





enrollments. UC also requested \$35 million in one-time funding to address deferred maintenance needs. Students introduced the concept of “overcrowding” to emphasize how unfunded over-enrollment affects them at ground level.

Huron Report: In 2017, the University hired Huron Consulting to review UCOP’s structure and recommend changes to its size, scope, and portfolio of services. Huron presented its final report to the Academic Council on January 31. The report noted that UCOP is at the forefront of higher education system offices and offers many “world class” services. But it also presented several options for refocusing, realigning, and reducing UCOP operations, including moving some systemwide functions to one or more UC campuses, creating new UC “locations” for large functions (e.g., UC Health), and reorganizing and streamlining specific UCOP offices and functions. Senate leaders emphasize that the University should approach the options in the context of avoiding harm to the system, strengthening accountability and reporting, and aligning the Division of Academic Affairs with the core UC mission. They also note that the potential spin-off of UC Health into an independent entity requires a separate examination independent of other recommendations.

Faculty Salaries: The Academic Council sent a [letter](#) to President Napolitano in late December urging the University to address the gap between UC faculty salaries and salaries at UC’s Comparison 8 group of institutions, in a plan that provides all faculty with a raise, improves salary equity across the system, and brings the published UC salary scales closer to market reality.

Undocumented Students: In January, Council endorsed an [aspirational statement](#) in support of the educational success of DACA students, other undocumented students enrolled at the University, and UC students who are U.S. citizens with undocumented families, who may be forced to leave the United States before completing their UC degree.

Campus Protests and Climate: The Senate chair and vice chair attended a UC Systemwide Meeting on Campus Protests and Campus Climate at UC Irvine yesterday. Participants considered best practices for managing campus protests while sustaining a positive, respectful, and constructive climate, especially around about highly charged political issues.

#### **IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY UNIVERSITY SENIOR MANAGERS**

- **Janet Napolitano, President**
- **Michael T. Brown, Provost and Executive Vice President**
- **Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer**

Huron Report: The University asked Huron Consulting to perform a strategic review of UCOP to ensure that it is maximizing its value to the University. Huron did not propose across-the-board cuts to UCOP, and emphasized that UCOP is, in general, appropriately sized, and has many “best in class” functions. Huron also presented several options for realigning UCOP that included moving programs currently housed at UCOP to a campus or to new stand-alone units. President Napolitano said she will not commit to any changes without a thoughtful consultative process that considers costs and potential effects on campuses. She said she is skeptical of making change for change’s sake and noted that any changes should have a clear benefit to UCOP’s performance and operations.

Budget Update: The Regents postponed a scheduled vote on an in-state undergraduate tuition increase when it became clear the vote would fail. The lack of support shows that more work is needed to educate Regents and legislators about how campuses use tuition revenue to benefit students, and how a tuition revenue shortfall will impact campuses. The University has committed to working with students, faculty, Regents, and legislators to achieve a state tuition buy-out. UCOP is developing a formal request to the state for \$105 million – including \$70 million in ongoing funds to replace tuition and student services fee increases; \$25 million to address the impact of unfunded enrollment growth; and \$10 to support undergraduate and graduate student enrollment growth for 2018-19. UC will also request \$35 million in one-time funding for deferred maintenance.

UC believes it has made sufficient progress on the five 2017 Budget Act requirements pertaining to the State’s sequester of \$50 million from UC’s budget. These include implementation of the State Auditor recommendations and a good faith effort to achieve a 2:1 ratio of freshmen to transfer enrollments on all campuses. EVC Brostrom is preparing a presentation on the University’s cost structure for the March Regents meeting.

Faculty Salaries: The President discussed Council’s letter on faculty salaries with the chancellors, who are similarly concerned about salary competitiveness, but also believe that any plan must be flexible enough to account for variations by campus, discipline, and department. The President has asked the Senate to provide additional campus-specific information about the salary gap that will inform an effective and campus-relevant systemwide plan.

Retiree Health: A Retiree Health Benefits Working Group is meeting to develop recommendations for ensuring the long-term financial viability of the retiree health benefits program. The Working Group will focus on plan and program design strategies that maintain the quality of the benefit while managing costs. UC is targeting a 4% cap on cost increases in 2019, but has not set a long-term goal yet, in recognition that multiple factors impact costs.

Federal Budget: The latest in a series of continuing resolutions to fund the government expires March 23, but paves the way for Congressional negotiators to reach agreement on 2018 appropriations for defense and non-defense discretionary accounts. The University will advocate for the highest level of funding for non-defense programs that support UC’s education, research, and health missions.

