2M) set aside in the 2016-17 budget to support faculty diversity, and a UCOP request for campus proposals to use up to \$600K of the funding on plans to hire a more diverse faculty in a specific unit. The chairs of UCAADE and UCAP represented the Academic Council on the advisory group that selected projects. The vice chair of UCAADE also served as the Merced representative on the advisory group.

RESEARCH ISSUES

Consultation with the Vice President

UCOP's new Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Art Ellis joined Council at two meetings to discuss his priorities and goals around research innovation and entrepreneurship, promoting research opportunities for undergraduates, increasing international and multi-campus research collaborations, collective excellence in research, and UC's participation in a joint NIH initiative focused on enhancing diversity in postdoctoral and faculty hiring in the biomedical sciences.

National Laboratories

UCOP's Vice President for Laboratory Management Kim Budil joined two Council meetings to brief Council about UC's oversight of three Department of Energy (DOE) national laboratories; the research and national security work undertaken at the labs; UC's use of the DOE management fee to fund research collaborations between lab scientists and faculty and graduate students on UC campuses; and UC's efforts to prepare for the upcoming re-competition for management of the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

UC HEALTH AND CLINICAL AFFAIRS

UC Health Briefing

UC Health Executive Vice President Stobo and UC Self-Funded Health Plan Director Tauber joined Council in January to discuss the governance structure for UC Health and the University's health benefit plans, health plan enrollment results for 2017, and UC's self-funded plans. Also joining the meetings were Regents Health Services Committee Senate Representative Joel Dimsdale and UC Faculty Welfare Health Care Task Force Chair Robert May, who described the work of their respective committees.

Clinical Affairs Task Force

Council discussed a potential charge and framework for a new Academic Senate Clinical Affairs Task Force intended to increase the Senate's involvement in the UC Health enterprise and ensure the communication of faculty perspectives about the quality of clinical services, education, and research in the context of the UC Medical Centers' expanding networks and affiliations. Ultimately Council took no action concerning the task force beyond approving the concept.

REVIEW OF LSOE/TEACHING PROFESSOR SERIES

Council facilitated a systemwide Senate review of proposed revisions to APM sections related to the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. Council endorsed the concept of a new title series to replace LSOE that includes a rank and step system, sabbatical privileges, and a research requirement emphasizing either pedagogy or research in the underlying discipline, and that precludes new hires in the LSOE series. Council did not endorse the title proposed for the series—"Teaching Professor." It agreed to convene a working group to address the concerns and questions raised by Senate reviewers and give more specific guidance to the administration about the next round of proposed revisions.

JOINT MEETING WITH CAMPUS EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLORS

In October, Council met with the Council of Vice Chancellors and Provost Dorr to discuss issues of common interest to faculty and administrators, including the University budget, the consequences of adding 10,000 undergraduates on the physical and educational capacity of the campuses; the policy cap on nonresident undergraduates; alternative revenue strategies; and the need to restore and enhance quality.

MEETING WITH REGENT JOHN PÉREZ

In March, Regent John Pérez joined Council for a wide-ranging discussion of critical issues facing the University, including the University budget and state funding, nonresident enrollment, faculty diversity, and the importance of the University's research and graduate education mission.

GOVERNANCE

Revisions to Senate Bylaw 182

Council facilitated a systemwide Senate review of the University Committee on International Education's (UCIE) proposed revisions to [Senate Bylaw 182](#) that formally expand UCIE's charge into a broader range of international topics and activities. Following the review, and subsequent amendments made to address concerns raised in the review, Council endorsed the revisions. The Assembly [approved](#) them in June.

Senate Representative to Regents Committee on Health Services

Council voted to re-appoint UCSD Professor Joel Dimsdale Senate representative to the Regents Committee on Health Services for an additional term ending June 30, 2018.

ACSCOLI

Council voted to extend the term of the Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) to 2028.

OTHER BRIEFINGS

Presidential Briefings: President Napolitano joined Council each month to exchange views with faculty about a range of topics, including the University budget, enrollment funding, diversity, health care and benefits, alternative revenue sources for the University, Presidential initiatives, proposed legislation affecting the University, the impact of new immigration policies and the University's efforts to protect the privacy and civil rights of undocumented students, and events such as Grad Slam and International Thinking Day.

UCOC Briefings: University Committee on Committees (UCOC) Chair Bob Clare joined Council at two meetings to discuss UCOC's process of appointing the chairs and vice chairs of systemwide Senate committees and other Senate bodies, and its efforts to increase diversity in Senate service.

Admissions Briefing: In January, Associate Vice President Handel briefed Council on fall 2017 application outcomes, the status of the UC Transfer Pathways project, and efforts to close transfer articulation gaps.

OTHER ISSUES

Senate Regulation 630.D. Council and Assembly [approved](#) revisions to Senate Regulation 630.D proposed by UCEP, recognizing the Natural Reserve System California Ecology and Conservation course as a systemwide course that can satisfy UC's senior residence requirement as stipulated in SR 630.

Amendment to Senate Bylaw 125.B.14: Council and Assembly [approved](#) an amendment to Senate Bylaw 125 codifying Council's authority to select a Senate nominee to the Health Services Committee of the Board of Regents.

Maximum Out of Pocket Costs: In November, Council [endorsed a letter of concern](#) from UCFW that the consolidation of maximum out-of-pocket (MOOP) expenses in UC Care will reduce benefits and increase costs for UC Care subscribers with the highest medical and pharmacy costs.

Support for Ongoing Funding of Faculty Exit Surveys: In December, Council endorsed a [letter](#) from UCFW in support of ongoing funding for exit surveys of departing UC faculty.

Presidential Policy on International Activities: In December, Council sent a [letter](#) to Vice Provost Carlson summarizing comments received from Senate divisions and systemwide committees to the review of a proposed Presidential Policy on International Activities, expressing significant concerns about the policy.

G-28 Travel Regulations: In February, Council sent a [letter](#) to Vice Provost Carlson summarizing responses from the systemwide Senate review of proposed revisions to UC's G-28 Travel Regulations, expressing general support for the proposed revisions but recommending a few additional clarifications.

UC Retirement Savings Program Fee Allocation: In March, Council [endorsed](#) UCFW's recommendation to support a plan developed by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Human Resources at UCOP for changing the administrative and record keeping fee assessment structure for the University Retirement Savings Program.

Presidential Unmanned Aircraft System Policy: In May, Council sent a [letter](#) to Vice Provost Carlson summarizing responses from the systemwide Senate review of a proposed policy on Unmanned Aircraft Systems (Drones), requesting additional revisions to the policy.

Proposed Presidential Policy on Export Controls: In June, Council sent a [letter](#) to Vice Provost Carlson summarizing responses from the systemwide Senate review of a proposed Presidential Policy on Export Controls, requesting additional revisions to the policy.

Changes to Retirement Savings Plan Funds Menu: In June, Council [endorsed](#) a UCFW recommendation in support of a UCOP proposal to implement changes to the UC Retirement Savings Plan funds menu in fall 2017.

Support for the University's Open Access Mission: In June, Council [endorsed](#) three letters from the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) supporting issues related to the University's Open Access mission, including a statement on *Commitment to Free and Open Information, Scholarship, and Exchange*.

UCOPE Recommendations for the Revised SAT and ACT and ELWR: In July, Council endorsed recommendations from the University Committee on Preparatory Education for the revised SAT and ACT and the University's Entry-Level Writing Requirement.

UCAF Statement on the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act: In July, Council sent a [letter](#) to President Napolitano endorsing a statement of concern from the University Committee on Academic Freedom about the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act passed by the U.S. Senate in 2016.

UCAF Statement on the Free Exchange of Information: In August, Council sent a [letter](#) to President Napolitano endorsing a University Committee on Academic Freedom statement affirming that free speech is a key principle on which the University is founded.

Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security: In August, Council sent a [letter](#) to Vice Provost Carlson summarizing responses from the systemwide Senate review of a proposed policy on Electronic Information Security.

REVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MANUAL (APM)

Council reviewed several proposed modifications to the Academic Personnel Manual in addition to the revisions to APMs 015 and 016 related to sexual misconduct policy. In October, Council approved [Technical Revisions to APM 190, Appendix G](#) related to the administration of summer salary benefits. In February, it [requested](#) additional clarifications to a set of proposed revisions to Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action and additional amendments to APM 015. In March, Council sent a [letter](#) requesting additional clarifications to a set of proposed revisions to APM 278 and APM 210-6 concerning the duties and responsibilities of the Health Sciences Clinical Professor title and advancement criteria for individuals in the title.

TASK FORCES AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

- Academic Planning Council
- UC Davis and UC Berkeley Search Committees
- Provost Search Committee
- Innovative Learning Technology Initiative Steering Committee
- Faculty Diversity Initiative Project Advisory Group
- Executive Budget Committee

RELATIONS WITH OTHER GOVERNING BODIES

The Board of Regents: The Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair executed their roles as faculty representatives to the Regents throughout the year, acting in an advisory capacity on Regents' Standing Committees, and to the Committee of the Whole.

ICAS: The Senate Chair and Vice Chair and the chairs of BOARS, UCOPE, and UCEP attended meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates in Oakland and Sacramento. ICAS represents the faculty Senates of the three higher education segments.

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 Aimée Dorr; Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Nathan Brostrom; Chief Operating Officer Rachael Nava; Vice Provost for Academic Personnel Susan Carlson; Vice President Kimberley Budil; Vice President Art Ellis; Associate Vice President Stephen Handel; Associate Vice President Kieran Flaherty; Operating Budget Director David Alcocer; General Counsel Julia Friedlander and Deputy to the Vice President for Student Affairs Jerlena Griffin-Desta; and Title IX Coordinator Kathleen Salvaty.

James Chalfant, Chair
Shane White, Vice Chair

Divisional Chairs:

Robert Powell, Berkeley
Rachael Goodhue, Davis
William Parker, Irvine
Susan Cochran, Los Angeles
Susan Amussen, Merced
Dylan Rodriguez, Riverside
Kaustuv Roy, San Diego
Ruth Greenblatt, San Francisco
Henning Bohn, Santa Barbara
Olof Einarsdottir, Santa Cruz

Senate Committee Chairs:

Henry Sanchez, BOARS
Kwai Ng, CCGA
Amani Nuru-Jeter, UCAADE
Theofanis Tsoulouhas, UCAP
Barbara Knowlton, UCEP
Lori Lubin, UCFW
Isaac Martin, UCORP
Bernard Sadoulet, UCPB

Council Staff:

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

ACADEMIC COUNCIL SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON LAB ISSUES ANNUAL REPORT 2016-17

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 labs, faculty, and students.

ACSCOLI held two in-person meetings and one teleconference in 2016-17.

National Labs Overview

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 a partner in Los Alamos National Security, LLC (LANS), 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.

General Updates from the Office of National Laboratories

1. Funding

LANL and LLNL receive most of their funding from DOE/NNSA, with the Office of Science, Energy Offices, Department of Justice, Homeland Security, and Department of Defense making up most of the remainder. The budget is expected to remain stable or even increase under the new administration. LBNL, however, gets most of its funding from the Office of Science, which may see cuts in the upcoming federal budget. The lab has been preparing scenarios for potential budget decreases.

2. Department of Energy and LBNL Contract

Under new Secretary of Energy Rick Perry, the DOE has announced it will continue to focus on the efficiency and streamlining processes that began under former Secretary Ernest Moniz. The DOE has begun a process to simplify and restructure its contracts to achieve more flexibility and reduce the burden on the national laboratories by eliminating government-approval requirements for minor expenses.

A new contract framework was successfully piloted at Stanford's SLAC lab and will most likely be implemented next at LBNL, where it will be tested to find out if it works with a more complex, multi-program lab. To help with the transition to the new contract responsibilities at LBNL, a former senior official from the DOE who helped develop the contract for SLAC has

been hired as a consultant. The university sees a big benefit in not having to seek government approval in areas – such as salaries – where it has no interest.

3. Staff hiring, retention, and morale

In the past year, there has been a large amount of hiring at the labs for positions in science and engineering. Retention is more of an issue than recruiting, often due to location. Lawrence Livermore loses computer and IT professionals to nearby Silicon Valley. The morale of lab workers at Los Alamos, which has been an issue of concern for ACSCOLI in the past, seems to vary depending on length of employment and whether an employee is in a management or top leadership position. Newer employees (about 25 percent of the workforce) who were never employed under sole-UC management (and had no UC pension expectations) tend to have better morale. Some higher-level managers might be worried about their jobs in a transition but UC is trying to alleviate fears and has removed the positions that directly report to key personnel from the pool of jobs that would be at risk.

4. Safety

Safety issues at LANL and the Berkeley Lab in the past couple of years have spurred the formation of cross-lab “communities of practice” in which groups share best practices for management, personal accountability, and improving communication. Training efforts have been implemented in conjunction with the unions, and the Berkeley Lab is working to make workplace safety part of the culture.

5. LANL Nuclear Waste

Waste disposition has restarted after an incident at the waste isolation pilot plant (WIPP) at Los Alamos in 2014. The lab is now confident about safety, and the project should be completed by fall, 2017, when another contractor will take over the remediation contract.

6. Plutonium Pits

Due to a shutdown, there has been no plutonium pit production at LANL in the past three years, but after a readiness assessment the lab is gearing up to get started again. Some ACSCOLI members question UC’s involvement in the maintenance and potential production of nuclear weapons, but Los Alamos is the only national lab that does it now. Arguments have been made for separating production from research & development, but although they are different types of activities requiring differing expertise, the proximity of production facilities to researchers may serve to enhance the research.

7. Major building projects

A large building project at the Berkeley lab was delayed slightly and costs have been higher than expected. The lab is doing some remediation of an area called Old Town that has original buildings that will enable the development of a new building site.

Los Alamos had to pay an \$11 million settlement to the state government for going over budget on a project. The building budgets are apparently too low and the relatively remote location is a problem. David McCallan from UC’s Office of the National Labs has been the site liaison for the last 1.5 years, which has involved spending time at the lab, participating in reviews, and otherwise bringing UC into the picture.

8. Lab Performance Evaluations

Each year, the three national laboratories are assessed on their performance through a set of performance objectives/categories to determine how much of the DOE-NNSA management fee will be earned, and whether the laboratory contract will be extended for another year. The grades were good this year, with a 94% at LBNL and 90% aggregate at LANL and LLNL.

Los Alamos National Laboratory Contract Expiration

The current contract for the Los Alamos National Laboratory is scheduled to expire in September 2018. The NNSA released a draft RFP in July, 2017, to obtain industry feedback; the final RFP is expected in September, 2017.

Throughout the year, committee members discussed methods for informing the faculty about the LANL contract and a potential bid process. Ideas for communicating with faculty included sending ACSCOLI updates to Academic Council, inviting Kim Budil, UC's Vice President for the National Laboratories, to Academic Council meetings, and providing news and information at the divisional level. Many faculty members are interested in the work of the labs and concerned about the lab's involvement in building and maintaining nuclear weapons. ACSCOLI members stressed the importance of providing accurate and factual information.

Meanwhile, the Office of the National Laboratories is preparing for UC's bid for the new contract.

White Paper from Office of the National Laboratories

ACSCOLI reviewed a draft white paper on UC-Laboratory relations from the Office of the National Laboratories. Written by Vice President Kim Budil at the request of ACSCOLI and the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), the paper was meant to inform faculty about UC's long history with the labs as well as describe the status of the current relationship and the work of the labs. ACSCOLI members provided feedback to VP Budil, including adding greater emphasis on the science and research aspects of the labs, and the involvement of graduate students and post-docs as important elements of the relationship.

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. In November, 2016, the LFRP staff announced the four winners of the 2017 funding grants that are worth a combined \$13.5 million over three years. The four collaborative projects focused on targeted areas of research that were selected to leverage UC-national lab synergy: biological applications of advanced computing, high energy density science, and mesoscale materials science. Four UC graduate students were also selected to receive the in-residence graduate fellowship awards.

This year's approach to the Lab Fees Research Program mirrors last year's, with three new thematic areas – climate science, national security through social sciences, and cybersecurity – that are of value to UC and the national labs, part of UC's public service mission, and complementary to the areas targeted last year. Thematic workshops in each targeted area were held in May with the support of the Vice Chancellors of Research. The approximately \$15

million available for the collaborative awards will most likely be divided into four awards, depending on the proposals. The maximum request is \$4 million, and all grants pay the full federal indirect costs.

There is also funding set aside this year for up to four graduate fellowship awards. Last year, twenty full proposals were submitted, with six very strong contenders and four that rose to the top. Many applicants came from Davis and Merced, possibly due to the campus locations in relation to LLNL.

Future of ACSCOLI

In advance of its 2018 sunset date, the Academic Council voted on May 24, 2017, to extend ACSCOLI's term by 10 years, to May 2028. ACSCOLI's charter was adjusted accordingly and approved by the Academic Council on July 26, 2017.

Representation

As Chair of ACSCOLI, Jim Chalfant served on the LBNL Contract Assurance Council. Member Ram Seshadri served on behalf of Chair Chalfant on the LBNL Advisory Board.

Acknowledgements

ACSCOLI wishes to acknowledge the contributions of its principal consultants: Kimberly Budil Vice President of the Office of the National Laboratories; Mary Croughan, Executive Director of the Research Grants Programs Office; and Kathleen Erwin, Director of the UC Research Initiatives. UC Davis Professor Robert Powell serves as Executive Committee Governor to the Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC (LLNS) and Los Alamos National Security LLC, (LANS) Boards of Governors and is a recurring guest of the committee. Powell also chairs the LLCs' Science and Technology Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

2016-17 ACSCOLI members:

Jim Chalfant, Chair (Academic Council Chair)
Shane White, Vice Chair (Academic Council Vice Chair)
J. Daniel Hare, Academic Senate Past Chair, 2015-16
Bernard Sadoulet, UCPB Chair
Jeffrey Richman, UCORP Vice Chair
Steven Glaser, UCB
Darrell D.E. Long, UCSC
Thomas H. Morton, UCR
Ivan Schuller, UCSD
Susannah Scott, UCSB
Ram Seshadri, UCSB
Joanne Miller, Academic Senate Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
ACADEMIC COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS
ANNUAL REPORT 2016-2017**

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 2016-2017 academic year. Highlights of the committee's actions are outlined below.

