NOTICE OF MEETING

TELECONFERENCE OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Wednesday, April 15, 2015
10:00 am - 12:00 pm

To participate in the teleconference, contact your divisional Senate office for the location of a central meeting place. If you are off-campus, you may call 1-866-740-1260 and key in access code 9870162#

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

II. MINUTES [ACTION]
   Approval of the Draft Minutes of the Meeting of February 11, 2015
   Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, February 11, 2015

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR
   - Mary Gilly

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST
   - Aimée Dorr

V. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES
   A. Academic Council
      - Mary Gilly, Chair, Academic Council
      1. Proposed Amendment to Academic Senate Regulation 682 [ACTION] 7-8
      2. Nomination and Election of the Vice Chair of the 2015-16 Assembly [ACTION] 8-10

VI. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT

VII. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

VIII. SPECIAL ORDERS
   A. Consent Calendar [NONE]

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XI. NEW BUSINESS
I. Roll Call

2014-15 Assembly Roll Call April 15, 2015

President of the University:
Janet Napolitano

Academic Council Members:
Mary Gilly, Chair
J. Daniel Hare, Vice Chair
Panos Papadopoulos, Chair, UCB
Andre Knoesen, Chair, UCD
William Molzon, Chair, UCI
Joel D. Aberbach, Chair, UCLA
Jian-Qiao Sun, Chair, UCM
Jose Wudka, Chair, UCR
Gerry Boss, Chair, UCSD
Farid Chehab, Chair, UCSF
Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair, UCSB
Donald Brenneis, Chair, UCSC
Ralph Aldredge, Chair, BOARS
Jutta Heckhausen, Chair, CCGA
David Lopez-Carr, Chair, UCAAD
Jeffrey Knapp, Chair, UCAP
Tracy Larrabee, Chair, UCEP
JoelDimsdale, Chair, UCFW
Liane Brouillette, Chair, UCORP
Gary Leal, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (5)
Kristie Boering
Suzanne M. J. Fleiszig
Oliver O’Reilly
Theodore Slaman
David Zilberman

Davis (6)
Gian Aldo Antonelli
Angie Chabram-Dernersesian
James Chalfant
Gino Cortopassi
John Oakley
Robert L. Powell

Irvine (4)
Sameer Ashar
David Kay
John Lowengrub

Los Angeles (8)
Roman Koropecjkj
Purnima Mankekar
Hanna Mikkola
Frank Petrigliano
Ninez Ponce
E. Richard Stiehm
Christopher Tilly
Dorothy Wiley

Merced (1)
Robin Maria DeLugan

Riverside (2)
Mary Gauvain
Ilhem Messaoudi Powers

San Diego (5)
Grant Goodall
Joanna McKittrick
Susan Narucki
Margaret Schoeninger
Steven Wasserman

San Francisco (4)
Jacque Duncan
John Feiner
Elyse Foster
Russell Pieper

Santa Barbara (3)
Charles Akemann
Henning Bohn
Eric Matthys

Santa Cruz (2)
Olof Einarsdottir
Catherine Jones

Secretary/Parliamentarian
George J. Mattey
I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday, February 11, 2015. Academic Senate Chair Mary Gilly presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Senate Director Hilary Baxter called the roll of Assembly members and confirmed a quorum. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of the December 10, 2014 meeting as noticed.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Mary Gilly

January Regents Meeting: The Governor filled the final vacant seat on the Board of Regents with his former secretary of legislative affairs, bypassing the consultation process outlined in the California Constitution. The Regents tabled a proposal to link coaches’ compensation to student athletes’ academic performance and approved the establishment of a Select Advisory Committee on the Cost Structure of the University. The “Committee of Two” will involve a series of meetings between the Governor, President Napolitano, and their staff to discuss ideas for reducing UC’s costs. The Governor noted that the process of developing and evaluating proposals would involve shared governance via taking proposals to the Regents, and President Napolitano committed to including the Senate. The Regents also received updates on the progress of implementing recommendations made by the UC Commission on the Future in 2010, and those made last year by the President’s Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault. Finally, Regent Kieffer described forthcoming presentations he requested on the nature of a UC undergraduate education.

State Budget and Engagement Plan: The Governor’s 2015-16 State budget proposal is bad news for the university. It ties a 4% funding increase to the state funded portion of the UC budget (representing only a 1.7% increase to the overall UC budget) to tuition and nonresident enrollment remaining at current levels. Chair Gilly recently asked campus Senate offices to disseminate a letter from the President to all faculty with information and talking points about the UC budget and the Long-Term Stability Plan for Tuition and Financial Aid approved by the Regents in November. The letter encourages faculty to take an active role in talking publicly about how their teaching, research, and public service contribute to UC’s excellence.
Laboratory Fees Research Program (LFRP): The DOE has penalized Los Alamos National Lab (LANL) for a recent safety problem involving a LANL barrel at a radioactive waste storage facility by reducing the management fee to $6 million from a possible $63 million. The shortfall will hurt the LFRP and jeopardize the work of the doctoral and postdoctoral students supported by that program.