DACA: The U.S. Senate is discussing several immigration reform bills, though none is likely to receive the 60 votes needed to advance. One bipartisan group of senators has proposed legislation that balances protections for DACA recipients with increased border security. The White House’s proposal includes a path to citizenship for DACA recipients, but would also eliminate the visa lottery program and set additional restrictions on family-based migration. Meanwhile, the University is encouraging DACA students to re-enroll, providing them with legal services, and sponsoring DACA renewal workshops on campuses.

Academic Affairs: Provost Brown is preparing presentations for the March Regents meeting on 1) the University’s financial aid model, and 2) the student-faculty ratio and its connection to faculty recruitment and diversity. The presentations are part of a series of deep dives into educational delivery that aim to help the Regents guide the future of the University. In addition, the Provost has empaneled two new Academic Planning Council workgroups: the Articulating the Academic Mission Workgroup will consider how UC can convey and communicate its

academic mission to constituencies and stakeholders, and the Workgroup on Graduate Education will consider the issues facing graduate education at UC. The Provost is considering the viability of Huron Consulting's options for restructuring programs housed in the Division of Academic Affairs, and the extent to which different governance models and locations may contribute to or diminish the systemwide value of those programs. The Provost said he understands the importance of narrowing the UC faculty salary gap and looks forward to receiving the Senate's advice about a plan.

---

***Discussion:*** Assembly members noted that moving systemwide programs to individual campuses may reduce their accountability to the system and urged the University to maintain systemwide programs as systemwide programs. They also had several questions for senior managers.

*Q: Where would the University find additional funding for faculty salaries?*

EVP Brostrom noted that the 2018-19 budget includes three line items that could be used for faculty salaries, including the \$50 million "quality reinvestment" set aside. The faculty salary gap is one of the priorities highlighted for that funding.

*Q: Competitive salaries are critical to the recruitment, retention, and diversification of the faculty. A plan to diversify faculty hiring should also address high housing costs. In addition, directing salary increases to the published UC salary scales will help ensure salary equity.*

EVP Brostrom noted that affordable faculty housing is a priority for every campus. Some affordable housing solutions are local, but the University also wants to identify systemwide solutions. Provost Brown added that the UC merit and promotion system contributes to equity and fairness in powerful ways. Irrespective of what UC does about faculty salaries this year, UC needs a long-term strategic solution to ensure the merit and promotion system remains effective.

*Q: How often do you meet with Dan Hare in his capacity as Faculty Advisor to the President?*

President Napolitano noted that she and Professor Hare have one-on-one meetings every two weeks in Oakland. In addition, Professor Hare has an office available to him at UCOP.

*Q: DACA students really appreciate the University's support. However, students remain concerned that a legislative solution that allows them to remain in the U.S. could still subject their families to deportation.*

President Napolitano noted that UC opposes funding for additional interior enforcement activities and additional limitations on family reunification immigration. In the University's advocacy for the Dreamers, it acknowledges that immigration relief for them will require a compromise, and the most reasonable compromise is more border security funding.

## **V. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE REPORT**

### **▪ Roberta Rehm, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare**

**Salaries:** UCFW Chair Rehm noted that UCFW is considering the President's request for more information about campus-based faculty salary gaps that could inform a systemwide plan. UCFW's position is that a systemwide plan should treat the faculty as a single entity as much as

possible, with some minimal discretion built in for chancellors to address issues of equity, inversion, compression, and recruitment and retention.

UC Health: UCFW is discussing Huron’s recommendation to transition the UC Health enterprise into an independent entity. UCFW’s Health Care Task Force will follow developments closely and ask to be part of any ongoing research or negotiations that arise.

Campus Climate: UCFW is aware that off-campus visitors associated with far right organizations have attempted to enter classrooms and intimidate faculty and students. Campuses are public spaces, but classrooms are under the direct supervision of faculty. Faculty have the right to exclude uninvited guests and issue permissions to record lectures or copy course materials. In addition, UCFW is participating in a review of the UC Police Policies and Administrative Procedures manual (the “Gold Book”) and other systemwide public safety directives.

## **VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

### **A. Academic Council**

#### **1. Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (Area “d”) Requirement**

Following a [systemwide Senate review](#), the Academic Council recommended at its January 31, 2018 meeting that Senate Regulation 424, which describes the area “d” (laboratory science) requirement for freshman admission, be amended. The amendments would increase the minimum area “d” requirement from 2 units (3 units currently are 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”. The amendments would change the name of the area “d” requirement from “Laboratory Science” to “Science” to reflect the broader range of science disciplines to be accepted for the third unit under area “d.” The changes would affect students entering high school in fall 2019.