INFORMATION PRIVACY, SECURITY AND GOVERNANCE

Throughout the UCACC's second academic year as a newly reconstituted Academic Senate committee, it successfully engaged the systemwide leadership of both the Senate and the administration in its discussions. The UCACC Chair and Vice Chair meet regularly with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Senate, and with UC CIO Tom Andriola. UCACC now has two seats on the Cyber Risk Governance Committee (UCACC Chair and Vice Chair), plus the Senate has a third standing seat on CRGC. Other Senate members are on the Advisory Board to the CRGC and attend alternate meetings of that body. Given that cyber risk issues have been particular points of tension, UCACC is pleased that the communication channels to address these concerns are now much improved. UCACC also engages regularly with Senate and administration bodies concerned with uses of technology for teaching and learning, which is another area that requires focused attention.

While continuing to address cyber risk, teaching and learning, privacy, and other on-going technology issues, UCACC is also turning its attention to IT governance at the campus level. In regular reports from UCACC members, it is apparent that faculty engagement with campus IT governance varies widely. The committee is gathering information about models at each campus in an effort to promote broader Senate engagement at all UC campuses.

IT GOVERNANCE

In support of its efforts to address IT governance in a more mission-driven rather than reactive manner, UCACC held its February meeting at UCLA to learn about that campus's information technology strategic planning and to engage UC-wide and campus leadership in the discussions. The differential involvement of Senate faculty in cyber risk discussions on the campuses was an indication of the varying IT governance processes across the system. The committee learned that UCLA has had strong support for joint governance of IT matters from several generations of chancellors and provosts. Senate groups from other campuses were encouraged to reach out to IT administrators and campus leadership to increase partnerships in IT governance. IT leaders are often isolated from faculty activities, and lack easy mechanisms to teach out to faculty. Joint governance is a two-way street, where multiple stakeholders should be encouraged to reach out to each other in search of common ground.

UCACC has prepared recommendations for the Academic Senate on IT Governance at the campus level that will be finalized and formally transmitted to Senate leadership in the fall.

DATA GOVERNANCE

Given the critical issues around information technology at the university, UCACC was reconstituted at an opportune time. The area of data governance is one example of a topic that is beginning to garner more attention at UC and elsewhere. The final report of UCLA's Data Governance Task Force, a joint Academic Senate-Administration committee co-chaired by UCACC Vice Chair Christine Borgman and UCLA Chief Privacy Officer Kent Wada, was released in 2016. The report covers faculty and student records data such as the information stored on ID cards and collecting in course evaluations. It was intended to be used as a template that could be adopted systemwide at UC as well at other universities. Data used and generated for scholarly research is also a concern of the university, but lies outside the scope of the Task Force. Other universities are using their students' data for automated decision-making and tracking, but UC has long held a strong privacy stance against such uses of data.

The primary concern about faculty records is how they will be used. UCACC's concerns include what roles the academic senate should play in data governance, how to build on existing campus governance structures, and how the data governance issues intersect with related initiatives such as privacy of learning data. The committee discussed the need to educate faculty about why they should be interested in privacy, and expects to continue to play a role in helping to determine workable governance processes

- ***Ad Hoc Task Force on Health Data Governance***

The committee was briefed on a new Task Force on Health Data Governance convened by President Napolitano that is charged with developing recommendations for how UC should manage and use the large amount of health data that is generated throughout the system. The Task Force resulted from the interest of outside vendors and organizations in using UC's patient data for predictive models to improve health care outcomes. Agreements are already underway at various levels of the university, from the system to individual researchers, and UC is interested in treating these agreements in a uniform way systemwide to avoid conflicts and overlapping agreements. UCACC wrote to the chairs of the Task Force's Working Group and Steering Committee to inform them about the work previously done in the area of data governance at UC. At the UCACC meeting in May, three committee members who are returning next year agreed to be part of an informal subgroup that could be convened and updated about the progress of the Task Force.

SYSTEMWIDE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

The UCACC Chair and Vice Chair consulted with UC CIO Tom Andriola regarding issues related to systemwide IT services and developing the agenda items for each meeting.

- ***Cybersecurity***

UCACC received regular updates on cybersecurity issues from UC CIO Tom Andriola and Chief Information Security Officer David Rusting. UCACC Chair David Kay and/or Vice Chair Christine Borgman attended the quarterly meetings of the Cyber-Risk Governance Committee in 2016-2017. Vice Chair Borgman gave a presentation on faculty involvement in IT issues at the March CRGC meeting, and Borgman and Kay jointly presented on risk and personally identifiable information (PII) at the June meeting.

Cyber risk generally, and FireEye in particular, are of immediate concern to faculty due to concerns about tradeoffs between privacy, surveillance, and security. Although campus leadership is supposed to share information about cybersecurity, some faculty have expressed concerns about a lack of communication from their administration. UCACC continues to discuss FireEye technology and share information among members about various approaches and processes. However, the committee recognizes that campuses are implementing FireEye in very different ways and encourages faculty to work directly with their campus administrations and to pursue more joint governance.

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

UCACC reviewed the revised Electronic Information Security Policy (IS-3) at the beginning of the year and provided suggestions for changes to the policy prior to the systemwide review.

- ***UCSF IT Outsourcing***

In February, UCACC learned about UCSF outsourcing 17 percent of its total IT workforce. The action is a response to dramatic cost increases and is expected to save \$30 million over a five-year period. In addition to the layoffs, concerns have been raised about sensitive data going offshore. UCACC learned that the vendor contract includes assurances about privacy and security. Some UCACC members suggested that UCOP state definitively that the university will not require or pressure other campuses to adopt UCSF's strategy or to participate in an outsourcing contract.

- ***Web Accessibility***

CIO Tom Andriola updated the committee on IT accessibility as the accessibility of higher education websites and online courses has come under increasing scrutiny by the U.S. Department of Justice, Department of Education, and disability rights organizations. A case brought by the DOJ against UC Berkeley is still pending. In 2017, Risk Services agreed to provide some funding for IT departments to assist with federal accessibility compliance systemwide.

ETLC REPORT ON LEARNING DATA PRIVACY PRINCIPLES AND RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

UCACC reviewed and discussed the Learning Data Privacy Principles and Practices document drafted by the Educational Technology Leadership Committee (ETLC). The document is meant to provide guidance for uses of data generated by learning management and student information systems. ETLC, a systemwide group of UC's academic technology leaders, based the document on current discussions within the higher education community such as the Leiden Manifesto for research metrics and the Asilomar Convention for Learning Research in Higher Education. The focus of the ETLC document is the problem of third party vendors that use the student data that they collect for commercial purposes or other ways that are not approved by the university.

While the ETLC Principles were viewed favorably by UCACC, the committee determined that it would be inappropriate to formally adopt or endorse the document, as it did not originate from the Senate and is subject to change by ETLC. UCACC encourages the ETLC to continue to work with Senate committees on learning, instruction, and technology at the campus and systemwide levels.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

UCACC Statement of Principles: UCACC ratified a "Statement of Principles" that is now posted on its website. The Principles include recommendations for design, development, and

deployment of information technology systems at UC. The document clarifies the central role of faculty as stakeholders in nearly all IT systems at UC and provides a framework for faculty involvement in academic computing and communication issues as they arise.

Link to Principles: <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ucacc/reports.html>

FAIR Principles: In May, UCACC members were introduced to the FAIR Principles, which were developed to meet the need for new and improved infrastructure, conventions, and evaluation systems in the changing scholarly communication landscape. San Diego UCACC representative Maryann Martone is a founding member of Force11, which is a group of scholars, librarians, publishers, and research funders who work to facilitate knowledge creation and sharing in a changing scholarly communications landscape. UCACC members agreed to endorse the FAIR Principles, and will send the committee's endorsement to Academic Council.

Online course evaluations: Academic Council Chair Jim Chalfant asked UCACC to advise on some confidentiality and anonymity issues that arise from online course evaluations. In small classes there is a possibility of inferring students' names from evaluation responses, although existing evaluation systems often take measures to make that identification more difficult, such as by not supplying a list of respondents if there are too few of them.

The committee discussed the distinction between anonymity, meaning the respondent's identity is not associated with his or her individual responses, and confidentiality, which allows the possibility of making the association in extraordinary circumstances (e.g., a threat of violence). UCACC members did not express a strong opinion in favor of one approach or the other and suggested that the issue be passed along for comment to other stakeholders such as UCEP, UCPT, and the Offices of Instructional Development.

Proposed policy on drones: Committee members agreed that a UC policy for drone operation was a good idea in terms of ensuring safety and avoiding legal liability. The final policy should, to the extent possible, accommodate the faculty's need for flexibility in instruction and research, and should be reevaluated periodically.

Strategic Sourcing: Acting Associate Director of IT Strategic Sourcing Tom Trappler joined UCACC in February to introduce his work and establish a communication channel with faculty. IT Strategic Sourcing at UCOP creates UC-wide agreements for IT-related services and products based on input from campuses about what products are needed. A new IT Sourcing Committee with CIO-designated representatives from each campus evaluates suggestions and establishes priorities. UCACC members suggested that a document describing the principles and criteria used for IT sourcing would be helpful for faculty, and made recommendations for a holistic approach for decision-making that incorporates interoperability and scholarly workflow.

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.

PRESENTATIONS AND CORRESPONDENCE REPORT

- Presentation: “Academic Senate Engagement in Governance of IT and Cyber Risk” (Christine Borgman, UC Cyber Risk Governance Committee, March 23, 2017)
- Presentation: “Faculty Engagement to Reduce PII Risk” (Christine Borgman and David Kay, UC Cyber Risk Governance Committee, June 26, 2017)
- Letter to chairs of Ad Hoc Task Force on Health Data Governance regarding prior UC work on data governance (Sent via Academic Council Chair Jim Chalfant, May 31, 2016)

REPRESENTATION

The UCACC Chair, David Kay, served as a faculty representative to the Information Technology Leadership Council and as an *ex officio* member of the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications. Chair Kay and Vice Chair Christine Borgman also 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 2016-17:

- Tom Andriola, CIO (Consultant to UCACC)
- Amy Blum, Managing Campus Counsel, UCLA
- Jim Davis, Vice Provost - Information Technology & Chief Academic Technology Officer, UCLA
- Mary-Ellen Kreher, Director of Course Design and Development, ILTI (Consultant to UCACC)
- Roslyn Martorano, Systemwide Privacy Manager
- David Rusting, Chief Information Security Officer, UCOP
- Jenn Stringer, ETLC member and Associate CIO, Academic Engagement, Educational Technology Services, UC Berkeley
- Tom Trappler, Acting Associate Director, IT Strategic Sourcing, UCOP
- Kent Wada, Director, Strategic IT Policy & Chief Privacy Officer, UCLA
- Jim Williamson, ETLC member and Director, Campus Educational Technology Systems & Administration, UCLA

Respectfully submitted,

UCACC 2016-17:

David G. Kay, Chair (I)
Christine Borgman, Vice Chair (LA)
Kenneth Goldberg (B)
Matt Bishop (D)
Russell Detwiler (I)
Michael Shin (LA)
Florin Rusu (M)
Laura Beth Harris (R)
Maryann Martone (SD)
Miguel Pampaloni (SF)
Todd Oakley (SB)
Brant Robertson (SC)
James A. Chalfant, Chair, Academic Senate (*Ex Officio*)

Shane White, Vice Chair, Academic Senate (*Ex Officio*)
Kwai Ng, CCGA Chair (*Ex Officio*)
Barbara Knowlton, UCEP Chair (*Ex Officio*)
Eric Bakovic, UCOLASC Chair (*Ex Officio*)
Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM (UCAF)

2016-2017 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) met two times in Academic Year 2016-2017 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.

Anti-Semitism Awareness Act

A focal point for UCAF's discussions this year was the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act. Passed by the U.S. Senate in December, and likely to be reintroduced before Congress, the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act directs the Department of Education to adopt the State Department's definition of anti-Semitism when investigating any incidents at universities. Last year, UCAF successfully persuaded UC's Board of Regents to not use this definition in their Principles against Intolerance because it is so broad that essentially anyone critical of any actions by the state of Israel could be tainted with the suspicion of anti-Semitism. Under the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act, any university found to have failed to respond seriously to such incidents under this State Department standard could result in the university losing all federal funding.

Without any built-in protections for the Academic Freedom, this Act invites attempts to pressure the Department of Education to coerce faculty and students to abandon research and teaching which might be construed as in any way critical of the actions of the state of Israel. In June, UCAF submitted a statement to the Academic Council which urges Congress to abandon this misguided and heavy-handed intrusion into the realm of academic inquiry and debate. In its statement, UCAF affirms that it is concerned about the rising tide of anti-Semitic actions/incidents, and hate speech in general, on campuses but indicates that this Act is not an appropriate response. On June 28th, Council endorsed the memo which will be forwarded to President Napolitano.

THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE'S ACR-21

In June, UCAF submitted a memo to Council asking the Academic Senate to endorse the California Legislature's Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 21. According to the Legislative Counsel's digest, California Legislature's ACR-21 "...would urge all private and public universities in California, to the extent that they have not adopted free speech statements consistent with the principles articulated by the Chancellor of the University of California at Irvine, and the Free Expression Statement formally adopted by the University of Chicago, to consider such statements as a model for developing and adopting free speech statements." On July 26th, Council endorsed this memo and it was forwarded to the President. The text of the legislation can be found

here: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180ACR21.

STATEMENT ON THE FREE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

Also in June, UCAF sent the Academic Senate a statement on the importance of the free exchange of information to the academic mission which the committee felt was broadly harmonious with the principles espoused by ACR-21 as described above. This statement addressed high-profile incidents at UC campuses and other universities where speakers with views considered abhorrent by certain students have been prevented from speaking when campus administrators felt unable to guarantee the safety of the speaker or of other members of the campus community. UCAF asserted that, rather than trying to suppress arguments and opinions that can be deeply distressing to certain audiences, it is vital to the mission of the university as an institution dedicated to the pursuit of truth, knowledge and understanding that it allows all viewpoints and opinions—so long as they do not constitute harassment or rise to the level of incitement of illegal activity—to be expressed and considered.

Through the statement, UCAF has asked that all campuses in the UC system take active steps to combat these troubling developments. The committee recommended a number of constructive forms of response to controversial speakers which do not undermine the collective right to freedom of speech while at the same time avoid the simple trap of giving sympathetic publicity to the very views the protestors decry. The statement was endorsed by Academic Council on July 26th and forwarded to the Office of the President.

UC Network Monitoring Initiative

This year the committee kept abreast of the implementation of UC's Network Monitoring Initiative. Following a July 2015 cyberattack at UCLA, the University issued a new cybersecurity policy and OP directed campuses to coordinate security monitoring, investigation and threat remediation activities. OP established the Cyber-Risk Governance Committee (CRGC) to which UCAF's Immediate Past Chair Kathleen Montgomery was appointed. There are currently no clear threats to academic freedom, but the committee is concerned about the potential for UC's efforts to raise its cyber-security profile to become overly intrusive, and considers it imperative that faculty are consulted and kept informed about all cybersecurity measures.

Weighing concerns about academic freedom is complicated because failure to protect UC's computer systems would prevent faculty from conducting research involving records with personally identifiable information. The need for cybersecurity is recognized but more information is required about the ground rules for how, where, and for how long information is used, assessed and stored. UCAF will keep up to date with future developments related to the Network Monitoring Initiative.

Other Issues and Additional Business

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

- Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination & Affirmative Action Regarding Academic & Staff Employment & APM 015

Additionally, UCAF devoted part of each regular meeting to reports on issues facing local committees.

Respectfully submitted,

Hugh Roberts, Chair (I)
Jody Kreiman (LA)
Eric Widera (SF)
Paul Gertler (B)
Thorne Lay (SC)
Jeffrey Haydu (SD)

Christopher Elmendorf, Vice Chair (D)
Lawrence Bogad (D)
Fabio Macciardi (I)
Jayson Beaster-Jones (M)
Emma Aronson (R)
Erika Rappaport (SB)

Jim Chalfant ((D); Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Shane White ((LA); Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Brenda Abrams, Principal Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL**

**2016-2017
ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) had three meetings during the Academic Year 2016-2017, one at UCOP and two 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:

Revisions to APMs 285, 210-3, 133 and 740

UCAP provided feedback on the proposed revisions to APMs 285, 210-3, 133 and 740 in November when the policies on the Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE) series were under management review and in May during the systemwide review. The committee had in-depth discussions about a variety of issues related to the proposed policy changes. Members carefully considered the appropriate title for faculty in the series and agreed that the title “Teaching Professor” recognizes their value in a fundamental way. UCAP proposed that the base salaries for individuals in the series should be identical to those of ladder rank faculty.

The committee also discussed and highlighted the long-term impact on research output and on the academic standing of programs if research faculty is replaced by Teaching Professors. Although the number of LSOEs at each UC campus currently varies from six to ten LPSOEs at UCLA to over 100 at UCI, concern that the numbers will increase in the future prompted UCAP to recommend that, because research is UC’s primary mission, there should be an upper limit on the number of Teaching Professors within a department as a percentage of ladder rank faculty. Assuming the policy is implemented in the fall, the administration indicated that campuses will be given a one year transition plan to move the LSOEs to the new series and salary scale. Next year, UCAP will monitor implementation especially to ensure that there is consultation with the divisional CAPs throughout the process.

