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
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