The revisions aim to align UC’s expectations for science preparation with changes to high school science curricula based on California’s adoption of the Common Core; the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) for K-12 and the new three- and four-course models CA high schools will move to under the NGSS; and the new NGSS Science categories– Physical Sciences, Life Sciences, Earth and Space Sciences, and Engineering, Technology and Applications of Science. Revisions to the area “d” course criteria posted in the [A-G Guide](#) will include specific examples of courses that could fulfill the requirements not explicitly mentioned in the Senate regulations. The revised policy will help increase scientific literacy and connect the University’s academic preparation expectations more closely with the curriculum reform efforts well underway in California high schools.

Several Assembly members expressed concern about the potential for differential access to area “d” courses under the new policy, given data showing that 95% of UC applicants already take three or more area “d” courses, but that 60% of the 5% who complete only two are from disadvantaged groups. In addition, there was concern that high schools may need more than one year to adapt to the new requirements.

BOARS Chair Sanchez pointed to data showing that most UC applicants who take only two area “d” courses do so because UC requires two for minimum eligibility. He clarified that the 5%

cohort of applicants who take only two area “d” courses includes 2.2% who take a third elective science course that may be eligible to area “d” with the policy change. In addition, 90% of the remaining 2.8% attend schools that currently offer 3 or more science disciplines. Thus, access to science courses does not itself present as an obstacle for the vast majority of students. Furthermore, UC applicants from schools offering only two science courses were admitted at a higher rate (60%) than students from other high schools. Comprehensive review ensures that no student is denied based on a single factor.

BOARS Chair Sanchez noted that the vast majority of UC applicants come from CA high schools that are increasing their offerings of 3 or more science disciplines, while the number of high schools offering only 1 or 2 disciplines is declining. He noted that 97% of California high schools will be able to offer a third science course immediately; that number will grow as more move to a 3 or 4-course NGSS model to meet the new State standard. Moreover, the expansion of courses eligible under area “d,” such as computer science and engineering, will give all students more flexibility to fulfill a three-year requirement. He added that the State Board of Education is also concerned about access and diversity. It adopted the NGSS to strengthen science and college preparation for all students, and high schools will have to offer a minimum of three science courses to implement the NGSS. Traditionally, UC has supported efforts like the Common Core that seek to improve college preparation and access. The LCFF funding formula provides many under-resourced schools with a possible means to offer multiple NGSS-aligned courses.

Several Assembly members applauded BOARS’ efforts to support the State’s move to strengthen science standards and noted that the data answered Council’s prior concerns and questions satisfactorily. The changes will help push high schools to offer more science, enhance academic preparation, and increase science course options for all students.

**ACTION: A motion to adopt the amendments was made and seconded. The motion passed 29 to 6, with one abstention.**

**VII. SPECIAL ORDERS**

**A. Consent Calendar [None]**

**VIII. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [None]**

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

**X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [None]**

**XI. NEW BUSINESS [None]**

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 pm

Minutes Prepared by: Michael LaBriola, Academic Senate Analyst

Attest: Shane White, Academic Senate Chair

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of February 14, 2018

## 2017-18 Assembly Attendance February 14, 2018

### President of the University:

Janet Napolitano

### 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 (absent)

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, UCAADE

Michelle Yeh, Chair, UCAP

Edward Caswell-Chen, Chair, UCEP  
(absent)

Roberta Rehm, Chair, UCFW

Jeffrey Richman, Chair, UCORP (absent)

Joshua Schimel, Chair, UCPB (absent)

### Berkeley (5)

Daniel Boyarin.

Fai Ma

Victoria Frede-Montemayor.

Ted Slaman (alt for Christopher Kutz).

Barbara Spackman (alt for Mark Richards).

### Davis (6)

Stephanie Dungan

S.J. Ben Yoo

Brenda Schildgen

Robert L. Powell (absent)

Scott Stanley (absent)

--

### Irvine (4)

John Dobrian

Masashi Kitazawa

Henry Weinstein (absent)

Amy Powell (absent)

### Los Angeles (8)

Noel Boyle

David Gere (alt for William Marotti)

Kym F. Faull

Roman Koropeckyj

Sandra Loo

Peter Tontonoz

Mansoureh Eghbali (absent)

Dorothy Wiley (absent)

### Merced (1)

Patti LiWang

### Riverside (2)

Manuela Martins-Green

Thomas Cogswell (absent)

### San Diego (5)

Deborah Hertz

Robert Kluender

Elizabeth Komives

Joseph Pogliano

Anna Joy Springer (absent)

### San Francisco (4)

Elena Flowers

Vineeta Singh

Leah Karliner

Marek Brzezinski (absent)