Faculty Exit and Retention Survey

Academic Personnel provided UCAP with the results of the Faculty Exit and Retention Survey pilot at six of the campuses for faculty who left in 2014-2015. The survey was conducted in partnership with Harvard’s Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education. In May, UCAP was pleased to learn that seven campuses have agreed to continue the survey for the next three years (except UCSF, UCSC, and UCB) and are making preparations for its distribution. The survey is key to gathering the type of data Academic Personnel at OP currently does not have about faculty decisions about staying or leaving. This data may inform the administration’s decisions related to salary, benefits and other policies and processes. It is hoped that all campuses will eventually participate and UCAP looks forward to reviewing data from the next administration of the survey.

Negotiated Salary Trial Program

In May UCAP discussed Academic Personnel’s report on the third year of the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP). The NSTP is a five year pilot at three UC campuses intended to aid recruitment and retention. The program allows faculty to supplement their salary with external, non-UC funds in certain circumstances and under the supervision of faculty groups at the campus. Academic Personnel is undertaking a thorough review of the program to make an informed decision about continuing, stopping,

expanding or altering the program. A task force comprised of four academic administrators and five Senate members was established to gather information to make a set of recommendations to the Provost. Academic Personnel also administered a survey to faculty in participating units to solicit their feedback on the program. The task force's report was due in June and it will be discussed next year by UCAP and other Senate committees as well as by administrators at the campuses. While the NSTP seems to have had a minimal impact on CAPs, there is a larger concern that the program has diverted attention away from the implementation of more comprehensive salary programs.

CAP Practices Survey

In 2001, UCAP implemented the CAP Practices Survey in order to gather information about the divisional committees' workloads and processes. The survey was conducted annually until 2012 when UCAP decided to administer it on a biennial basis because the data was not changing significantly from year to year. This year, UCAP members (with input from the divisional CAP analysts) agreed that the survey should be conducted every three years, with the next administration in the 2018-2019 Academic Year. The members and divisional analysts also reviewed the instrument to determine if any questions should be eliminated and if any new questions should be added. In anticipation of changes to the Academic Personnel Manual's policies for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, the survey will include a question about the divisions' use of separate CAPs to evaluate faculty in the clinical series. The survey can be shared with divisional CAPs and other interested parties at the campus level including faculty and administrators.

Other Issues and Additional Business

In July 2016, UCAP approved an ad hoc review committee for a University Professor title nomination from UCR, and in accordance with APM 260, UCAP nominated an ad hoc faculty review committee to review an appointment to the University Professor title proposed by a campus. During the committee's November meeting, members reviewed the ad hoc committee's recommendation and all case materials, and Chair Tsoulouhas notified Vice Provost Carlson by email that UCAP unanimously supported the recommendation for the University Professor appointment at UCR.

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

- Proposed revisions to Presidential Policy Business & Finance Bulletin – G-28, Travel Regulations
- Proposed revisions to APM sections 015 and 016
- Proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 336
- Proposed revised Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action regarding Academic and Staff Employment and APM 015
- Proposed revisions to APM sections 278 and 210-6
- Collective Excellence

Campus Reports

UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to a discussion of issues facing local committees and comparison of individual campus practices, including practices related to diversity.

UCAP Representation

UCAP Chair Tsoulouhas 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 Acknowledgements

UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic

Personnel; Arthur Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies; and Janet Lockwood, Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel. UCAP occasionally consulted the Academic Senate Chair Jim Chalfant and Vice Chair Shane White about issues facing the Senate and UC.

Respectfully submitted,

Theofanis “Fanis” Tsoulouhas, Chair (M)

Daniel Farber (B)

Stuart Brown (LA)

Carla Freccero (SC)

Peter Ditto (I)

David Lloyd (R)

Michelle Yeh, Vice Chair (D)

Seana Coulson (SD)

Patricia Oteiza (D)

Peter Sturman (SB)

Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (M)

Catherine Waters (SF)

Jim Chalfant (Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (D))

Shane White (Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (LA))

Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE) Annual Report 2016-17

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE) met four times during the 2016-17 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.

Free Speech and Controversial Speakers on Campus

Meeting in February on the day after violent protests erupted on the UC Berkeley campus in response to a controversial "alt-right" speaker, UCAADE spent some time discussing the balance of free speech with the values of the university. Members wanted to know whether anything can be done to prevent individuals who espouse hateful views from being invited to campuses. The conversation led to a more in-depth discussion in April, when UCAADE invited representatives from the Office of General Counsel, Student Services, Diversity and Engagement, Labor Relations, and Student Government to attend the meeting. The April discussion covered many topics related to controversial speakers on campuses, including:

- ***Hate Speech/free speech***

Hate speech is part of free speech. Incitement to violence, "fighting words" and harassment are prosecutable, but there is a high bar. Committee members learned that, in general, speakers cannot be banned for prior speech and most verbal harassment of students by outside agitators is protected under the first amendment. Responses to incidents might include promotion of alternative points of view and the scheduling of alternative events at the same time. "More speech" is a frequent response to hate speech.

- ***UC Principles of Community, Policies, and Responses***

Members of the university administration who are involved in protests and related issues (UCPD, OGC, Student Affairs, and the Chief Diversity Officers) are working on coordinated guidance. They are aware of the rapidly changing political and cultural environment, including the rise of the "hard-right" and "hard-left," among others, that makes for a more challenging atmosphere.

- ***Legal Resources for Students***

Controversial speakers have been known to approach student groups who may not know how to refuse them. Students may not realize that there are resources and assistance available to them on campus. UCAADE members thought that the university could invest some resources in providing training to student leaders that would include legal rights and cultural competency. Although students are not technically the clients of university counsel, student government leaders are entitled to the use of UC's legal resources when they are making decisions about the use of student funds.

- ***Workplace rules and hostile work environment***

Speakers who are brought to campus by student groups may be contributing to a hostile work environment. Committee members thought that focusing on campus climate might be more effective than invoking “free speech” when dealing with the antagonism often generated by controversial speakers. Many members of the university community would appreciate further guidance from the top levels of campus administration in dealing with these hot-button situations.

Improving Faculty Diversity and Campus Climate

In addition to hate speech/free speech, another big topic for UCAADE this year was how to effectively improve faculty diversity and campus climate without revisiting the same themes and ideas that have been circulating for years. To that end, the committee invited President Napolitano to a meeting in May to discuss potential strategies.

UCAADE talked with President Napolitano for an hour on May 11th about ways to improve diversity at all levels of academic employment. Conversation was wide-ranging, and touched on the efficacy of initiatives for hiring more diverse faculty that were tested during the 2016-17 academic year, as well as ongoing programs and strategies that have been used in the past. The Faculty Equity Advisor (FEA) programs on some campuses have been shown to be successful, and with commitment from chancellors and deans, some campuses have made progress in improving faculty diversity. Unfortunately, there has been little progress for some underrepresented groups. President Napolitano said that she believes very strongly in the value of a diverse university community and is committed to strengthening diversity within UC using methods for hiring and retention. She noted that every university in the country is struggling with how to increase the diversity of its faculty.

Some key takeaways from discussion with the President were:

- UC needs to devote ongoing resources to improving diversity or there will be little change.
- The importance of a diverse faculty needs to be a clear and consistent message from all levels of administration.
- UC should adopt or expand diversity-strengthening practices that are shown to be successful.

UCAADE will continue to work towards increased communication and collaboration with groups such as the campus Chief Diversity Officers, the UCOP Office of Diversity and Engagement, and the EEO/AA/Diversity Administrators systemwide group that are involved in faculty diversity issues.

Letters of Recommendation

UCAADE first discussed letters of recommendation at its October meeting, and agreed that the practice of requesting letters of recommendation from freshman applicants was not a good idea for various reasons, including the additional burden on teachers and advisors, the potential for increasing inequities between districts with more resources and those with fewer resources, and the lack of rationale for doing so. The discussion was in response to a pilot at UC Berkeley that included adding letters among other changes to their admissions process. President Napolitano asked the Academic Senate to develop a single policy with respect to letters of recommendation for freshman applicants that could be used consistently across all campuses. UCAADE’s preliminary research showed little evidence that letters of recommendation enhance admission of

undergraduate students from underrepresented groups. Members noted that letters of recommendation are not suggested practice for staff and faculty hiring. UCAADE continued to discuss letters of recommendation in subsequent meetings during the year, and Chair Amani Nuru-Jeter participated in the Task Force that drafted a new policy on augmented review that was approved by the Academic Assembly and sent to President Napolitano in June (see: <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/reports/JC-JN-Assembly-Augmented-Review.pdf>)

Salary Equity Studies

Last year, UCAADE drafted a set of recommendations to encourage more standardization in future studies to facilitate cross campus comparisons and longitudinal analyses. In September, 2016, Academic Council approved UCAADE’s recommendations with the condition that the document’s introduction be modified to reflect concerns about standardization vs. campus autonomy. While Council members were very supportive, they also expressed some concerns about what is feasible given limited resources on campuses and varying availability of data. The recommendations were distributed by Provost Dorr to the campus Executive Vice Chancellors, Vice Provosts for Academic Personnel, and other relevant administrators for review and feedback. Division chairs were also given the opportunity to submit faculty feedback. At the end of the 2016-17 academic year, UCAADE had received comments from eight campuses. UCAADE expects to devote some of its attention to salary equity studies next year.

| Faculty Salary Equity Survey Recommendations Responses Received - 4/6/17 | | |
|--|--------|----------------|
| | Senate | Administration |
| Berkeley | | X |
| Davis | | X |
| Irvine | | X |
| UCLA | | X |
| Merced | X | |
| Riverside | | |
| UCSD | X | X |
| UCSF | | |
| UCSB | X | X |
| UCSC | X | X |

Anti-Discrimination Policies

Last year (2015-2016), UCAADE began a review of UC’s anti-discrimination policies, including the APM, Senate Bylaws, Standing Orders of the Regents, and other policy statements and reports. At the same time, President Napolitano convened the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate to review the investigation and adjudication processes for sexual harassment and sexual violence cases involving faculty. Because the Joint Committee’s work involved the same policies, UCAADE decided that the best course of action was to wait for the outcomes while continuing to examine the policies with a broader lens. At UCAADE’s first meeting of 2016-17, in October, the discussion of the Joint Committee’s proposed revisions to APM 015, 016, and Senate

Bylaw 336 raised UCAADE's ongoing concerns about these policies in relation to broader discrimination and harassment. UCAADE provided specific comments on the proposed revisions in November, and in December submitted to the Academic Council additional suggestions for changes to APM 015, 016, and the related Senate Bylaws. Provost Dorr indicated that current changes would focus on the specific revisions proposed but that they appreciated the additional feedback and would get back to it at a later date. UCAADE continued to raise these additional concerns with Academic Council; and in May, 2017, the Academic Council agreed to establish a joint work group to discuss suggestions for further revisions to APMs 015 and 016 and to Bylaws 334-337.

Other Topics

\$2 million diversity initiative: UCAADE received regular reports from Academic Personnel Vice Provost Susan Carlson on the "Use of One-time Funds to Support Best Practices in Equal Employment Opportunity In Faculty Employment." UC received \$2,000,000 from the state to support equal opportunity in faculty employment, including systemwide training, monitoring and compliance. In planned expenditures on pilot projects at three campuses, UC is supporting new faculty diversity efforts that supplement efforts already underway. UCAADE Chair Nuru-Jeter served on the selection committee for the pilots and continues to serve on the project advisory group that provides continual guidance for the projects.

"Contributions to diversity" statements: UCAADE reviewed information collected by UCAP on how the changes to APM 210-1-d, the "Contributions to Diversity for Faculty Appointment and Promotion," in 2015, are being implemented on the campuses. UCAADE discussed with UCFW and UCAP the challenges in implementing the new policy, and will continue to monitor this area in the coming years.

Faculty Equity Advisors:

Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, UCLA, and San Diego have Faculty Equity Advisor programs, while UCSF and Merced are starting up. Riverside and Santa Cruz do not have programs. Berkeley has a large network of FEAs that are involved with search committees throughout the hiring process. At other campuses, there are only a few people in the role, and they are primarily responsible for providing training and support to search committees. Campuses with faculty equity advisors are encouraged to include them as frequent guests or *ex-officio* members of their CAAD (or campus equivalent). Campuses that report successful communication between faculty and administration make it a common practice to invite administrators to faculty committee meetings. UCAADE intends to work with the EEO/AA/Diversity Officers group to discuss possibilities for information sharing and potential for standardizing FEA program practices.

Faculty Exit Survey: UCAADE also received updates on the Faculty Exit Survey pilot and research partnership with Harvard's Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE). Campuses were given the option to participate again, with a portion of the fee paid through UCOP. Some campuses realized in the first round that they did not have sufficient methods for collecting retention data, but seven campuses will participate again (Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Merced, Riverside, San Diego, and Santa Barbara).

Collective Excellence: UCAADE was given the opportunity to opine on a document entitled “Pursuit of Collective Excellence in Research at the University of California” that was developed by the Office of Research and Graduate Studies.

President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program Initiative (PPFP): UCAADE received a brief update on the President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program Initiative (PPFP) at the May meeting. UCAADE expects to follow-up with PPFP next year.

Systemwide issues and campus reports

UCAADE devoted part of each meeting to reports from individual campuses and the discussion of systemwide issues as reported by Academic Senate leadership.

Reports and Recommendations

- Equity for faculty salaries at the University of California: Suggestions for future faculty salary equity analyses (September 28, 2017)
- Proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on International Activities (November 18, 2016)
- Proposed Revisions to APM 015, APM 016, and Senate Bylaw 336 (November 18, 2016)
- Berkeley’s interim pilot admissions policy to request letters of recommendation from some freshman applicants (November 21, 2016)
- Extended comments on changes to APM 015, 016, and Senate Bylaws 335 and 336 (December 14, 2016).
- Proposed Revised Presidential Nondiscrimination Policy and APM 015 (January 10, 2017)
- Proposed Revised Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) (January 10, 2017)

Representation

UCAADE Chair Amani Nuru-Jeter served on the selection committee and advisory committee for the \$2 million Diversity Initiative. Chair Nuru-Jeter and Vice Chair Tanya Golash-Boza represented UCAADE at monthly BOARS meetings.

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: President Janet Napolitano, Vice Provost Susan Carlson, Vice Provost Yvette Gullatt, Associate Vice Provost Elizabeth Halimah, Diversity, Labor, & Employee Relations Director Amy K. Lee, PPFP Director Mark Lawson, Chief Deputy General Counsel Julia Friedlander, Senior Counsel Elisabeth Yap, UC Berkeley Professor Jesse Rothstein, UCFW Chair Lori Lubin, UCAF Vice Chair Christopher Elmendorf, Director of UC Berkeley’s Office for Faculty Equity and Welfare Karie Frasch, UCLA Equity, Diversity & Inclusion Program Officer Brandi Kirkpatrick, and UC Student Association President Ralph Washington, Jr. The committee also thanks the faculty members who served as alternates during the year.

Respectfully submitted,
UCAADE 2016-17:

Amani Nuru-Jeter, Chair (B)

Tanya Golash-Boza, Vice Chair (M)
Lok Siu (B)
Bruce Haynes (D)
Rufus Edwards (I)
Catia Sternini (LA)
Clarissa Nobile (M)
Manuela Martins-Green (R)
Rommie Amaro (SD)
Katherine Julian (SF)
Beth Gwinn (SB)
Miriam Greenberg (SC)
Sophia Armen, Graduate Student Representative (SD)
James Chalfant, Chair, Academic Senate (*Ex Officio*)
Shane White, Vice Chair, Academic Senate (*Ex Officio*)
Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)
ANNUAL REPORT 2016-17**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) met ten times in Academic Year 2016–17 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](#), submitted in late January, discusses freshman and transfer application, admission, and SIR (Statement of Intent to Register) outcomes under comprehensive review for the years 2012–2016; first-year UC performance outcomes for students who entered UC in fall 2015; 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 that the push to enroll 5,000 new California resident undergraduates had a noticeable effect across the admission cycle in 2016, as campuses admitted more students from deeper into their applicant pools to meet the higher targets, and the report discusses several significant changes in 2016 outcomes that follow from these efforts.

AUGMENTED REVIEW AND LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

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

At multiple meetings, BOARS discussed President Napolitano’s request to the Senate for a systemwide policy on the use of letters of recommendation in undergraduate admissions. The request was prompted by a 2015 proposal from the Berkeley campus to seek letters of recommendation from all applicants, and concerns from faculty, administrators, Regents, and others that allowing one campus to require letters as a condition of admission would be inconsistent with the principle of maintaining a single undergraduate admissions policy and consistent application requirements for all UC campuses. The proposal also raised concerns about the extent to which a letters requirement could unintentionally disadvantage vulnerable student populations.

BOARS solicited input from campus admissions committees and directors, high school counselors, and the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE). Based on feedback BOARS received from these groups about the workload burden associated with letters for nearly 200,000 UC applicants and the ability of students who attend under-resourced schools to obtain high-quality letters, BOARS decided against recommending a systemwide policy requiring letters from all UC applicants.

Instead, a BOARS subcommittee led by Vice Chair Comeaux crafted a policy on Augmented Review in Undergraduate Admissions that allows letters on a limited basis. Following Academic Council and Assembly approvals, the UC Regents voted unanimously in July to adopt the policy,

now codified as [Regents Policy 2110](#). The policy 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 will monitor implementation and outcomes from the policy, including applicant responses to campus requests for supplemental information and the effects of letters of recommendation. BOARS views the policy as a starting point it can revisit if relevant new information comes to light.

- ***Berkeley Letters of Recommendation Pilot and Studies***

BOARS also discussed outcomes from the UC Berkeley letters of recommendation pilot project and two studies Berkeley commissioned to better understand the effect of letters on admissions at that campus. The pilot followed an agreement between the Academic Council and Berkeley in 2015 that permitted Berkeley to solicit letters from applicants receiving an initial review score of “possible” based on their application materials or later in the review process. Berkeley Professor of Public Policy and Economics Jesse Rothstein joined BOARS in November 2016 to discuss his study of letters in the fall 2016 Berkeley admissions cycle and to gather advice about an expanded study of letters in the fall 2017 cycle focused on how letters affected underrepresented students. Professor Rothstein returned to BOARS in July 2017 to discuss outcomes from the study, which attempted to isolate the effect of the letters and examine whether their inclusion affected the relative admissions chances of Berkeley freshman applicants from underrepresented groups. The study found that the invitation to submit letters may have reduced the share of admitted students from underrepresented groups, but that the invitation had a positive effect on their likelihood to enroll.

NONRESIDENT ADMISSION

- ***Compare Favorably Report to President Napolitano***

BOARS’ July 2017 [report to President Napolitano](#) on the “Compare Favorably” policy for nonresident admission responds to the President’s fall 2016 request to the Senate to clarify the policy’s (1) compliance with the California Master Plan for Higher Education; and (2) its consistency with the University’s overall freshman admission goals, comprehensive review policy, and holistic review processes in place on UC campuses. A 2016 State audit had criticized the policy and the University’s nonresident admission and enrollment practices. BOARS’ report summarizes the Committee’s efforts to analyze the issues associated with comparing residents and nonresidents and to consider several alternative measures for the evaluation.

The report describes how quantitative measures of academic preparation (average high school GPA and test scores) compared for admitted California resident and nonresident freshmen in 2016, and how academic outcomes at UC (first-year GPA, persistence and probation rates) compared for resident and nonresident freshmen who first enrolled in fall 2015. The report also

describes an analysis of similar outcomes across several specific admitting units on campuses, and it details what BOARS learned from a series of regression analyses examining the relationship between test scores and high school GPA on first-year UC performance.

The report concludes that the existing Compare Favorably policy provides appropriate flexibility for campuses while maintaining the University's primary responsibility to California students and ensuring that campuses are admitting nonresidents who perform at least as well as California residents. In the report, BOARS does not recommend changing the policy but indicates that it will continue to monitor campus compliance, report outcomes on an annual basis, and suggest adjustments as data warrant.

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

BOARS also issued its [annual "Compare Favorably" report](#) on 2016 nonresident admissions. Like the special report to the President, 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 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 (NGSS) for K-12, which include four science categories: Physical Sciences; Life Sciences; Earth and Space Sciences; and Engineering, Technology and Applications of Science.

The work group included faculty from all ten campuses who represented a broad range of science and science education disciplines. It met four times in spring 2017, and ultimately recommended revisions to policy that require approval by the greater Senate. The revisions to Senate Regulation 424 include: 1) increasing the minimum area "d" requirement from 2 units (3 recommended) to 3 units, while continuing to require 2 units of coursework that "provide basic knowledge in at least two of the fundamental disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics"; and 2) changing the name of the area "d" subject requirement from "Laboratory Science" to "Science." BOARS also approved the working group's recommendation to broaden options for science disciplines that can fulfill the third year area "d" requirement. Under the new policy, high school students would be able take a third course from the three fundamental disciplines listed in the regulation, or select a third course from other disciplines reflected in the NGSS, including earth and space sciences, interdisciplinary sciences, computer science, engineering, and applied sciences. The options would be reflected in the [A-G Guide](#). The Academic Council approved BOARS' request for a systemwide review of the proposal.

TRANSFER ADMISSION

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

- ***Letter on Transfer Pathways***

In May 2017, Chair Sanchez sent a letter to campus admissions directors, associate vice chancellors for enrollment management, campus Senate division chairs, and Senate executive directors updating them on the status of the UC Transfer Pathways project and providing guidance about the use of the Transfer Pathway course expectations in campus selection processes.

- ***UC Transfer Pathways Articulation Analysis***

UCOP briefed BOARS on the ongoing effort to analyze articulation agreements and gaps between UC and the California Community Colleges (CCC) for courses in the 21 UC Transfer Pathways: 1) to determine if there is agreement among the nine UC undergraduate campuses about whether a given course offered at each of the 113 CCCs is acceptable as fulfilling a specific UC Pathway course expectation; and 2) to identify articulation gaps between a specific UC campus or campuses and a specific CCC for a given Pathway course expectation. The next stage involved identifying all relevant courses at each CCC that fulfill one or more UC Pathway course expectations and confirming that UC will apply credit for each course. All Pathway courses are published on the [UC Transfer Pathways Guide](#), a new online resource that shows which UC-transferable courses from ASSIST meet the specific course expectations for a given Pathway.

- ***Increasing Transfer Enrollment to the 2:1 Ratio***

BOARS discussed UC's progress meeting the 2:1 freshman-to-transfer enrollment ratio target included in the Budget Framework Agreement with the state, individual campus strategies for increasing the number of qualified applicants and SIRs to meet the target, and barriers to achieving that goal, including a lack of qualified transfer applicants, strong regional competition for transfers, and higher demand at the freshman level. BOARS expressed its commitment to the transfer admission path and support for the Master Plan mandate to reserve a sizable portion of enrollments for transfers, as well as its support for positive measures such as increasing transfer outreach and recruitment, strengthening student support services to ensure the success of admitted transfers, and expanding programs like UC Transfer Pathways that provide clear preparation roadmaps for transfers. BOARS also believes the University must balance the mandate for transfer enrollment growth with the higher demand for access at the freshman level.

- ***Associate Degrees for Transfer***

BOARS discussed a meeting UCOP hosted in May 2017 for UC and CCC faculty from physics and chemistry departments to consider possible Associate Degrees for Transfer based on the UC Transfer Pathways.

ADVANCING DIVERSITY

BOARS discussed efforts to expand diversity on campuses, including strategies to increase applications from underrepresented students and the yield of those students after they are admitted.

- ***Support for ELC-Only Pathway***

In February 2017, Chair Sanchez issued a letter to campuses reaffirming the value of guaranteed students and the need for all campuses, including the most selective, to prioritize California residents who are eligible for the guarantee via *ELC-only*. The letter referenced a new systemwide program that encourages campuses to admit more applicants who are eligible for an admissions guarantee through the ELC-only pathway and who graduated from a high school designated as Local Control Funding Formula Plus (LCFF+). In the past two admissions cycles, UC has been flagging applicants meeting those criteria and encouraging campuses to give them an additional review to achieve a 4% target as a proportion of overall admits. The state is funding additional outreach and academic support services targeted to the students.

- ***Simulation Analysis of UC Admissions***

BOARS asked UCOP to produce a study illustrating how changes in UC’s undergraduate admissions policy have influenced the student profile of admitted freshmen. The study employed an algorithm that mimics an admissions process based only on GPA and standardized test scores to identify the group of students who would have been admitted through that process, compared to real outcomes under comprehensive review using 14 factors. The study showed that comprehensive review has led to the admission of a higher number of students from underrepresented minority groups and from low-income and first generation college backgrounds, especially at the more selective UC campuses, than would have been admitted using more narrow academic indicators.

- ***Support for Undocumented Students***

BOARS discussed the uncertainty created by the results of the national election, particularly for undocumented members of the UC community, and initiatives the University was undertaking to better support undocumented students.

SMARTER BALANCED

BOARS discussed a potential role in UC admissions for Smarter Balanced, an assessment system aligned with California’s Common Core State Standards for English language arts and math. In May 2017, California Board of Education President Michael Kirst, Deputy Superintendent of the CA Department of Education Keric Ashley, and Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Executive Director Tony Alpert joined BOARS to discuss how the University might incorporate Smarter Balanced assessments into its evaluation of students for undergraduate admission, in addition to, or in lieu of, existing assessments. BOARS endorsed a plan to pursue two studies to support BOARS’ deliberations: 1) an independently funded campus-specific study to analyze how Smarter Balanced scores compare with existing admission criteria for students entering UC Davis and how well they predict student performance in first-year courses there; and 2) a UC systemwide study of Smarter Balanced assessment scores in relation to other admissions factors currently in use, as well as first-year student outcome metrics.

VISUAL & PERFORMING ARTS (VPA) SUBJECT REQUIREMENT (“F”)

In February 2017, BOARS approved a policy change related to the [Visual and Performing Arts \(VPA\)](#) (“F”) requirement for freshman admission that will allow California high schools, programs, online publishers, and online schools to submit online VPA courses to UC for review and potential approval in area “F” with no restrictions tied to the mode of course delivery. Prior policy required VPA courses to combine any online delivery with face-to-face interaction

between student and teacher, regardless of the specific discipline. As a result, online high school courses in dance, music, theater, visual arts, and interdisciplinary arts were not previously eligible for area “f” approval.

PARENTAL ALUMNI STATUS ON THE UC APPLICATION

In October 2016, Provost Dorr and Senior Vice President Henderson joined BOARS to discuss a UCOP proposal to add a place on the UC application for students to designate their parents’ UC alumni status. Last year BOARS raised concerns that the request could falsely suggest that alumni information might affect an admission decision and could also discourage some students from applying. Provost Dorr and Senior Vice President Henderson reported that feedback from BOARS and others had led to a decision to withhold any questions about parents’ college of graduation from the application.

JOINT MEETINGS WITH THE UC ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS

The Admissions Directors and AVCs for Enrollment Management joined BOARS on the phone in November 2016 to discuss the President’s requests for a systemwide policy on Letters of Recommendation and a review of the “Compare Favorably” policy. BOARS and the campus Admissions Directors also held their annual half-day joint meeting in July to discuss outcomes from the 2017 admissions cycle; issues and challenges associated with nonresident admission; transfer admissions issues, including the 2:1 freshman-to-transfer enrollment ratio, transfer access to capped majors, and the role of the UC Transfer Pathways in comprehensive review; results from the new Personal Insight questions on the UC application; implementation of the Augmented Review policy; and strategies for expanding student diversity in the context of increasing selectivity.

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 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; and strategies to ensure strong English language skills in international admits.

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 State audit of UCOP.

Office of Admissions: The Office of Admissions 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 “a-g” course certification 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.

Presentation on Demographic Trends: In December 2016, Associate Vice President Handel presented data on California demographic trends and their implications for UC enrollment and diversity, to provide BOARS with a long-term perspective on UC’s educational goals and challenges.

Personal Insight Questions: UCOP briefed BOARS on the 2017 UC application’s eight new “Personal Insight” questions for freshmen and transfers developed by admissions directors in 2015; data on utilization of the questions; and feedback from admissions reviewers, counselors, and students about the benefits of the questions.

Transfer Pathways Guide Website: UCOP briefed BOARS on the December 2016 launch of the [UC Transfer Pathways Guide](#) online resource for prospective UC transfers and its new Course Finder tool that allows prospective transfers to determine which CCCs offer specific Pathway courses that fulfill the UC Transfer Pathway they are following.

College Readiness Audit: BOARS reviewed a State auditor [report](#) on the availability of “a-g” courses in 11 California high school districts. The Auditor issued no recommendations for UC and provided a favorable evaluation of the University’s processes for “a-g” course submissions and reviews.

UCEP Report on Alternative Credit: BOARS reviewed a UCEP report on campus policies for awarding UC credit for Advanced Placement exams, and for applying that credit to UC graduation requirements for specific majors and/or for general education requirements.

Global Politics HL International Baccalaureate Exam: BOARS approved the recommendations of UC faculty content experts charged with determining whether UC should award elective credit for scores of “5” or higher on the new International Baccalaureate HL Global Politics exam.

PTE Academic Proposal: BOARS reviewed a proposal for recognition by the UC system of the Pearson Test of English (PTE) Academic as an approved English language test for undergraduate international applicants who are non-native English speakers.

BOARS REPRESENTATION

BOARS Chair Sanchez represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, the Assembly of the Academic Senate, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) and the ICAS IGETC Standards Subcommittee. Vice Chair Comeaux represented BOARS on the Systemwide Strategic Admissions Taskforce (SSAT) and the Education Financing Model Steering Committee.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

BOARS collaborated closely with UCOP and benefited from regular consultations with Vice President for Student Affairs Robin Holmes-Sullivan, Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions Stephen Handel, 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. Adam Parker made key contributions to the annual report to the Regents and the Compare Favorably report to the President. BOARS also appreciates the contributions of UCAADE Chair and BOARS Liaison Amani Nuru-Jeter, and the faculty who attended BOARS meetings as alternates for regular committee members: Mark Brilliant (UCB), Ignacio Navarrete (UCB), Jade Jenkins (I), Uma Jayakumar (R), David Volz (R), and Rita Mehta (SC).

Respectfully submitted,

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Henry Sanchez, Chair (SF) | Maribel Bueno Cachadina (SB) |
| Eddie Comeaux, Vice Chair (R) | Melissa Famulari (SD) |
| Frank Worrell (B) | Christopher Viney (M) |
| Patrick Farrell (D) | Kevin Heller, Graduate (D) |
| Ann Sakai (I) | |
| Eddie Comeaux (R) | Jim Chalfant, <i>ex officio</i> |
| David Smith (SC) | Shane White, <i>ex officio</i> |
| Adrienne Lavine (LA) | Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst |

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
Annual Report 2016-17**

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 2016-17 Academic year, CCGA approved 18 program proposals; nine of these were Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs (SSGPDPs), and one had PDST (Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition). Six proposals will carry over to the 2017-18 year. *No proposals, self-supported or state-supported, were declined.*

Programs Approved During the 2016-17 Year

| Campus | Program | Date Received | Date Approved | SSGPDP? |
|---------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| UCB | Real Estate Development and Design | 2/28/17 | 7/5/17 | Yes |
| UCI | Business Analytics | 8/10/16 | 2/1/17 | Yes |
| UCI | Conservation and Restoration Science | 8/12/16 | 3/1/17 | Yes |
| UCI | Sue and Bill Gross School of Nursing | 9/22/16 | 12/15/16 | Yes |
| UCI | European Thought and Culture | 1/10/17 | 7/15/17 | No |
| UCI | Finance | 2/29/16 | 11/2/16 | Yes |
| UCLA | Business Analytics | 8/16/16 | 1/4/17 | Yes |
| UCLA | Environment and Sustainability | 3/15/16 | 1/4/17 | No |
| UCLA | Conservation of Material Culture | 4/1/16 | 11/3/16 | No |
| UCM | Public Health | 9/22/16 | 2/1/17 | No |
| UCM | Mgmt., Innovation, Sustainability and Tech | 11/29/16 | 6/7/17 | PDST |
| UCSB | Technology Management | 3/15/16 | 10/15/16 | No |
| UCSD | Social Documentation | 10/25/16 | 4/24/17 | No |
| UCSD | Drug Development and Project Mgmt. | 11/28/16 | 3/1/17 | Yes |
| UCSD | Geotechnical Engineering | 2/1/17 | 7/5/17 | No |
| UCSD | Public Health | 2/1/17 | 7/5/17 | No |
| UCSD | Professional Accountancy | 3/1/17 | 7/5/17 | Yes |
| UCSF | Nursing Practice | 6/29/16 | 1/26/17 | Yes |

**Proposals to be Carried Over to 2017-18
(Showing those received by June 30, 2017)**

| Campus | Program | Date Received | Status | SSGPDP? |
|---------------|---|----------------------|----------------|----------------|
| UCB | Molecular Science and Software Engring. | 4/3/17 | Under Review | Yes |
| UCB | Information and Cyber Security | 4/3/17 | Under Review | Yes |
| UCI | JDP with SDSU – Computational Science | 1/31/17 | Under Review | No |
| UCI | Nursing Practice | 4/18/17 | Under Review | Yes |
| UCLA | Nursing Practice | 5/19/17 | Under Review | Yes |
| UCSC | Coastal Science and Policy | 6/21/17 | To Be Assigned | No |

The committee worked assiduously with campuses and faculty throughout the year to help them craft proposals that would meet the University’s expectations of excellence. Three-quarters of the proposals submitted in 2016-17 were approved before the end of the committee year in August. Most proposers found the review process a helpful and rewarding one. Program proposals were strengthened in response to the comments raised by outside reviewers as well as by CCGA. Programs were able to strengthen aspects of the program, including curriculum, capstone requirement, placement support, FTE allocations, facilities, and administrative support, among others.

Topics of Note During the 2016-17 Year

Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs) and PDST

Ongoing reductions in state support have resulted in campuses increasingly looking to SSGPDPs as a means of funding new degrees and growing departments, as well as backfilling declining state support for existing programs. In the early fall of 2016, the long-awaited Presidential SSGPDP Policy was released. This policy proved very helpful to CCGA, which had previously dealt with questions about SSGPDP proposal requirements and approvals. A new policy on PDST was also developed and released. CCGA expressed support of the new PDST policy.

The new SSGPDP policy designates a wider range of programs as self-supporting and mentions the possibility of converting programs from PDST to SSGPDP. Conversions, historically have been very rare; however, it is foreseeable that CCGA will get more requests in the future. In 2016-17, in response to some campus inquiries, CCGA reiterated that per the 2016 SSGPDP policy, conversion of an existing state-supported program to self-supporting status is regarded as “exceptional.” CCGA holds all conversion requests to a very high bar. As the policy states, “special justification must be given for a conversion application to be approved.” The scope of “specific justification” allowed is construed narrowly.

Conversions will raise questions regarding return-to-aid, diversity stipulations, and the issue of taking a program that has been built by state money and turning it private. The committee discussed what criteria are going to dictate if a campus request to convert a program can move forward. What “clear and overwhelming” evidence will be required? How confident can the committee be in approving conversions when it does not have data on how current SSGPDP courses are faring financially? The Provost said that the campuses would need to meet the usual SSGPDP requirements, and must be able to demonstrate that there would be a clear set of jobs for program graduates. She said that it was the role of CCGA to give interested programs guidance regarding conversion proposals. In a memo sent to campuses in March, CCGA outlined briefly the components of a conversion request. However, CCGA decided that it would not put forward any formal guidelines for proposals, but would review campus requests/justifications on a case-by-case basis.