### Santa Barbara (3)

Bjorn Birnir

Susan Cassels

Eric Matthys

### Santa Cruz (2)

Kimberly Lau

Dorian Bell (absent)

### Secretary/Parliamentarian

George J. Matthey



**III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

- **Shane N. White**

**IV. TRANSFER GUARANTEE**

President Napolitano's request to the Senate to consider an admissions guarantee to all qualifying California Community College transfers

**V. PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE ON POLICING**

**VI. ACADEMIC COUNCIL PLAN TO CLOSE THE FACULTY SALARY GAP**

- a. <https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/reports/SW-JN-faculty-salary-gap-plan.pdf>
- b. <https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/reports/SW-JN-faculty-salaries.pdf>



1111 Franklin Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-5200  
Phone: (510) 987-9074  
<http://www.ucop.edu>

March 7, 2018

## ACADEMIC SENATE CHAIR WHITE

Dear Shane:

Today I was honored to be joined by you, Vice Chair May, and other members of the University community to deliver the first in a series of speeches to mark the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the University of California. Thank you for making time to be there in person.

Over its 150 years, the University of California has become a foundational institution for the State of California and the nation as a whole. We have grown from one campus in Berkeley to a system of 10 top-ranked universities, five exceptional medical centers, three affiliated national laboratories, and a Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources that reaches every county in the state. We are recognized as both the best and the most accessible university system in the United States.

As we mark this anniversary, however, we should do so with one eye on the present and another on the horizon. Since its inception, UC has not just helped California prepare for the future; we have helped shape it. We must do the same today, for tomorrow. UC must find new ways to continue to lead and excel, despite the enormous challenges facing public higher education institutions.

As part of my vision for how UC can continue to fulfill its teaching, research, and public service mission in the future I laid out a series of calls to actions, including:

- A call to the UC Academic Senate to determine what it will take to extend a guarantee of admission to all qualifying California Community College transfer students.
- A call to the Chancellors to explore how we can streamline the degree pipeline, and ensure that at least 70 percent of our undergraduates, across the system, earn their degrees within four years by the year 2030.

- And, finally, a challenge to the Legislature and the next Governor to work with us and CSU to tackle the college graduate gap and make sure our state is producing the educated workforce it needs for the decades ahead.

Nearly one-third of UC's undergraduates begin their higher education path at a community college. These students succeed at the same rate as those who arrive at UC as undergraduates, and they contribute to the diversity of experiences among our student body. Within a decade of completing their UC degrees, 51 percent of those who transferred from a community college, and who work in California, are earning salaries that place them among the top one-third of income-earners in the state.

Early in my presidency, I made a commitment to increase the number of community college transfer students at UC. Thanks to partnerships with the Academic Senate, campus leadership, and our counterparts at the California Community Colleges, we have accomplished this and continue to simplify the transfer process for students. In the fall of 2017, UC had 6,000 more California Community College transfer students enrolled at our campuses than we did in the fall of 2013.

However, our work is not yet done. My call to action to the Academic Senate is to determine what it will take to extend a guarantee of admission to all qualifying California Community College transfer requests.

Some proposals that are worth considering include:

- The guarantee can use the current 21 Transfer Pathways as a key building block. Successful completion of a Pathway, along with obtaining the requisite GPA, should entitle a community college student to a guaranteed place in the UC system.
- Where the community college Associate Degree for Transfer equates to or exceeds the major preparation required in a UC Transfer Pathway, it should be considered for acceptance in lieu of a Pathway for purposes of a guarantee.
- Enhancing the current Transfer Admission Guarantees (TAGs), and allowing prospective students to have more than one TAG, should also facilitate transfer. Encouraging those campuses that currently do not offer TAGs to do so, perhaps in less impacted majors, is also worth exploring.

I am asking you and the Academic Senate to review these and other proposals to facilitate transfer and transfer preparation so that the guarantees are in place by the fall of 2019, at the outset of the University's 151<sup>st</sup> academic year.

Academic Senate Chair White

March 7, 2018

Page 2

This would be a major leap for the University of California – one that must be implemented carefully to achieve its desired effect. I am committed to working closely with the Academic Senate, leaders at the California Community Colleges, and other stakeholders to make sure we get this right.

I trust that you agree to this call to action and I look forward to working together to make it a reality.