The question of whether some SSGPDPs were able to achieve self-supporting status as planned was also a concern raised by CCGA members. To that end, CCGA has asked for information from UCOP for both a systemwide big-picture view and campus-level breakdowns. At the time of writing, we are still in the process of collecting the data. While it is not the duty of CCGA to conduct annual or third-year reviews of individual SSGPDPs, the committee encourages divisional Graduate Councils to identify struggling SSGPDPs early and make sure that appropriate measures are taken to either make changes or to discontinue a program unable to achieve self-supporting status.

Introduction: Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies

Vice President Art Ellis joined the University in August and met frequently with CCGA over the course of the year. He formulated ideas on graduate-related projects the campuses and OP might work on together.

- *International Thinking*

Vice President Ellis explained that President Napolitano had designated a couple of “thinking” days: one for innovation thinking and the other for international thinking. In September, the Chancellors met in a two-day retreat to discuss long-term strategic priorities related to these topics. Several priority areas emerged from the discussions, including the need to strengthen and enhance the University’s overall international strategy and its approach to global competition for faculty, research funding, and students. The Vice President stated that this might involve the exploration of options for joint/dual degrees with international partners, study abroad, and the internationalization of the campuses.

- *Collective Excellence and Mentoring*

Vice President Ellis discussed the University’s Collective Excellence initiative that was designed to investigate the many ways that scholars can contribute to UC’s research enterprise. Such contributions include: team-based scholarly output, stewardship of research tools, traditional research, teaching-research collaborations, and a globally-engaged, diverse research workforce. These topics raised issues of diversity and mentoring, which were of particular concern. The Council of Graduate Deans received complaints from some students in the fall regarding less-than-ideal mentoring experiences, and the graduate deans were not sure how to solve the problem. (See “Faculty-Student Mentorship,” below.)

Graduate Student Wellbeing Survey

Vice President Pamela Brown met with the committee to share the findings of the systemwide Graduate Student Wellbeing Study which had developed from a similar survey that that the Berkeley campus had conducted. The survey provided a stratified random sample of UC Graduate students that captured student campus affiliation, ethnicity, discipline, and underrepresentation.

The survey took place February 29-April 29 2016 and sampled over 13,400 individuals, with a 40 percent response rate.

Nearly three-quarters of graduate students are generally satisfied with life but challenges remain:

- Over one-third reported symptoms of clinical depression
- Nearly one-quarter are dissatisfied with mentorship and advising
- Over two-fifths are not financially confident
- Over one-quarter experienced food insecurity
- Almost one-third are not upbeat about career prospects

Initial recommendations from the survey included the following:

- Continue to expand and promote mental health services and prevention efforts.
- Increase training for advisors and faculty to recognize and respond appropriately to warning signs of distress in graduate students.
- Expand opportunities for graduate students – especially doctoral students – to learn about career opportunities outside academia through information sharing or experiential learning.
- Help students manage finances and promote food security.
- Help empower students to maximize mentoring relationships by employing effective strategies in managing advisee/advisor relationships.

Faculty-Student Mentorship

UCB Graduate Division Dean Fiona Doyle informed the committee about a UCSA letter reflecting student concerns about faculty mentoring. She discussed what has been put in place on the Berkeley campus in terms of “best practices” for faculty mentors. These include awards for excellence in faculty mentorship. Overall, she is convinced that the vast majority of faculty is committed to good mentoring and doing what is needed. Unfortunately, there will always be the risk one or two “bad apples” in the mentor pool. The success of the faculty-student mentoring relationship relies heavily up on personal chemistry and amicability; students sometimes may not be matched with the ideal mentor. From the student perspective, a major obstacle is the lack of anonymity if s/he raises a complaint; the student complainer is too easily identifiable. Ms. Doyle put forward that perhaps some explicit mention of mentorship expectations could be included in the Faculty Code of Conduct, which would have to come from the Senate, not the graduate deans.

The committee agreed that there is a gap between the Faculty Code of Conduct and what would be considered “bad behavior,” and that the University needs to separate the egregious from the less-than-ideal. The Academic Council Chair said that he would like to see CCGA take the lead in determining how the campus grad councils are implementing best practices. The Academic Council vice chair cautioned against conflating the separate issues of “bad apples” and best practices. Ms. Doyle remarked that it would be good to interview the campuses to develop a suite of best practices; something on the systemwide level could be very effective. Students need to know that they are being heard and that there are practices for dealing with inappropriate behavior.

In response, CCGA has produced a guideline on mentorship best practices. It will be sent to campuses’ Graduate Deans and Graduate Council for their reference. CCGA has also expressed willingness to meet with graduate student representatives in the future to continue to facilitate dialogues between graduate students and the faculty on the subject.

Acknowledgements

CCGA is grateful to have had valuable input from - and exchange with- these UCOP and campus consultants and guests over the past year: Provost Aimée Dorr, Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies Art Ellis, Director of Graduate Studies Pamela Jennings, Director of Academic Planning Todd Greenspan; Academic Planning Manager Kimberly Peterson, Academic Planning and Research Analyst Chris Procello, and Council of Graduate Deans representative Tyrus Miller (UCSC). Special thanks to Academic Council Chair Jim Chalfant, Vice Chair Shane White, Senate Executive Director Hilary Baxter and Associate Director Jocelyn Banaria.

Respectfully submitted,

Kwai Ng, Chair (UCSD)
Karen Duderstadt, Vice Chair (UCSF)
Daniel Neumark (UCB)
Anna Peluffo (UCD)
Susan Charles (UCI)
Onyebuchi Arah (UCLA)

Ramesh Balasubramaniam (UCM)
Michael Coffey (UCR)
Richard Arneson (UCSD)
Dar Roberts (UCSB)
Donald Smith (UCSC)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ANNUAL REPORT 2016-17

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 four times by videoconference. Major issues and accomplishments are reported below.

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

At the November 2016 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 2017-18 chairs and vice chairs of their designated committees. UCOC reviewed and approved these recommendations from April to July 2017.

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 appointed five new members to the Editorial Committee, one new member to the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) Health Care Task Force (HCTF), and reappointed one member to UCFW Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR). In addition, UCOC selected two Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) members.

Appointment of Senate Representatives to Special Committees & Task Forces, Search Committees, & 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 UC San Diego and UC Santa Cruz Chancellor Ad Hoc Review Committees, Steering Committee on the UC Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Lab Science ("d") work group, the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC), and the UC Center Sacramento (UCCS) Advisory Board.

Other UCOC activities

- Revisited Bylaw 128, specifically, Chair and Vice Chair positions for two years (i.e., BOARS and the University Committee on International Education, UCIE). Discussion focused on having a two-year term based workload and/or expertise.
- Examined the divisional Committee on Committees (COC) Chair compensation.
- Drafted a Conflict of Interest (COI) statement since there does not appear to be a systemwide Senate COI.
- Discussion on systemwide Senate committee membership, specifically on the challenges of obtaining divisional representatives to systemwide committees.

- [Bylaw 150.B.2](#), which states that UCOC “appoints all the general membership of all other Senate committees.” UCOC discussed whether and how the Committee could become more proactive in working with the Divisions to ensure a diverse and well-represented slate of members of the system-wide committees. This is complicated by the fact that most divisions make their committee nominations very late in the academic calendar.
- Review of 2017-18 systemwide committee membership rosters.

Respectfully submitted:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Robert Clare, Chair (UCR) | Kimberly Prather (UCSD) |
| Patricia Gallagher, Vice Chair (UCSC) | Stanton Glanz (UCSF) |
| Ming Wu (UCB) | Stuart Sweeney (UCSB) |
| Sue Bodine (UCD) | Micah Perks (UCSC) |
| Roxane Cohen-Silver (UCI) | Jim Chalfant (Council Chair, ex-officio) |
| Gregory Leazer (UCLA) | Shane White (Council Vice Chair, ex-officio) |
| Rick Dale (UCM) | Jocelyn Banaria (Committee Analyst) |
| Jeffrey Sacks (UCR) | |

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
EDUCATIONAL POLICY
2016-2017 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) met seven times in Academic Year 2016-2017 (including twice by videoconference) 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.

State Budget Framework Initiatives

This year, UCEP completed its work on several components of the June 2015 [budget framework initiatives](#) announced by Governor Brown as part of his May Revision to the 2016-2017 budget for the University. Over the course of this past year, the committee considered the issue of alternative credit, primarily through the use of Credit by Examination and the awarding of Advanced Placement (AP) credit, and the committee assisted with the Major Requirements initiative.

Credit by Examination

Last year UCEP members gathered information from their campuses about policies and practices related to credit by examination. Information about campus policies was put into a memo that was available to the committee for the May 2016 UCEP meeting. The issue was further discussed at this meeting, including that the credit-by-examination option is used infrequently across the campuses and that students need to have a very good understanding of their level of proficiency in a particular subject in order to take advantage of this mechanism. Members investigated the campus practices further over the summer, and considered if any of the restrictions on credit by examination should be removed and whether students should be encouraged to take this option. Based on this information, a draft report was submitted to the committee at the October 2016 meeting and approved. [UCEP’s final report on the use of credit by examination](#) was submitted to Academic Council and forwarded to the Provost in late October.

Advanced Placement Credit

UCEP had multiple, in-depth discussions about the awarding of Advanced Placement (AP) credit in spring 2016 and the consideration of AP credit was organized in terms of application to university requirements, departmental (major) requirements, and General Education (GE) requirements. Two main issues regarding reexamining AP credit were identified. The first issue was whether the general policy of requiring a 4 or above on AP exams for major credit is justified, particularly in foundational courses. The second issue was the differences in awarding AP credit for GE courses among campuses and how awarding AP credit, or not, aligns with the pedagogical goals and philosophies of the GE programs at the different campuses.

Before UCEP’s October 2016 meeting, members collected information from their home campuses about current policies and discussed the awarding of AP credit with academic advising staff. The committee also reviewed data on the average number of AP units among incoming freshmen. A supplementary report on AP credit and first-generation status was offered by Institutional Research, which revealed some equity questions of interest to local representatives for campus-level dialogue. A draft report was reviewed by the committee at the November 2016 meeting and approved. [UCEP’s final report on the awarding of Advanced Placement credit](#) was submitted to Academic Council and forwarded to the Provost in December 2016.

Major Requirements

The budget framework initiative emphasized efforts to support student progress and improve time-to-degree and UCEP assisted the Provost's Office with the evaluation of Major Requirements across the UC campuses. Department faculty at all campuses were tasked with reviewing major requirements to determine whether the number of upper-division units required to complete a major can be reduced without compromising quality, with a goal of not exceeding one academic year's worth of coursework (generally the equivalent of about 45 quarter units). When it was determined that the requirements for majors could not be reduced, departments submitted rationales to the Provost's Office to justify not making changes. From October to February, UCEP reviewed a portion of these rationales in order to decide if the reasons for the required number of units were valid or if the justifications were not sufficient. The Provost's Office sent UCEP's written requests for clarification or additional details back to the departments which provided revised rationales that UCEP also reviewed. UCEP completed its work on this component of the budget framework initiative in February.

Innovative Learning Technology Initiative

At the end of the last Academic Year, too late in the year to obtain comprehensive and meaningful feedback from campuses, UCEP received a set of policy questions related to the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative's (ILTI) online courses. ILTI wants to expand the use of online courses and policies established without online courses in mind may be impediments. This year, members consulted with their campus committees to gather input in response to the policy questions. At the March meeting, members discussed the input from the campuses as well as issues of broader concerns related to online courses such as underprepared students, differences between hybrid and fully online courses, the value of face to face time, multi-campus courses, and testing centers including how to test students who are not on physically on campus. A memo outlining the committee's feedback about the policies and describing UCEP's more basic concerns was submitted to the ILTI Coordinator in mid-June. UCEP's feedback will be discussed by the ILTI steering committee and it is likely that UCEP will be asked for guidance related to implementation of any new policies and procedures.

UCEP also spent time in March discussing possible definitions for "online" and "hybrid" in the belief that defining these terms will be helpful during future committee discussions about courses under the umbrella of ILTI. The members agreed to the following general guidelines: less than one hour per week in person would be an online course and more than one hour in person (where the faculty member is there for lectures or discussion, excluding office hours) would be a hybrid course. A course can be called online even if the students are required to take the exam in person at a specific place.

Student Led Courses

In October, the committee was asked by the Chair of the Academic Senate to investigate current policies and practices for student led courses. This request came about as a result of questions from President Napolitano and some Regents about a UC Berkeley student-led course on Palestine. UCEP members investigated campus policies and procedures and discussed this matter in February. It was determined that student-led courses must go the established course approval processes at the campuses and that faculty are closely involved with them. [UCEP submitted a memo to Academic Council](#) in February which included brief descriptions of the practices at each campus.

Policy on Readmission of Students

In an effort to clarify and centralize information, the Academic Planning Council asked UCEP to propose generic language for campus readmission websites about catalog rights for students who interrupted their education for various reasons and want to return to UC to finish their degrees. While the number of students who may be interested in returning to UC may be small, the goal is to create more consistent and complete information for them. The committee recognized the importance of distinguishing between the re-enrolling students in good academic standing and the re-admission of those who were not in good

academic standing when they left. UCEP also focused on reassuring and encouraging students with concerns about changes in the requirements for their majors. In May, the committee settled on language that emphasized working with academic advisors to develop a course plan that integrates the requirements stated in the catalog at the time of original enrollment with current course offerings. In the fall UCEP will help with reviewing the new language on campus websites.

General Education

Chair Knowlton represented UCEP and the UC Academic Senate on the California State University System's (CSU) General Education Task Force at several meetings in the spring. The Task Force is primarily comprised of CSU faculty representatives and also includes a representative from the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges. The Task Force is charged with examining and offering suggestions concerning general education programs across all CSU campuses. Chair Knowlton will continue to serve on the Task Force which will have additional meetings in the fall to produce a report. It is anticipated that UCEP will be invited to opine on the Task Force's report next year.

UC's Analytical Writing Placement Exam

In the spring, UCEP had several discussions about UC's systemwide Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE), which is one significant way to satisfy the UC's Entry Level Writing Requirement. The University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) oversees the AWPE but because several Senate divisions do not have Preparatory Education committees, it is likely that local education policy committees or undergraduate councils would provide input about this matter. It is also the case that both UCEP and the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools contributed to reviews of the exam, most notably in 2002. UCEP considered its role with Senate Regulation 636 and ELWR, affirming to focus on how these campus and system-wide writing competency policies relate to the success of matriculated students. This year, UCOPE requested a comprehensive analysis of the AWPE by UCOP's Institutional Research unit which will be completed in late August and shared with BOARS and UCEP for continued dialogue.

UCEP agreed that it should discuss the analysis and identified several preliminary questions for consideration next year. One question is how university credit is assigned to ELWR courses, with some campuses giving it "workload" credit (e.g. UC Davis) and others offering full university credit. How the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) is satisfied varies across the campuses and UCEP may want to consider what an appropriate balance might be between localized decision-making and system-wide guidelines. General writing proficiency, the appropriateness of the Entry Level Writing Requirement itself with maintaining baseline writing proficiency, the range of composition requirements in the first year, whether the AWPE is measuring what should be measured, and the impact on international students or students in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) fields are a few of the issues that might be discussed in the coming year.

AWPE completion rates probably vary by campus, with some campuses having a particularly high degree of need to satisfy ELWR. A member commented that there is a significant issue with the exam as it relates to diversity. Students in underrepresented minority groups, particularly in the STEM fields, are impacted by having to take basic writing and math courses, so any data by major would also be valuable. The report from Institutional Research will be available for UCEP's review in the fall.

Other Issues and Additional Business

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

- Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 182
- Proposal for UCI School of Nursing

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 Barbara Knowlton represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Academic Assembly. Chair Knowlton also participated on the Provost's monthly budget briefing teleconferences and the Academic Planning Council. Vice Chair, Ed Caswell-Chen attended several ICAS meetings. Finally, UCEP was represented by John Tamkun (UCSC) and Stephan Miescher (UCSB) on the UC Education Abroad Program Governing Committee.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements

UCEP benefited from consultation and reports from Aimee Dorr, Provost and Executive Vice President, UCOP; Pamela Brown, Vice President for Institutional Research and Academic Planning, (IRAP); Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP; Kimberly Peterson, Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP; Ellen Osmundson, ILTI Project Coordinator, UCOP; and Steve Handel, Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions.

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,

Barbara Knowlton, Chair (LA)

Tony Smith (I) (fall/winter)

Anne Zanzucchi (M)

Laura Nelson (B)

Kimberly Topp (SF)

Beth Lazazzera (LA)

Alicia Tran (Undergraduate Student-SB)

Edward Caswell-Chen, Vice Chair (D)

Arvind Rajaraman (I) (spring)

Judith Rodenbeck (R)

John Tamkun (SC)

James Rauch (SD)

Stephan Miescher (SB)

Jim Chalfant ((D), Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)

Shane White ((LA), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)

Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
2016-17 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 teleconferences during the 2016-17 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, Robert Anderson (Fall) and David Brownstone (Winter and Spring) (TFIR) and Robert May (HCTF). These two task forces spend a great deal of time in consultation with systemwide Human Resources (HR). Many of these consultants, along with others from Academic Personnel and the Office of the Budget 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.

CASH COMPENSATION ISSUES:

The ladder-rank faculty again received a 3% increase in cash compensation, and President Napolitano again decreed that it would not be administered across-the-board. Rather, she directed that 1.5% could be allocated equally to all, but that the second 1.5% was to be targeted to addressing one of four areas: equity, inversion, compression, and exceptional merit. The campuses were given discretion on determining the needs in the second group. UCFW echoed previous committees in nothing that even if the full 3% had been made available to all ladder-rank faculty, the compensation gap would still continue to grow. The success of the targeted redress efforts in reducing identified shortfalls is unclear, especially as this year, outcome reporting was not required. Next year's UCFW will meet with President Napolitano to discuss strategies for addressing the cash compensation gap.

The Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP), in which some general campus faculty are eligible to solicit external salary support similar to that in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP), has been renewed for four more years and additional campuses may enroll in the continuing pilot. Data show that no differences in teaching load have resulted from the pilot. Some on UCFW are concerned that this program will exacerbate inequalities in the salary scales and differential compensation by discipline.

UCFW began investigating the use of tenure-track positions in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan after learning that some locations may be unnecessarily

assigning some employees into part-time positions. The operationalization of requirements for full-time commitment to the University vis-à-vis 95% time with a full research load need clarified, and legacy practices may need revisited. UCFW is working with Academic Personnel and Programs to collect and analyze data.

POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS:

As part of the budget negotiations conducted in 2015, President Napolitano and the Regents agreed to launch a new pension “option” by July 1, 2016. The new option limited benefits to the PEPRA cap, and some employee groups may also have access to a supplemental defined contribution (DC) plan. The new pension tier offers to qualifying employees the option to supplement the defined benefit (DB) plan with a DC plan, and faculty can begin deposits to the supplemental plan starting with the “first day and first dollar”, where other employees can only begin deposits once their compensation level passes the PEPRA threshold. Employees can also change their election at the 5-year (or tenure review) mark, should they choose to do so. UCFW worked closely with Human Resources and External Relations/Communications to revise educational materials regarding the new tier and its impacts – specifically the importance of quick decision-making upon hire. New hires who do not make an affirmative election, but wait to be defaulted into a plan, lose up to three months of (employer) contributions, and the associated compounded interest over a thirty-year career.

HEALTH AND WELFARE BENEFITS:

UCFW continued to monitor the operations of UC Care. UC decided to change the UC Care TPA for 2017, and expectations of improved service and billing were unmet. In particular, migration of incumbent prescriptions to the new vendor was chaotic, and many enrollees complained. As a result, a new prescription vendor has been selected for 2018, and HCTF will again monitor performance.

UC Care also changed its calculation of out-of-pocket maximums, from two separate \$1500 totals (medical and Rx) to a combined \$3000 total. HCTF feared this will negatively impact those with high Rx expenses, and worked with UC Care to analyze the data upon which the consolidation decision was made and to better predict care impacts in the future. Enhanced communications will also be sought.

Last year, HCTF successfully lobbied UC Care Executive Vice President Stobo to investigate more options for improving mental and behavioral health delivery and outcomes. A work group with stakeholders from industry and providers, including HCTF representation, was convened, but has made slow progress.

UCFW learned last year that the benefit afforded to unmarried domestic partners, especially in instances of survivorship, were unclear and subject to abuse. HCTF worked closely with HR to identify the problems and the number of individuals impacted; how to fix the problem remains under discussion. HCTF drafted a white paper outlining its position and requesting redress of the issue. UCFW and the Academic Council endorsed the petition and forwarded it to the administration. The administration, however, has declined to act, citing concerns about extending benefits during a time of budgetary contraction. HCTF will continue to lobby for equal benefits.

Last year, the Senate gratefully accepted an advisory seat on the newly restructured Regent's Committee on Health. This year, UCOP created a new structure for health care administration decision-making: The Executive Steering Committee will make strategic decisions, and the Joint Operating Committee will handle day-to-day operations. The ESC is comprised of CFO Brostrom, COO Nava, EVP Stobo, the President's designee, and a Senate representative. The JOC is co-chaired by VP Duckett and UC Care Executive Director Tauber. Ensuring timely consultation for the fulfillment of shared government duties remains challenging in all groups.

Finally, UCFW continued to lobby HR and others to increase support for the Health Care Facilitator program. Facilitators report being overworked, understaffed, and given non-facilitator duties; despite these obstacles, the facilitators continue to receive excellent reviews.

INVESTMENT

TFIR was in close contact with the administration during an effort to streamline and make more user-friendly the Fidelity investment options, which was led by the Office of the Chief Investment Officer, in conjunction with Human Resources. The project sought 1) to "white label" funds and 2) to revise their content to match their names. Thus, the "global equity fund" will now consist entirely of global equities, etc. The move to white labels reflects a belief that removing corporate labels will allow investors to decide which type of funds they like, rather than acting on name recognition or other factors.

TFIR also advised on how to restructure fees associated with the DC plan, and how to communicate the change. TFIR recommended, and the administration agreed, that a flat fee per user is the easiest to administer and to explain, even though it slightly advantages high-volume and active self-investors.

TFIR began discussions with OCIO and others regarding the UCRP discount rate, and how and when it might need to be changed.

FACULTY WELFARE

UCFW continues to monitor the results of a pilot faculty exit survey program led by the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel with the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE), a Harvard think tank. Although the data are still relatively slim, indications are that faculty who leave do not do so for large cash compensation increases. Securing funding for continued administration of the survey could prove problematic, though.

Following revision of the faculty code of conduct sections involving sexual harassment and sexual violence, UCFW met with the new 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.

In response to recent high-profile security and police involved incidents at several campuses, UCFW began an investigation into campus police protocols, standards, and policies. UCFW learned that not all campuses have functioning public safety advisory boards, that no such body exists at the systemwide level, and that the process for revising police policies has room for shared governance. UCFW proposed, and the Academic

Council endorsed, forming a systemwide task force of subject-matter experts and stakeholder group representatives to edit the Gold Book, aka, the UCPD Policy Manual. UCFW will monitor the launch and operations of local public safety advisory boards.

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:

- 015, 016 and SR 336 (Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence)
- 015 and Proposed Presidential Policy on Non-Discrimination

Additional Items:

UCFW was pleased to receive updates on the following items, and will continue to monitor developments in these areas:

- Changes to Mortgage Origination Program
- UCPath Center and Operations
- Impacts of changes to Federal regulations regarding travel, deportation, and reporting activities of foreign nationals

CORRESPONDENCE:

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

- Proposed Electronic Information Security Policy
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Export Controls
- Proposed Policy on International Activities
- Proposed Changes to the Lecturer with Security of Employment Policies
- Proposed Amendments to SBL 182 (International Education)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

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

Academic Affairs: Provost Aimée Dorr;

Academic Personnel and Programs: Vice Provost Susan Carlson and Director Janet Lockwood;

Finance: Executive Vice President Nathan Brostrom;

UC Health: Executive Vice President Jack Stobo;

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, Director of Benefits Programs Mark Esteban, and Executive Director for Compensation Programs and Strategy Dennis Larsen;

Office of the Chief Investment Officer: CIO Jagdeep Bachher, Associate CIO Arthur Guimaraes;

External consultants from Mercer, Deloitte, and Segal.

We are particularly grateful for the involvement, support and guidance from the Senate leadership, Chair Jim Chalfant and Vice Chair Shane White, 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 superb staff support.

Respectfully yours, UCFW 2016-17

Lori Lubin, Chair

Roberta Rehm, Vice Chair

Caroline Kane, UCB

Michael Hill, UCD

Jean-Daniel Saphores, UCI

Areti Tillou, UCLA

Sean Malloy, UCM

Victor Lippit, UCR

Gedeon Deak, UCSD

Margot Kushel, UCSF

Stan Awramik, UCSB

Stefano Profumo, UCSC

Robert Anderson and David Brownstone, TFIR Chairs

Robert May, HCTF Chair

Richard Attiyeh, CUCEA Chair (ex officio)

Henning Bohn, UCRS Advisory Board Faculty Representative (ex officio)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
Annual Report 2016-17

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 EAP 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 EAP Programs Reviewed in 2016-17

Exeter College/Oxford University Summer Program - *Approved*

University of Nicosia, Cyprus - *Approved*

Leiden University College the Hague - *Approved*

Internships in Francophone Europe - *Approved*

Socio-Ecological Sustainability in Southern Chile - *Approved*

Asian Diaspora in South America – *Postponed pending further development*

Mediterranean Diet and Food Science Program - *Approved*

Program Review Reports/Reviews

National Taiwan Normal University Language and Culture Program – report from 2015-16 - *Approved*

Tsinghua University – report from 2015-16 - *Approved*

European Multi-Site - report from 2015-16 - *Approved*

National University of Tres de Febrero – report from 2015-16 – *Approved*

Singapore – report from 2015-16 – *Approved*

Canada (10-Year Review) *Report Approved*

Germany (10-Year Review)

Thailand (10-Year Review)

Czech Republic (3-Year Review)

France (10-year review) One-year Follow-Up Report for the 2014-15 France Ten-Year Review

The report was accepted by UCIE.

Spain (10-Year Review). *The report was approved 12-0-0 with the proviso that UCIE be given a progress report once a year for the next two years from now to demonstrate program improvement.*

Program Discontinuances/Closures

Bilkent University

University of Leeds

Autonomous University of Barcelona

Topics of Note During the 2016-17 Year

The Role of CIEs on the Campuses

During the 2016-17 year, the committee compiled information about the way in which each campus handles international programs and educational issues. The chart below summarizes the results:

| Campus | Does your campus have a CIE? Do you chair it? | How often does it meet? | If not, to whom do you report? | Does the chair of your CIE sit on Senate Council? |
|----------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Berkeley | No | N/A | Committee on Educational Policy | N/A |
| Davis | Yes Yes | We meet 6 times per year, twice per quarter. | N/A | No |
| Los Angeles | Yes Yes | At least three times a year (once a quarter). | N/A | As far as I know, no. |
| Irvine | Yes Yes | Once a quarter. | N/A | No |
| Merced | UC Merced doesn't have a stand-alone CIE. | N/A | The Merced UCIE representative reports to the chair of the Undergraduate Council | UCIE matters are brought forth to the Divisional Council by the Chair of the Undergraduate Council. |
| Riverside | Yes Yes | It meets quarterly, usually 1-2 weeks after the systemwide meeting (by design). | N/A | Yes...this is outlined in our bylaws. |
| San Francisco | We have a global health sciences program and global health support programs for students conducting research or | N/A | Jaime Sepúlveda executive director of global health sciences. | No |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|--|-----|--|
| | clinical training abroad. | | | |
| San Diego | Yes Yes | Last year about 7 times. Minimum of 3 times and more electronically. | N/A | No |
| Santa Barbara | Yes Yes | It meets about once per month. | N/A | Not sure about Senate Council, but does serve on UCIE. |
| Santa Cruz | Yes Yes | We meet every other week (5 times/quarter) | N/A | Yes, CIE chair is a member of senate executive committee |

UCEAP Activities and UCIE

EAP closed out the last academic year with 5669 students in 43 countries. The goal of the program is to reach 10K students while maintaining the program’s integrity. EAP shared its new mission and vision statement with UCIE:

Mission Statement:

Through international academic experiences, the University of California Education Abroad Program (UCEAP) inspires students to explore and transform their lives, UC, and the world.

Vision Statement:

A recognized leader in the field of international education and the preeminent education abroad program for the University of California system, UCEAP cooperates with campus partners to create an integrated and inclusive UC culture of study abroad.

- Foster an Integrated and Inclusive UC Culture of Study Abroad
- Strengthen Collaboration with Campus Partners
- Be the Preeminent Education Abroad Program for the UC System
- Be a Recognized Leader in the Field of International Education

The Director stated that EAP wants to be the preeminent education abroad program in the UC system and that she would like UC to be a recognized leader in the field of international education. EAP is exploring new forms of academic programming such as multi-site programs, which are very appealing to students. The committee voiced concerns about the prevalence of multi-site programs and of English-only instruction. Members felt that students were not getting a “real” education abroad, and that the quality of the experience offered was becoming increasingly diluted. EAP staff replied that - to some extent - students are afraid of jeopardizing their GPA by taking classes in a foreign language. These concerns, and others, are realities that the program has to face when creating packages and experiences that will attract as broad a student audience as possible.

EAP is putting forward an application for a new initiative: Peace Corps Preparation. Three UC campuses are among the top 25 schools nationwide that have students who go into the Peace Corps. The requirements for the program can be easily incorporated into what is required of students for their majors: three upper-division classes and a language requirement depending on where they want to be placed. It also includes a 50-hour internship/work experience, nearly all of which can be completed while the students are participating in their EAP experience abroad. The program would increase students’ chances of being accepted into the Peace Corps.

UCEAP Policy Changes(March 2017)

1. Changes to the Variable Unit Option Policy - *Approved*
2. Changes to the Pass/No Pass Policy - *Approved*

International Thinking Day

International Thinking Day(s) (March 6-7, 2017) put aspects of internationalization on the table for discussion systemwide. Topics included information about internationalization, global rankings, and scholarly outputs. The meeting itself highlighted plenary sessions about some of the “international” activities that take place across the University. Invitations were extended to the campus chancellors, plus one individual from each campus. The Associate Dean of EAP noted that the UC mission statement does not include any reference to internationalization, international education, etc. EAP Director Nyitray noted that she had suggested the inclusion of such language at a planning meeting some time ago and was continuing to her efforts in that vein.

Bylaw 182

For some time, UCIE has been working to amend Bylaw 182 to more accurately depict the scope and duties of the committee. Resistance from the Academic Council, however, prevented any changes being made for several years. The UCIE Chair and the Council Chair and Vice Chair worked assiduously over the course of the 2016-17 year to revise the Bylaw to both reflect reality and meet with the Council’s approval. Members worked to secure campus approval on individual bases, and a new version of Bylaw 182 was finally approved by the Academic Council in June. The text of the new, approved bylaw is at the start of this report.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Academic Council Chair Jim Chalfant, Vice Chair Shane White, Senate Executive Director Hilary Baxter and Associate Director Jocelyn Banaria. Thanks also to our EAP partners: Vivian-Lee Nyitray, Hsiu-Zu Ho, Linda York, and Sarah Abraham.

Respectfully submitted,

Eduardo Macagno, Chair
Frank Wilderson, Vice Chair
Gustavo Manso (UCB)
Michael Lazarra (UCD)
Hosun Kang (UCI)
Lothar Von Falkenhausen (UCLA)

Yanbao Ma (UCM)
Kurt Anderson (UCR)
Julian Schroeder (UCSD)
Lisa Thompson (UCSF)
Sathya Guruswamy (UCSB)
Yat Li (UCSD)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

2016-2017 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) met in person two times and once by videoconference in the 2016-2017 Academic Year to conduct business in accordance with its charge, outlined in [Senate Bylaw 185](#), to advise the President about the administration of University libraries and issues related to innovations in forms of scholarly communication. Highlights of the committee's major activities are outlined briefly below.

Open Access

Senate Open Access Policy

[The Senate's Open Access Policy](#) dominated UCOLASC's discussions this year. The California Digital Library (CDL) reported that close to 50,000 publications had been collected as of May and data indicates that people all over the world are accessing this content, an outcome very much in line with the goals of the policy. The publication management system, powered by Symplectic Elements, has automated much of this process, including harvesting faculty publication records from indexes and prompting faculty by email to claim and deposit their publications, and deposits increased dramatically with implementation of this system. However, there are serious concerns about the stability of funding from the Provost's Office for the system license, and consequently about the future of the policy itself.

This year, UCOLASC initiated the third year review process of the Senate's Open Access policy. The committee dedicated considerable time to discussions about the outcomes of the policy and whether they align with the expectations and desires of the Academic Senate, and about setting goals for the policy going forward. In June, [the committee submitted a report to the Academic Council](#) on the status of the policy, highlighting the critical need for ongoing funding for the policy's support infrastructure which includes the Symplectic Elements system and associated staffing. This support infrastructure is not only vital to the success of the Academic Senate policy, it is also essential for the implementation of the separately-issued Presidential Open Access Policy that applies to non-Senate employees of the University as of October 23, 2015. The UCOLASC report was endorsed by Council on June 28th and subsequently transmitted to the President's Office.

Commitment to Free and Open Information, Scholarship, and Knowledge Exchange

In March of this year, UC's Office of Scholarly Communication and the UC Libraries jointly issued a Statement on Commitment to Free and Open Information, Scholarship, and Knowledge Exchange, "in response to recent actions by the new federal administration and in order to address resulting concerns about continued open access to and preservation of information, scholarship, and knowledge." The full text of the statement is available at <https://goo.gl/0VVV2E>. UCOLASC endorsed this statement and [requested that Academic Council](#) also consider endorsing it on behalf of all Academic Senate faculty. The Statement was endorsed by Council on June 28th and transmitted to the President's Office.

OA2020

The Max Planck Digital Library is coordinating an international effort, dubbed OA2020, to convert the dominant subscription-based scholarly journal publishing model to Open Access (see <http://oa2020.org/>). UCOLASC discussed OA2020 throughout the year and members coordinated with the campus libraries and librarians to facilitate discussions in divisional Senate library committees. As of June, three UC campuses (Berkeley, San Francisco and Davis) had signed the non-binding OA2020 Expression of

Interest (see <http://oa2020.us/>) and the remaining UC campuses are actively considering also signing the Expression of Interest. UCOLASC members agreed that OA2020 is consistent with the Senate's Open Access Policy and that it also aligns with UC's larger mission to conduct research in the public interest. OA2020 is a critical part of a larger effort by scholarly organizations and academic institutions, including UC, to regain control of scholarly communication and to transform it in ways that work better for authors, readers, and libraries. In June, [the committee submitted a memo](#) to the Academic Council asking for its support of this effort in the form of a public affirmation of what UCOLASC has called UC's Open Access mission, set in the larger context of [UC's mission](#) of "providing long-term societal benefits through transmitting advanced knowledge, discovering new knowledge, and functioning as an active working repository of organized knowledge." Council approved this request on June 28th and forwarded UCOLASC's memo to the President's Office.