Yours very truly,



Janet Napolitano  
President

cc: Vice Chair May, Academic Senate  
Provost Brown  
Executive Vice President and Chief of Staff Nava  
Vice President Holmes-Sullivan  
Chief Policy Advisor Kao

## VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST

- Michael T. Brown

## VIII. STATUS OF THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET

- Nathan Brostrom, Chief Financial Officer

## IX. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

### Academic Council

- Shane White, Chair

### 1. Amendment to Academic Senate Bylaw 128 [ACTION]

Following a systemwide Senate review, the Academic Council recommended at its March 21, 2018 meeting that Senate Bylaw 128 be amended to add a new section J governing conflicts of interest (COI) on Senate committees, subcommittees, and task forces, as noted below.

#### **Justification for Senate Bylaw 128. J**

Due to the multifaceted roles of faculty members in the University's complex research, teaching and service missions, it is inevitable that conflicts of interest will sometimes exist with respect to the conduct of Senate governance. Following a systemwide Senate review, the Academic Council has approved an amendment to Bylaw 128 originally proposed by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J). A new section J would govern conflicts of interest (COI) on Senate committees, subcommittees, and task forces, replacing Senate reliance on vague language in Sturgis' Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure with a standard procedure. Section J outlines a multi-layer process for addressing a COI. The first layer is at the level of a committee member who may recognize a potential COI of their own or of another; the second is at the level of arbitration by a committee chair; and the third is at the level of the chair of the Academic Council as the final arbiter in cases of disagreement about self-recusal between the member and the committee chair. The bylaw also specifies that any committee member may raise a concern about a potential COI.

During the systemwide review, several reviewers noted that Section J lacks a comprehensive definition of conflict of interest with examples specific to the activities of Senate bodies. Council decided that while a more limited policy is appropriate for the bylaw; it should also produce a supplemental follow-up document that outlines examples, circumstances, and guidance about COI for inclusion on the Academic Senate website. Council expects to complete that effort this year.

**ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly is asked to endorse the Academic Council's recommendation to amend Senate Bylaw 128 as noted below.**

<http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/bylaws/blpart2.html#bl128>

128.J. Conflict of Interest: Members of Assembly committees, sub-committees and task forces must be aware that professional judgments made in committee work may be compromised or appear to be compromised by a conflict of interest. Any member of a committee who thinks they have a conflict of interest must inform the Chair (or the Vice-Chair if there is a potential conflict of interest on the part of the Chair) thereof. Any member of a committee who thinks another member has a conflict of interest should inform the Chair (or the Vice-Chair if there is a potential conflict of interest on the part of the Chair) thereof. The member with the potential conflict may choose to limit their participation up to and including full recusal. Any party may consult the Chair of the Academic Council for advice (or the Vice-

Chair if there is a potential conflict of interest on the part of the Chair). In the absence of agreement between the member and the Chair (or Vice-Chair) of the committee on the appropriate actions, the Chair (or Vice-Chair) of the committee shall inform the Chair (or Vice-Chair) of the Academic Council, who shall make the final determination as to what actions are appropriate.

## **2. Nomination and election of the Vice Chair of the 2018-19 Assembly [ACTION]**

Senate Bylaw 110.A., which governs the election of the Vice Chair of the Assembly, states: “The Assembly elects a Vice Chair who is a Senate member from a Division other than that of the incoming Chair, to assume office the following September. The Academic Council submits a nomination. Further nominations may be made by the Assembly members from the floor, and on written petition by twenty-five Senate members. The Vice Chair also serves as Vice Chair of the Academic Council. The following year the Vice Chair becomes Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council. Neither the Chair nor the Vice Chair may serve as a Divisional Representative.”

In accordance with Bylaw 110.A, the Academic Council submits its nomination of Professor Kum-Kum Bhavnani of UC Santa Barbara as 2018-2019 Assembly Vice Chair. Professor Bhavnani was selected as the Council’s nominee at its March 21, 2018 meeting. Her qualifications and personal statement are as follows:

### **KUM-KUM BHAVNANI CURRICULUM VITAE**

Distinguished Professor, Sociology, University of California at Santa Barbara, CA 93106-9430

#### **HIGHER EDUCATION**

Oct '70 - June 1973      B.Sc (Hons) Upper Second      University of Bristol, England  
Oct '73 - Oct. 1974      M.A (Child/Educational Psychology)      University of Nottingham, England  
Oct '83 - June. 1988      Ph.D. (Soc. & Polit. Sci. Cttee) King's College University of Cambridge, England

#### **PRESENT OCCUPATION**

**August 1991 – Present:**      Assistant, Associate and Full Professor, Dept. of Sociology,  
Distinguished Professor Above Scale (current rank)      University of California at Santa Barbara

**Sept 2012 – Sept 2016:**      Chair, UCSB Academic Senate

**November 2016 to present:**      Part-time & Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for International  
Initiatives, Office of Research

At UCSB my academic interests are globalization, women and international development, cultural studies, feminist studies, anti-racist studies, and critical social psychology. I have Affiliated Faculty status in Women’s Studies and in the Department of Global Studies (GIS). I chair the minor in Women, Culture and (Third World) Development within GIS.