Journal Licensing

At each meeting, UCOLASC received reports on journal licensing negotiations from CDL's Director of Collections, Ivy Anderson. Two big licenses were under negotiation this year, with Springer-Nature and with Sage. It was noted that the merger of Springer and Nature complicated the negotiation of the three-year licensing agreement for CDL. Director Anderson shared that CDL has spoken to various publishers about implications for future shifts to publishing in Open Access.

Joint Meeting with University Librarians

UCOLASC met with the University Librarians in February to discuss topics of common interest, including Open Access, Regional Library Facility Planning, AAU/ARL OA Monographs Task Force, and the Pay It Forward Project funded by the Mellon Foundation and conducted by the CDL and UC Davis.

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.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements

UCOLASC acknowledges the contributions of its administrative consultants and guests. The committee benefited from regular consultation and reports from University Librarians Convener MacKenzie Smith (UCD), CDL Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director Günter Waibel, CDL Director of Collections Ivy Anderson, CDL Director of Publishing Catherine Mitchell, and Librarians Association of the University of California President Dana Peterman (UCLA). UCOLASC also consulted the Academic Senate Chair and Vice Chair about issues facing the Academic Senate.

Respectfully submitted:

Eric Bakovic, Chair (SD)
Dennis Ventry (D)
Karl Ryavec (M)
Cynthia Darling (SF)
Thomas Shannon (B)
John Colicelli (LA)

Luca De Alfaro, Vice Chair (SC)
Amelia Regan (I)
Leonard Nunney (R)
Eileen Zurbriggen (SC)
Wolf Kittler (SB)
Brian Eliceiri (SD)

Jim Chalfant (Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (D))
Shane White (Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (LA))
Brenda Abrams, Principal Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)
ANNUAL REPORT 2016-17**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) held eight in-person meetings and two teleconferences in Academic Year 2016-17 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 AND ENROLLMENT

Senior leaders from the UCOP Offices of the Chief Financial Officer, Budget and Analysis and Planning and Academic Affairs, Institutional Research and Planning joined UCPB to inform the committee about the progress of budget negotiations in Sacramento, budget contingency planning, capital projects, tuition policy, proposed performance outcome measures, and other UC-specific budget matters.

UCPB closely monitored last year’s budget requirement to enroll an additional 5000 California undergraduates for the 16-17 academic year. UCPB heard monthly from UCOP about enrollment planning contingencies occurring at the campuses, as well as how the 2017-18 enrollment increase was to be allocated by campus. UCPB again called for meaningful enrollment planning that would recapture the education narrative which the state is currently driving by focusing exclusively on California undergraduate admissions, rather than overall educational environment and academic quality after enrollment. In response, this year the administration began a long-term visioning exercise that asked each campus to project its idealized 2040 steady state. UCPB members worked to ensure local Senate division participation in the exercise.

In the context of rapid expansion of our undergrad population and the emerging capacity constraints, UCPB started to explore with the administration how to come up with quantitative proxies for education quality that may allow UC to monitor the impacts of the current evolution and to guide his enrollment and capital planning. This will remain a focus of the committee.

This year the state conducted an audit of UCOP, and its findings were unkind to the University; the University has issued counterstatements that dispute the methodology employed by the auditor and the assumptions used. Nevertheless, UCOP agreed to implement nearly all of the recommendations, but the state still passed a bill that will give it direct funding authority over UCOP. UCPB concurred with the administration that, in order to prevent inequities between campuses on their contribution to central expenses, the rebenching algorithm should be applied on the total of state funds, including the UCOP line item and allocations to the various campuses corrected for the assessment that would have been normally applied. This implies that campuses will have to redistribute internally the funds that would have been raised for the assessment. While such an allocation mechanism in principle cancels the effects of a UCOP line item, this might lead to distortions. UCPB will monitor how the change impacts off-the-top assessments, progress made during rebenching in equalizing funding by campus, and how pass-through funds are impacted. The introduction of the line item is both a threat to the constitutional independence of the university and a step backward in the transparency that rebenching introduced.. UCPB recommends that all effort be made with the State to convince the legislators to revert to the assessment mechanisms.

Following last year's audit of UC as a whole, the state required UC to develop a new policy regarding non-resident undergraduate enrollment, among other stipulations. UCPB spent significant time and effort helping to refine UCOP's arguments opposing an arbitrary cap on non-resident undergraduate enrollments, but the state was ultimately not persuaded by these arguments. Instead, the Regents adopted a compromise position with an agreement to revisit the issue within four years. UCPB is concerned that more well-established campuses will benefit disproportionately from the policy as it allows them to retain out-of-state tuition at current levels while precluding less well-established campuses from increasing their income to a similar level. UCPB is also concerned that academic quality will continue to suffer not only as a result of loss of income but also due to loss of economic, geographic, and other aspects of diversity.

UCPB considered the consequences of the requirements imposed by the legislature on campus by campus transfer ratios and preference to in State graduate students and contributed to the formulation of a response by the Academic Senate.

UCPB advised the administration on how to develop and deploy a revised policy on professional degree supplemental tuition (PDST). Recognizing that enrollees in this program advance their fields and enhance UC prestige, UCPB counseled leeway in the new policy. UCOP heeded this advice, and the new policy allows for multi-year projections, so long as they are supported by adequate data. UCPB agrees that this policy allows for greater financial planning by both students and departments.

UCPB again this year received regular reports on the emerging campus structural budget shortfalls. Berkeley plans to consolidate academic programs, find administrative "efficiencies" including the layoff of up to 500 staff members, and is restructuring campus operations with varying degrees of success. As other campuses encounter similar structural deficits, best practices are being sought, as well as alternate funding methods.

GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH SUPPORT

University support for graduate programs also received much discussion by UCPB again this year. Last year, the administration promulgated new guidelines to govern self-supporting graduate and professional degree programs (SSGPDPs). UCPB reviewed a dozen such proposals, and noted on many that faculty are expected to teach or supervise capstone type projects on an overload basis, and that long-term physical plant costs are often not considered in a realistic way. The campuses included greater budget projections, but additional details would improve future proposals. UCPB is coordinating with CCGA how to best improve the process.

FINANCE AND INVESTMENT POLICY

UCPB met with the Chief Financial Officer division regarding capital project planning and the University's credit rating and borrowing capacity.

This year, UC received the final of three "one-time" payments from the state for UCRP in recognition of achieving its enrollment target and launching a new pension tier as agreed to in the 2015 budget deal. Despite the less-generous benefits of the new tier, the incumbent liability was unchanged by the new tier. How best to address the older liabilities is the subject of continuing discussions. In addition to continued borrowing from STIP and TRIP, UCRP will increase the employer contribution to 15% going forward. This increase is expected to bring UCRP to 90% funded status by 2030, and UCPB supports the move. Additional strategic changes being considered involve adjusting the inflation assumption.

Changes to federal accounting regulations will result in an accounting increase in UC's

retiree health liability, though the absolute amount remains unchanged. UCOP is developing proposals to meet obligations made during hiring and employment while simultaneously lowering the calculated liability. UCPB is working closely with UCFW to ensure that institutional fiscal prudence does not overburden retirees. The Senate is working to reframe the debate on individual retirees rather than institutional concerns. Health outcomes versus accounting solvency are being weighed and debated.

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

At the end of 2015-16, the Academic Council elected to disband the Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR) and empanel a new standing subcommittee on ANR that will report directly to UCPB. UCPB worked to populate the new task force throughout the year, and the task force met for the first time in early summer. The task force will focus on 1) building relationships with ANR leadership, and 2) financial transparency. Vice Chair Schimel is leading the task force into next year.

OTHER BRIEFINGS

- **UC Health:** UCPB met with Executive Vice Provost John Stobo to discuss financial performance of the UC medical centers and UC's self-insurance program, UC Care. The size of the health enterprise relative to the academic campuses makes it an essential component of UC's overall fiscal health. Health margins were down this year, and that is a product of changes to reimbursement practices and increasing post-employment benefit expenses. Contingency planning in case of changes to federal health care legislation is underway. Another significant expense for UC Health is cybersecurity, which is a growing and increasingly complex undertaking.

UC Care is still a new enough program that its cost overruns are within acceptable margins. Nevertheless, the plan must improve its efficiency to be sustainable in the long-term. Employer plan cost containment sometimes comes at the expense of plan member out-of-pocket cost increases.

- **UC Path:** In an on-going effort to modernize its payroll system, UC has engaged in the UC Path project. UC Path is two-pronged: 1) a facility in Riverside that will handle common payroll transactions, and 2) a shared software campus human resources professionals can use in place of the multiple legacy systems that do not communicate with each other. Various leadership changes and strategic reorganizations have caused delays and overruns, but the project seems on firm footing now. UCOP has been using UC Path since December 2015, and the next "go live" event is scheduled for the fall of 2017, which include UCLA- a campus with a full employee base as well as a medical center and its attendant title codes and complexity. Because of UC's uniqueness and complexity, software must be customized. The overall cost is now unfortunately high, and UC has stopped advertising this program as a cost savings, and now refers to it only as a business improvement necessity. Each campus has participated in the development process and has agreed to the processes as developed. UCPB will monitor implementation of the next phase.
- **Education Abroad Program:** UCPB participates in the EAP governing committee. UCPB remains concerned that structural budget issues remain unresolved, and communicated these concerns to Provost Dorr. A new EAP Associate Vice Provost/Executive Director continues to develop strategies to address long-term budget issues.
- **DOE National Labs:** UCPB was represented on the Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues by Chair Sadoulet, and received regular updates on issues of interest from the labs.

Management fees from the LLC in which UC partners are diminishing, and governance and operating concerns with LLC partners have arisen.

CORRESPONDENCE

In addition to memoranda addressing the above, UCPB submitted opinions and analyses on the following:

- Proposed Revisions to APM 190-G (Retirement contributions on academic summer salary)
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Export Controls
- Proposed Presidential Policy on International Activities
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security
- Proposed Revisions to APM section 285, 210-3, 133, and 740 (Lecturers with Security of Employment)
- 12 Proposed SSGPDPs

UCPB REPRESENTATION

Chair Bernard Sadoulet represented UCPB at the Academic Council, the Academic Assembly, the Academic Planning Council, the Provost's Budget Advisory Group, and the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee (TTAC). He also served on the UC Education Abroad Program Governing Committee and was Chair of Finance Committee for UCEAP. Vice Chair Schimel was also a member of the UC Education Abroad Program Governing Committee and the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

UCPB is most grateful to the following committee consultants and guests for their valuable contributions: Provost Aimée Dorr; Associate Vice President for Budget Analysis and Planning David Alcocer; Pamela Brown, Vice President, Institutional Research and Academic Planning; Todd Greenspan, Director of Academic Planning in IRAP; Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs Susan Carlson; Executive Vice President and CFO Nathan Brostrom; Controller Peggy Arrivas, and Chief Risk Officer Cheryl Lloyd.

Respectfully submitted:

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Bernard Sadoulet, <i>Chair</i> (UCB) | Andrew Kahng, San Diego |
| Joshua Schimel, <i>Vice Chair</i> (UCSB) | Russ Pieper, San Francisco |
| Raveevarn Choksombatchai, Berkeley | Ann Jensen Adams, Santa Barbara |
| Robert Powell, Davis | Abel Rodriguez, Santa Cruz |
| Jim Steintrager, Irvine | |
| Tim Lane, Los Angeles | |
| Mukesh Singhal, Merced | |
| Christian Shelton, Riverside | Aaron Dolor, Graduate Student |

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the 2016-2017 Academic Year, the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) met in person twice and once by videoconference and the UCOPE 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; monitor the development and use of placement examinations in mathematics; and work with the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools to communicate these standards to all high schools and colleges in California.

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

Analysis of 2016 AWPE Data

This year, the committee submitted a request to Institutional Research (IR) for analysis of recent administrations of the AWPE. UCOPE voted unanimously on two occasions to send forward a request for data and analysis of the AWPE. The first vote took place at its January meeting, the second at its April meeting, where the vote focused on revisions to the initial assessment request. UCOPE held a third meeting this year, a video conference in July, at which it voted again unanimously to proceed with the analysis. The most recent IR analysis of the AWPE was conducted in 2011-2012, which took place at the same moment that enrollment of international students spikes at UC. Among its numerous conclusions, which were critical of the AWPE, the 2012 report argues that the AWPE privileges white, male students. This finding is but one factor motivating the oversight committee's request for further analysis. Among the other factors motivating the request for data are the lack of consistent tracking of reliability data from the administration of the AWPE over the past few decades and no validity analysis of its rubric on record. UCOPE's multiple requests, as the minutes document, were sent to the Academic Council for approval, before they were formally transmitted to IR in May. It is anticipated that IR's report will be completed in late August or early September.

AWPE Committee Chair and Chief Reader

In the fall, UCOP's Student Affairs initiated the process of finding a new Committee Chair and Chief Reader for the Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) in consultation with UCOPE. Student Affairs prepared information about the job duties, requirements and position criteria and contacted over forty individuals including UC Writing Program Directors, members of the UC Council of Writing Programs, and past UCOPE and EMS Advisory Group chairs to solicit nominees for the position. Student Affairs also established the candidate review committee which included UCOPE's vice chair and Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions, Stephen Handel. Finalists for the position were interviewed in December and Jonathan Lang (UCB) accepted the offer. Chair Designate Lang began a one apprenticeship under current AWPE Committee Chair Gadda and was introduced to UCOPE during the committee's January meeting. Chair Designate Lang will assume all of the Chair/Chief Reader responsibilities in January 2018.

Review and Selection of AWPE Essay Prompts

Under the leadership of consultant George Gadda, UCOPE members approved selected writing prompts to be used in the 2017 UC-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 Gadda samples of student exams were read and calibrated in advance of the May administration. Committee members ranked student essays according to a rubric established by the AWPE Committee in 1987. In January and April, Chair Gadda also gave the committee a detailed explanation of the AWPE process.

Julie Lind, AWPE Coordinator, Undergraduate Admissions, reported that the program continues to be financially stable although the program had extra expenses this year related to job shadowing by the AWPE Committee Chair/Chief Reader Designate and programming to improve accessibility of the website. The number of students selected for the exam increased this year in part because the new SAT will not be as a method of satisfying the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). UC tested over 15k students on May 14th.

The Redesigned SAT and ACT Exams and the ELWR

During the January and April meetings, the committee discussed the newly redesigned SAT Exam, first administered in March 2016, and how it will satisfy the ELWR. The SAT no longer provides a writing score, but does provide an Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (EBRW) score and a separate SAT Essay score. The ACT no longer provides a Combined English/Writing score, but does provide an English Language Arts (ELA) score. Students were able to meet the ELWR by achieving a score of 30 or higher on the ACT ELA in the fall 2016 and fall 2017 admissions cycles. For the fall 2017 cycle, there was no threshold for meeting ELWR via the SAT, so students were not able to use this exam to meet the requirement.

In July, UCOPE received an analysis of the redesigned SAT and ACT exams prepared by Institutional Research at the Office of the President and the committee had a special videoconference that month to decide whether to set an SAT threshold going forward and whether to revise the ACT ELA threshold. The analysis used data from the fall 2017 freshman admissions cycle to compare SAT EBRW, SAT Essay, and ACT ELA scores to scores on UC's own AWPE. The analysis covered students who planned to enroll at UC as indicated by submitting a Statement of Intent to Register.

Based on the analysis, UCOPE voted in favor of 1) setting a threshold of 680 on SAT EBRW for meeting the ELWR for a pilot period until more data are available, defining the pilot period as the 2017-2018 admissions cycle, and stipulating that the pilot will include analysis and reporting of scores on the EBRW score, a separate SAT Essay score, and the AWPE scores.; 2) not using the SAT Essay score as a method for meeting the ELWR until more data are available; and 3) maintaining the current threshold of 30 for meeting the ELWR using ACT ELA. The pilot is effective beginning with new students enrolling in Fall 2018 (students applying to UC in November 2017) and until a new policy is adopted by the Academic Senate. UCOPE submitted [a memo reporting](#) its decisions to the Academic Council and this memo was subsequently transmitted to Undergraduate Admissions at OP.

AWPE Efficacy and Problems

In January, UCOPE agreed that it would be valuable for the committee to learn more about how placement works at UC and nationally and about different models. Four scholars in the field of writing studies, who are also UC Writing Program Administrators, were invited by Chair Queen to UCOPE's April meeting to discuss the efficacy of and problems with the AWPE. While the AWPE provides an idea about student readiness, members of this panel suggested that more effective placement processes tend to blend guided self-placement with actual evidence of students' writing that requires students to illicit factors said to be predictive of success. It was noted that an ongoing concern about the AWPE is related to its fairness and accuracy with regard to diverse students, especially UC's large and growing international student population.

Outcome data about the AWPE is needed to help inform the committee's thinking about how specific groups of students may be significantly disadvantaged by the exam. It was recommended that writing faculty across UC should be brought together to discuss what assessment and placement processes could be in place especially because there is expertise that is oriented around the culture of each campus. Based on the upcoming analysis of the AWPE, UCOPE may be able to begin identifying alternatives to the exam or ways to supplement it.

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 Bradley Queen 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 George Gadda; AWPE Committee Chair and Chief Reader Designate Jon Lang; EMS Advisory Group Chair Dana Ferris and all members of the EMS Advisory Group; AWPE Coordinator Julie Lind; Director, Undergraduate Admissions Han Mi Yoon-Wu; 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,

Bradley Queen, Chair (I)
Joseph Biello (D)
John William Gary (R)
Camille Forbes (SD)
Darlene Francis (B)
Daniel Gross (I)

Carrie Wastal, Vice Chair (SD)
David Jennings (M)
Benjamin Brecher (SB)
Carol Miller (SF)
Debra Lewis (SC)
Robert Cooper (LA)

Jim Chalfant (Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (D))
Shane White (Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (LA))
Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE
2016-17 Annual Report**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Under Senate Bylaw 195, the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure met twice in person and once by teleconference in 2013-14 as well as working through email to carry out its duties to advise on general policies involving academic privileges and tenure and to maintain statistical records on grievance, disciplinary, and early termination cases that are addressed through formal Privilege and Tenure (P&T) processes. In addition to conducting its own business during meetings, the committee consulted extensively with Senior Counsel Cynthia Vroom, the Office of General Counsel's designated attorney advisor to committees on privilege and tenure; the systemwide Senate leadership; and Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs Susan Carlson. Senior Counsel Vroom and Vice Provost Carlson are consultants to the committee.

Topics of Note During the 2016-17 Year

Public Records Act (PRA) Request

Public records act requests were submitted to the University regarding instances of sexual violence and sexual harassment on all 10 campuses. The data listed 113 instances of sexual violence or harassment over the past three years; about two-thirds of the perpetrators no longer work for the University, and about one-quarter were faculty. Roughly half the victims were students and half were staff. Approximately four faculty continued to serve as actively serve in teaching positions. The University had the difficult job of balancing the individual's right to privacy with the public's right to know.

APM and Bylaw Revisions

Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Sections 015 (The Faculty Code of Conduct) and 016 (University Policy on Faculty Conduct and The Administration of Discipline) were sent out for review during 2016-17. The proposed changes were recommended by the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate, a committee convened by President Napolitano in October 2015. This action also resulted in a review of Academic Senate Bylaw 336.

The Joint Committee suggested changes to APM 015 to explicitly clarify that sexual violence and sexual harassment are violations of The Faculty Code of Conduct. UCPT worked with the Senate leadership to crafted language that specified: 1) when the Chancellor is deemed to know about an SVSH allegation; 2) when the Chancellor must initiate any related disciplinary action; 3) how the related disciplinary action is communicated to the respondent; and 4) that there is no time limit for reporting an alleged violation.

The Joint Committee also proposed changes to APM 016 which governs the schedule for involuntary paid leave. The proposed revisions suggested a new timeline that is practical, that can be applied consistently, and that is fair to the respondent.

UCPT members discussed the proposed changes at length, particularly the question of "expedited review." Some of the main concerns were the following:

- Would it be out of synch with the academic schedule?
- Would it rely on involuntary leave schedule or time-dependent grievance procedures?
- Would faculty rights be significantly abridged by these recommendations?
- Claiming "expedited" review and then having the dates not work could be grounds for a lawsuit.
- If a hearing is part of the handling of a case, significant time could be required.

In addition to concerns about expedited review, members voiced concerns about the paid part of the leave, the criteria for withholding pay, the issue of campus safety vs. punishment, and perhaps the “softening” of some of language of the proposed changes.

The Committee discussed concerns – and drafted a letter - over pressure to bring a second disciplinary action against a faculty member under APM 016 and Senate Bylaw 336. This faculty member had already been sanctioned once for the same conduct. Members asked if the procedures could be clearly defined as two separate actions. They suggested that comments should be focused less on the consecutive disciplines and more on the concept that two investigations of the same event are inappropriate.

Title IX Coordinator

OP hired a new systemwide Title IX Coordinator (reporting directly to the President) in February. Her role is to oversee UC’s ongoing efforts to effectively prevent and respond to sexual violence and sexual harassment. These efforts include education, investigation, adjudication, and sanctioning in cases involving students, faculty and staff. The coordinator met with the committee and discussed documents she had drafted to help guide peer review. The committee discussed the documents and gave the Coordinator feedback regarding their language and implementation.

Letter on Faculty Discipline

Because of the variety of changes to personnel policies and guidelines during the year (the Sexual Harassment/Sexual Violence Policy, the changes to the APM and the Bylaws), UCPT authored a letter to the Academic Senate that reviewed and spelled out essential components of the faculty disciplinary process. The document laid out the processes involved in – and the differences between - the four components of the response to faculty misconduct: Formal Discipline, Informal Resolution (including Early Resolution), Interim Measures, and Administrative Actions. It also included a detailed FAQ section to help further elucidate the various steps of the four options.

Acknowledgements

UCPT is grateful to have had valuable input from - and exchange with- these UCOP and campus consultants and guests over the past year: Provost Aimée Dorr, Vice Provost Susan Carlson, and Senior Counsel Cynthia Vroom. Special thanks to Academic Council Chair Jim Chalfant, Vice Chair Shane White, Senate Executive Director Hilary Baxter and Associate Director Jocelyn Banaria.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Simon, Chair (UCB)
Nancy E. Lane, Vice Chair (UCD)
Sharon Inkelas (UCB)
Paul Gepts (UCD)
Gregory Evans (UCI)
Alistair Cochran (UCLA)

Patricia LiWang (UCM)
Michael E. Adams (UCR)
Katja Lindenberg (UCSD)
Roland Henry (UCSF)
Adebisi Agboola (UCSB)
Jorge Hankamer (UCSC)

University Committee on Research Policy

Annual Report 2016-17

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), as specified in Senate Bylaw 200, is responsible for fostering research; for formulating, coordinating, and revising general research policies and procedures; and for advising the President on research. UCORP met eight times during the 2016-17 academic year. This report briefly outlines the committee's activities during the year.

CAMPUS ISSUES: FACULTY GRANTS AND ORU REVIEWS

At the beginning of the year, UCORP spent some time discussing the variety of COR involvement with organized research units (ORUs) and other collaborative research organizations on campus. Members were concerned about the effectiveness of ORU review processes, the inclusion of other collaborative units that do not have the ORU designation, and issues around funding. There is no systemwide standard for review criteria or metrics, and campuses approach ORU reviews in different ways. The information provided by UCORP members on campus review procedures was combined into a shared document.

Over the course of the year, UCORP also discussed the various campus processes for faculty research grant award funding. Information provided by UCORP members showed that procedures and grant amounts varied widely by campus. Two models emerged as the primary methods: 1) minimizing administrative overhead by widely distributing the money, and 2) a “start-up” model of supporting ideas that would otherwise not be able to get funding or to leverage additional funding. In the coming years, UCORP will continue to share “best practices” and ideas for successful faculty grant programs.

RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES

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

1. Multicampus Research Unit Reviews

Last June, UCORP and Provost Aimée Dorr agreed that, under UC's system of joint governance, research entities that receive systemwide funding should comply with the [Compendium](#) (the manual for “Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units”) and be periodically reviewed by the Academic Senate, with UCORP as the lead committee. Systemwide oversight of MRUs decreased significantly in the 2000s as UCOP staff were cut, communication decreased, and the review schedule languished. With a new Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies in place this year and a more stable budget, UCORP took the opportunity to strengthen relationships and focus attention on the structures for evaluating MRUs. UCORP began by working with ORGS (the Office of Research and

Graduate Studies) to determine which programs currently classified as “MRUs” would retain their official designation and undergo a formal review as provided in the Compendium.

ORGS staff went through the MRU portfolio and divided the systemwide research programs into those that receive persistent systemwide funding and those that do not receive persistent systemwide funding, but that may have received systemwide funding in the past or are supported in part through competitive awards granted by UCOP. A third category of multicampus research programs includes entities that are not formally classified as MRUs but receive some type of systemwide support. UCORP worked with ORGS to re-establish procedures for the required five-year and fifteen-year reviews for all MRUs. UCORP also assisted ORGS in refining the templates for the annual reports and periodic reviews. As a first step to getting back on track, all MRUs were asked to submit annual reports in time for UCORP’s June meeting. UCORP’s 2017-2018 agenda will include developing a schedule for five-year reviews of MRUs as well as helping ORGS formulate a process to review other systemwide research entities.

Per the compendium, UCORP leads the five- and fifteen-year reviews in consultation with CCGA (Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs) and UCPB (University Committee on Planning and Budget). The committee chairs agreed that CCGA and UCPB would nominate a “consultant” to liaise with UCORP for the 5-year reviews and that the committees would form a joint subcommittee for the 15-year reviews to make sure there is sufficient coordination. The agreement was documented in a letter from UCORP Chair Isaac Martin to the current CCGA and UCPB chairs

2. UC Laboratory Fees Research Program

The UC Lab 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. In November, 2016, grant funding of more than \$13.5 million over three years, was awarded to four collaboration projects in three targeted areas of research that were selected to best leverage UC-national lab synergy: biological applications of advanced computing, high energy density science and mesoscale materials science. The four collaborations represent genuine engagement among faculty, laboratory scientists and students across all 10 campuses and Lawrence Livermore, Los Alamos and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratories. In addition, four UC students were selected as the inaugural recipients of the In-Residence Graduate Fellowships.

The latest request for proposals (RFP) was released in March, 2017. Like last year, the two funding opportunities are a “UC Multicampus-National Lab Collaborative Research and Training (UC-NL CRT) Award” and a “UC-National Lab In-Residence Graduate Fellowship” for doctoral graduate students who have advanced to candidacy. The multicampus collaborative (CRT) opportunity requires participation by a minimum of four campuses and either LANL or LLNL, and this year must focus on one of three targeted areas: climate science, cybersecurity, and national security through social sciences. Based on the letters of intent received by the June deadline, the program expects that 30 proposals will be submitted. After extensive review by multidisciplinary panels, 3-5

proposals will be funded. The graduate fellowship opportunity received 25 letters of intent, of which a possible four applicants will be funded.

3. *Additional updates and items from ORGS*

- ***Collective Excellence:*** UCORP provided feedback for a new document, “The Pursuit of Collective Excellence in Research at the University of California,” that was written to raise awareness and recognize the many ways that excellence may be manifest in UC’s research enterprise. The document is now finalized and [posted](#) on the ORGS website.
- ***MRPI awards:*** Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPI) funding supports innovative multicampus research collaborations with two-year planning/pilot awards and up to four years of funding for new or established innovative research collaborations. The 2017 competition awarded 15 proposals, totaling more than \$17 million over four years. UCORP was impressed with the professionalism and thoroughness of the award process and praised the UCRI staff for their work on the proposal review process.
- ***Research policies:*** UCORP heard updates from ORGS consultants about state and federal legislation, a new export control policy intended to demonstrate UC’s compliance with the law, and proposed policies on research data management and openness in research. Despite much preliminary discussion, neither the openness in research policy nor the data management policy materialized. UCORP also learned about changes to indirect cost recovery rates for State grants, which are increasing from 25% to 40% over the next five years. Faculty are concerned that the higher rates will drive away State agencies that currently provide grants, but UCORP’s consultants noted that UC is providing waivers on an individual basis, and campuses are working to streamline the waiver request process.

NATIONAL LABORATORIES

UC Vice President for the National Laboratories Kim Budil participated in a UCORP meeting in the fall to provide updates on the National Labs and the status of the Los Alamos contract bidding process, which is scheduled to begin in fall, 2017. Based on input from the Academic Senate, VP Budil is considering a statewide tour of the campuses to inform the faculty about the labs and UC-lab collaborations. UCORP suggested that a background/informational document might be useful to help frame the relationship between UC and the national laboratories, and in March, 2017, the committee sent VP Budil a proposal for a white paper. Budil responded quickly with a draft white paper in May, and UCORP was able to discuss it at its last meeting in June. The committee was impressed by the fast turnaround time and offered suggestions for including more of the content requested in the proposal, as well as information about the bidding process for the LANL contract.

RESEARCH INNOVATION & ENTREPRENEURSHIP

In October, UCORP met with Paul Corson, Chief of Staff to the new Senior Vice President for Research Innovation and Entrepreneurship. The newly-formed office at

UCOP, led by Christine Gulbranson, is working on UC-wide efforts in support of technology development and commercialization. Corson reported that the office is currently focusing on a branding effort, communication, establishing partnerships, and looking at ways to update licensing technology. UCORP will continue to pursue a relationship with SVP Gulbranson and invite updates from her office.

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES (ANR)

In May, ANR Vice President Glenda Humiston reported to UCORP on the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources' strategic planning process. President Napolitano requested that ANR review and streamline administrative services, increase efficiencies, finalize MOUs with campuses regarding CE specialists, and increase the diversity of the workforce. As part of that review, ANR is examining salary equity, staff training and development, volunteer management solutions, and strategies for financial stability. UCORP will continue to foster the consultative relationship with ANR on topics such as program priorities, grant decisions, and academic issues.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Endowed Chairs: UCORP learned from UCOP's Institutional Advancement directors about potential procedures for establishing and reviewing endowed chairs, including the Presidential Matching Chair program and endowed chairs for Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) and the Lawrence Berkeley Lab. Campuses have established processes for endowed chairs that include academic senates, but the proposed new Presidential chairs for ANR and Berkeley Lab are outside the control of an individual campus and there are no current processes for involving the systemwide Senate.

Systemwide issues and campus reports: UCORP devoted part of each regular meeting to discussing systemwide issues as reported by Academic Senate leadership and reports on issues on individual campuses.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW PARTICIPATION AND CORRESPONDENCE REPORT

In addition to the above, UCORP responded to requests for systemwide review of policies and items of systemwide import:

- Draft Policy on International Activities (Oct. 31, 2016)
- Proposed Revised Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (Dec. 9, 2016)
- Proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 182, revising the bylaws of the University Committee on International Education (Dec. 9, 2016)
- Sustainable Building Operations section of the Sustainable Practices Policy [Response to inquiry] (February 23, 2017)
- Proposed Changes to the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) Series (APM-285, 210-3, 133 and 740) (May 17, 2017)
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Export Controls (May 17, 2017)
- Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3) (June 29, 2017)

UCORP REPRESENTATION

As Chair of UCORP, Isaac Martin served on the Academic Assembly, Academic Council, and the Academic Planning Council. Vice Chair Jeffrey Richman represented UCORP on the Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

UCORP is most grateful to its consultants, who have provided invaluable information and perspective to the committee: Art Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS); Mary Croughan, Executive Director for Research Grants and Program Office; Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives; Wendy Streitz, Executive Director for Research Policy Analysis and Coordination, ORGS; Jeff Hall, Director of Research Policy; Glenda Humiston, Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources; and Kimberly Budil, Vice President for the National Laboratories. Nick Anthis from UC Research Initiatives helped to edit, prepare and compile, and the materials for the MRU annual reports.

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 2016-17:

Isaac Martin, Chair (UCSD)
Jeffrey Richman, Vice Chair (UCSB)
Kimmen Sjolander, UCB
Janet Foley, UCD
Raju Metherate, UCI
Leif Havton/Richard Desjardins, UCLA
David Noelle, UCM
Richard Arnott, UCR
Andrew Baird, UCSD
Janet Myers, UCSF
Jianwen Su, UCSB
Steve Whittaker, UCSC
James Chalfant, Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio* (UCD)
Shane White, Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (UCLA)
Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst (UCOP)

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION (UCR&J)
ANNUAL REPORT 2016-17**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Responsibilities and Duties

Pursuant to [Senate Bylaw 205](#), the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J) 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, UCR&J 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.

UCR&J conducted business over email, and major actions are reported below.

Evaluation of proposed Bylaw changes

[Bylaw 336](#) – Revises procedures and timelines for Privilege and Tenure proceedings in discipline cases. The amendments are intended to align Bylaw 336 with proposed revisions to APM 015 (The Faculty Code of Conduct), and APM 016 (University Policy on Faculty Conduct and The Administration of Discipline).

Examination of Divisional Legislation

Legislative Ruling 12.93A gives Divisional Committees on Rules and Jurisdiction authority to determine whether changes their Divisional Manuals have systemwide significance. UCR&J will, however, review proposed changes of potential systemwide significance that come to its attention.

[Bylaw 125.B.14](#) – Authorizes the Academic Council to nominate to the President an Academic Senate member who holds a clinical appointment at a UC School of Medicine to serve on the Health Services Committee of the Board of Regents.

Editorial and non-substantive changes in the Bylaws

[Senate Bylaw 205.B.4](#), requires that editorial and non-substantive changes be reported to the organizations directly concerned and published in the call for the next meeting of the Assembly. See Attachment 1 for the detailed list of such changes.

Advice to Divisions and Committees

- The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) inquired as to whether UCEP is authorized to propose amendments to Senate Bylaws, specifically Bylaw 630. UCR&J advised that UCEP has the authority to make such proposals.
- The San Francisco Division asked whether changes to the grading system of a School within a Division are subject to UCR&J review under [Regulation 778](#). UCR&J replied that Regulation 778 applies to any changes in any part of the grading system within a Division, and that a substantive review by the Divisional Committee on Educational Policy is also required (concerning whether changes to part of the grading system within a division can be applied only to certain programs).
- The Santa Cruz Division asked about whether a department may require approval for currently articulated community college courses to substitute for University of California courses. UCR&J advised that departments wishing to opt out of previous agreements must do so in a timely manner and in accordance with Divisional procedures.
- The University Committee on Committees (UCOC) asked whether [Bylaw 128.H](#), concerning voting rights for non-Senate members, applies to Senate committee task force members. UCR&J's advice was that Bylaw 128.H applies to all Senate committees, including task forces.
- UCR&J provided detailed advice to the Senate Chair regarding procedures for submitting Memorials to the Regents.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Akemann, Chair (UCSB)
Jae-Woo Lee, Member At Large (UCSF)
George J. Matthey, Member At Large (UCD)
Daniel Melia, Ex Officio, Divisional R&J Chair (UCB)
Joel Sobel, Ex Officio, Divisional R&J Chair (UCSD)

IX. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES [INFORMATION/DISCUSSION]

A. Academic Council

- **Shane White, Chair Academic Council**

1. Discussion of Regents' Special Meeting of November 16, 2017

- a. <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/nov17/b2attach1.pdf>
- b. <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/nov17/b2attach2.pdf>
- c. <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/nov17/b2attach3.pdf>