#### **Divisional and Systemwide Senate Service:**

Chair      UCSB Academic Senate (2012 to 2016)  
Member      Systemwide Academic Planning Council  
Chair      ad hoc Senate Committee for IV: Pardall tunnel re-designed, community plantings, engineering students re-built and installed an iconic water wheel + others 2014 to 2016

Chair	System-wide Committee on International Education (2011 – 2012)
Chair	UCSB Committee on International Education (2010 – 2011)
Chair	Campbell Hall Renovation Committee (2011)
Member+ co-Chair	Design Review Committee (2010 onwards)
Vice-Chair	Academic Senate, UCSB Division (2006 – 2008)
Co-Chair	Design Review Committee for UCSB (2006 – 2008)
Co-Chair	Search Business Services Director for the campus (2007)
Co-Chair	FTE Conversion Committee for UCSB (2006 – 2008)
Chair:	Council on Planning and Budget 2005/06
Vice-Chair:	Council on Planning and Budget 2003/04 and 2004/05
Member	Graduate Council (1995 – 1998)

**Other University Service (including joint Senate-Administration Committees)**

Co-Chair	Chancellor’s Co-ordinating Committee on Budget Strategy 2012-2016
2012 to present	At the request of the Dean of Social Sciences, in my role as senior faculty, I formally mentor (continuing) four faculty of colour since that program was initiated in 2012
Co-Chair	Chancellor’s Co-ordinating Committee for Isla Vista (from 2014 to present)
Chair:	Internal Review Committee Education Abroad Program 2004/05
Chair	New Instructional Building Committee (2011)
Member	Campus Search Committees, Library Rebuilding Committee, Classroom Renovation Committee, Classroom Utilization Committee, Board for the Center of Black Studies, Board of MultiCultural Center, Executive Committee of the College of Creative Studies, + ad hoc promotion review committees

**OTHER OCCUPATIONS SINCE THE DOCTORATE**

**July 2008 – July 2010                      University of California London Study Centre**

London Study Centre Director for UC Education Abroad Program

**July 2000 – 2002                              Smith College, MA 01063**

Inaugural Editor Meridians and Visiting Professor

(Raised \$210,000 from Ford Foundation for the journal, along with other grants)

**August 1989 – August 1990              Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.**

Visiting Associate Professor in Women's Studies. One year leave from Bradford University

**Sept. 1987 – August 1991                Dept. of Applied Social Studies, University of Bradford, Britain.**

Lecturer (tenured since Sept 1989, i.e. equivalent to Associate Professor in the US) in Applied Social Studies.

**KUM-KUM BHAVNANI CHALLENGES AND PRIORITIES FOR THE UC SYSTEMWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE**

The UC is one of the finest universities in the world. The forms of governance we embrace guarantee the UC’s outstanding research and scholarship; create the best conditions for the exceptional education we provide for diverse populations; and ensure that our public university is of service and creates well-being for many different populations within and outside California. The role of the faculty Senate is central to sustaining the UC’s mission and stature. We are united in protecting the university’s mission from compromises or concessions such as increased student-faculty ratios and reduced staff support, aspects that erode our excellence and diversity.

Having been a two-term Divisional Chair at UC Santa Barbara (2012 to 2016) I know that the Senate is a strong bellwether by which to assess how well a Division, and/or the UC as a whole, is doing. I have been

away from direct Senate responsibility for the past two years. This vantage point of the semi- outsider – alongside my shared passion for the UC mission and the critical role played by faculty and staff in this mission – has led me to posit the following as some of the issues the Senate and its leadership might encounter in the coming two years.

1. **The relationship between UCOP and the State Legislature** could be stronger, and the role of the faculty Senate, along with OP, is crucial to making this relationship more positive. The issues we still must explain to the legislature, with even greater clarity, include: UC policies regarding NRST, the significance of the university’s research agendas, and enrolment and tuition increases. If elected, I would work to develop strategies via Council discussions and with other stakeholders on how to present ourselves to the legislature as one university, while remaining mindful of the particular cultures of each campus. Following discussion of Senate and UCOP strategies with the President and the Provost, UCOP and Senate are then in a better position to offer a united vision to the legislature. The Council Chair’s remarks at Regents’ meetings might also be an appropriate vehicle through which to propose ideas on how to create an even more robust relationship between UC and the State.

2. **The Huron Report** offers a controversial set of suggestions on how best to reorganize UCOP, with this reorganization going to the heart of the UC’s mission. Huron recommends an 18-month planning period for implementing changes. We must decide, as a Senate, which changes to strongly oppose (I, personally, don’t think it is feasible to oppose every suggestion put forward by Huron), and, simultaneously, to decide how to defend the UC from these proposed budget cuts.

3. **Faculty Salaries:** With the Offices of the President and the Provost I would want to discuss how best, and how quickly, we may address the 8.4% pay gap between UC faculty salaries and those of our peers. The recommendation by UCFW for a 5% across-the-board increase is something I support.

4. **LSOE and Teaching Professors:** These discussions go to the heart of the UC’s teaching and research missions. I see the role of Council discussions as further facilitating campus views on this matter, to be cohered into a Senate view by the Council leadership.

5. **“Moreno Report”:** The events of last year regarding the State Audit and the role played by UCOP in that audit have informed many recent discussions. Having read the 2017 Report, I know that this challenge for the UC could evolve further in the coming two years.

6. **Sexual Violence Sexual Harassment (SVSH):** I would make sure the Senate is included in all discussions on SVSH. The general claim that all faculty only protect their own are harmful to all of us, and it is these types of inaccurate assertions that we can question through discussion with campus stakeholders and at OP.

7. **Continue to Invite Regents to Council Meetings:** This is a helpful way for Regents and Senate to share the deep commitment we have to the UC and its mission, and to view each other as partners within the UC.

8. **Diversity of our faculty and our students:** The diversity of the UC – of race/ethnicity, of ideas, of research, of faculty and staff, ensures our excellence. I would work hard with others to improve this even more.

I know that in listing the above, some Council members will agree with me, others will disagree, and yet others may feel I have omitted important issues. I stress the list includes merely some of the issues that currently pose challenges, and could set priorities for our work. We all also know the issues can change in the twinkle of an eye. During my four years on Council I definitely learnt that, as well as learning a lot, from Council members, leadership and staff, as well as, of course, from my Division. Finally, if I were to be elected to this position, I would view it as an honor and a privilege. It is a task that requires determination, an ability to speak plainly but with diplomacy, and to lead by including all of the Senate’s constituencies. I like to think my experience and personality make me up to this task.

**ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly is asked to elect the 2018-2019 Assembly Vice Chair**



### 3. Ratification of the 2018 Oliver Johnson Award [ACTION]

The Oliver Johnson Award for Service to the Academic Senate is given biennially to a member or members of the UC faculty who has performed outstanding service to the Senate. Its broader goal is to honor, through the award to the recipient, all members of the faculty who have contributed their time and talent to the Senate.

Nominations for the award are made through Divisional Committees on Committees to the Universitywide Committee on Committees (UCOC). UCOC, in turn, submits the names of two nominees to the Academic Council. At its March 21 meeting, the Academic Council chose to honor both Daniel Simmons (UCD) and Duncan Mellichamp (UCSB) with the 2018 Oliver Johnson Award. The Assembly is asked to ratify the Academic Council's choice of recipients.

---

#### Re: Oliver Johnson Award Nominations

Dear Shane:

The University Committee on Committees (UCOC) is nominating Professor Emeritus Duncan Mellichamp (UCSB) and Professor Emeritus Daniel Simmons (UCD) for the 2018 Oliver Johnson Award for Distinguished Leadership in the Academic Senate. We selected these two names from a handful of nominations, all of which reflected extraordinary service on both the divisional and systemwide level, as well as stellar records of academic achievement.

#### Duncan Mellichamp (UCSB)

Professor Duncan Mellichamp is an Emeritus Professor of Chemical Engineering; he was one of six founding faculty members of that department in 1965 (a department that now consistently ranks in the top 10). Professor Mellichamp has exceptionally dedicated service to both UCSB and the UC for over 50 years. During his time as Academic Council Chair, he initiated processes to assess how effectively the Senate represents faculty interests in areas where administration has primary responsibility. The [Task Force on Governance](#), established by the Academic Council in November 1996, represented the first full-scale review of the organization and operations of the University-wide Senate to be conducted in more than three decades at the time.

Professor Mellichamp's time on the University-wide Senate is perhaps most remembered by his very strong advocacy with the Regents for the inclusion of "same-sex" domestic partners in UC employee benefits. To quote from the November 1997 issue of the *Notice* of the Academic Senate:

*The Regents' September consideration of this proposal was an outgrowth of an extended discussion they had regarding domestic partners in July. That discussion, in turn, was prompted by an earlier plea from last year's Academic Council Chair, Duncan Mellichamp, that the board take the issue up.*

Professor Mellichamp's early (and ultimately successful) advocacy for this position is yet another testimony to his exceptionally strong ethics and sense of academic community.

#### Daniel Simmons (UCD)

Professor Daniel Simmons is an Emeritus Professor of Law; he contributed eight full years on the systemwide Academic Council – four years as divisional chair (1991-93 & 2004-06), two years as

Council Vice Chair (1993-94 & 2009-10), and two years as Council Chair (1994-95 & 2020-11). His first term as Senate chair included the contentious Regental debates over affirmative action, and his second term came after the unprecedented state disinvestment from UC. This required responding to the Commission on the Future of UC (i.e., the “Gould Commission”), and taking up both rebenching and the first set of post-employment benefits reforms (creating the “2013 tier” within UCRP.)

Professor Simmons served as division chair during the transition from Chancellor Hullar to Chancellor Vanderhoef. During this time, many faculty felt uncertain how the administration deal with budget cuts. Professor Simmons advocated successfully for a more substantial faculty role in academic planning, including the allocation of faculty FTEs. His second term as division chair required that he dealt with a resolution calling for a no-confidence vote in Chancellor Vanderhoef, while implementing the many recommendations for Senate bylaw changes and other reforms.

Professor Simmons’ leadership brought about improvements in Program Review and the campus General Education requirements. Also during his second term as a member of the Academic Council, Dan played a key role in helping to find an orderly way for the Senate to function while the Academic Council acted to remove the Chair of the Senate.

Enclosed are Professors Mellichamp and Simmons’ nomination materials, as submitted by their respective Divisions. If you have any questions about these nominees, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Patricia Gallagher  
Chair, University Committee on Committees

**ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly is asked to ratify the 2018 Oliver Johnson Awardees**

## **X. SPECIAL ORDERS**

### **A. Consent Calendar**

#### **1. Variance to Senate Regulation 750.B Requested by San Francisco Division**

**[ACTION]**

At its March 21 meeting, the Academic Council approved the following proposed amendment to San Francisco Division Regulation 750.B concerning persons in charge of courses. The amendment would include the Health Sciences Clinical Faculty series in the regulation. The University Committee on Educational Policy approved the request at its March 2018 meeting, and the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has certified its consonance with the Code of the Academic Senate. Note that approval of the variance authorizes a change to UCSF Senate regulation 750, not to systemwide Senate Regulation 750. Approved variances appear in Appendix III of the Systemwide Academic Senate Manual on the Senate website (<https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/appendix3.html>).

**ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly is asked to approve the variance to 750.B for the San Francisco Division.**

CURRENT LANGUAGE	PROPOSED LANGUAGE
<p><b>SR-750</b></p> <p>[A] Only regularly appointed officers of instruction holding appropriate instructional titles may have substantial responsibility for the content and conduct of courses which are approved by the Academic Senate.</p> <p>[B] Professors, professors in residence, professors of clinical ____ (e.g., medicine) and adjunct professors of any rank, instructors, instructors in residence and adjunct instructors, and lecturers may give courses of any grade. Persons holding other instructional titles may teach lower division courses only, unless individually authorized to teach courses of higher grade by the appropriate Committee on Courses or Graduate Council. If a course is given in sections by several instructors, each instructor shall hold the required instructional title. (EC 15 Apr 74).</p> <p>[C] Announcements of special study courses in which individual students work under the direction of various members of a department may state that presentation is by the staff, but a member of the department shall be designated as the instructor in charge.</p> <p>[D] Only persons approved by the appropriate administrative officer, with the concurrence of the committee on courses concerned, may assist in instruction in courses authorized by the Academic Senate.</p> <p>[E] No student may serve as a reader or assistant in a course in which the student is enrolled. (Am 16 Mar 70; Am 15 Jun 77)</p>	<p><b>SR-750</b></p> <p>[No Change]</p> <p>[B] Professors, professors in residence, professors of clinical ____ (e.g., medicine), <b><u>and health sciences clinical professors of any rank, clinical professors of any rank, health sciences clinical instructors and clinical instructors</u></b>, adjunct professors of any rank, instructors, instructors in residence and adjunct instructors, and lecturers may give courses of any grade. Persons holding other instructional titles may teach lower division courses only, unless individually authorized to teach courses of higher grade by the appropriate Committee on Courses or Graduate Council. If a course is given in sections by several instructors, each instructor shall hold the required instructional title. (EC 15 Apr 74).</p> <p>[C] [No Change]</p> <p>[D] [No Change]</p> <p>[E] [No Change]</p>

**XI. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]**

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

**XIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]**

**XIV. NEW BUSINESS**