CCC Baccalaureate Degrees: The Governor signed into law a new pilot program that will allow 15 California Community Colleges to offer bachelor’s degree programs in certain vocational fields not currently offered at a UC or CSU campus.

Transfer Streamlining: BOARS has endorsed an effort to implement the Transfer Action Team’s recommendation to align major preparation requirements for similar majors across UC campuses to help prospective transfers prepare simultaneously for multiple campuses offering that major. UCOP is identifying the appropriate campuses representatives from ten majors to convene for a discussion about alignment.

IV. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council
   ▪ Mary Gilly, Chair

   1. Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 155, Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC)

   In 2012-13, Council recommended disbanding the University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC) and reassigning parts of its charge, based on poor functioning and a lack of clarity about its purpose, but the Assembly asked UCOC to instead update the UCCC bylaws to revitalize the committee and render it more directly useful to the Senate and the university. The proposed new bylaw would broaden the committee’s mission to include issues arising at the interface of computing technology, education, and research – including online education, intellectual property, accessibility, security, and privacy. The CCGA and UCEP chairs would be ex-officio members of the new UCACC.

   An Assembly member who sat on the Council that recommended disbandment noted that expanding the charge does not guarantee a more effective committee. Another member objected to the phrase “quality assurance” in the committee’s charge, noting that quality assurance for online courses is most appropriately the purview of UCEP and CCGA. It was noted that the intent is for UCACC to monitor technological quality, not course quality. UCEP and CCGA will continue to consider educational quality in online education. UCACC will be expected to bring technology concerns forward from the campuses, share best practices, and advise the president and Chief Information Officer about emerging issues. It was noted that the CIO is eager to engage the committee in discussions about where technology will have the biggest impact on the core academic mission of the university and the extent to which technology resources are appropriately geared to achieving and enhancing them.
ACTION: An Assembly member moved to remove the words “quality assurance” from 155.B.3. The amendment was seconded. Then a friendly amendment was made to remove the full phrase “including quality assurance of online courses and academic technology” from 155.B.3. The amendment was seconded and passed with majority vote.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed bylaw with the noted amendment. The motion passed 41 to 4.

2. Amendment to Senate Bylaw 50.A

The conforming change to Senate Bylaw 50.A would remove from bylaw a reference to the Berkeley-San Francisco Faculty of the School of Public Health, which became obsolete in November 2005 when the Berkeley Division established a Berkeley Faculty for the School of Public Health independent of UC San Francisco.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the amendment. The chair asked for unanimous consent, and the amendment passed without objection.

3. Budget Update

Vice Chair Hare noted that the Governor’s proposed state budget for 2015-16 increases funding for all sectors of public education; however, the Proposition 98 guarantee ensures much larger increases for K-14 than for UC. Approximately $2.5 of the $3 billion increase in the education budget is for K-14, while UC would receive only a $119 million increase. This 4% increase to the state-funded portion of the UC budget is equivalent to only a 1.7% increase to the overall UC budget, and is contingent on tuition and nonresident enrollment remaining at 2014-15 levels and the Regents acting on the recommendations of the Committee of Two. In short, after years of severe budget cuts, the Governor’s budget proposal will require UC campuses to make further cuts in order to meet basic obligations.

UC sees promise in alternative budget plans proposed by the Assembly Speaker and Senate President pro tem, and hopes that negotiations leading up to the final June budget will result in a more favorable outcome. UC also has concerns about some aspects of the alternative plans. For example, although the plans would increase funding to UC, they also call for immediate and dramatic increases in resident enrollments, which may not be realistic based on the system’s current capacity. In addition, the Speaker’s plan would increase the amount of teaching required of UC faculty and implement a pension cap for new UC employees. UC also sees alternative revenue opportunities associated with Proposition 39 (energy efficient capital projects), AB 32 (cap-and-trade), and Proposition 2 (Rainy Day Budget Stabilization Act).

V. SPECIAL ORDERS
   A. Consent Calendar [None]

VI. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [None]
VII. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [None]

VIII. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [None]

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [None]

X. NEW BUSINESS [None]

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 am
Minutes Prepared by: Michael LaBriola, Academic Senate Analyst
Attest: Mary Gilly, Academic Senate Chair

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of February 11, 2015
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III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR  
  ▪ Mary Gilly

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST  
  ▪ Aimée Dorr

V. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES  
  A. Academic Council [ACTION]  
    ▪ Mary Gilly, Chair

  1. Proposed Amendment to Academic Senate Regulation 682

Following advice from the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, and a systemwide Senate review, the Academic Council recommended at its February 25, 2015 meeting that Senate Regulation 682 be amended as proposed by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) to allow individual Graduate Councils to decide the interval between the filing of advancement to candidacy for a Master’s degree and the conferral of the degree.

Current version:
Except as provided in SR 694, no graduate student will be recommended for any degree except upon completing at least one year of residence at the University of California, devoted to such a course of study as the Graduate Council concerned regards as a proper year's work, and upon complying with such other regulations as may apply. A minimum period of study of one term in the case of the Master's degree must intervene between formal advancement to candidacy and the conferring of the degree. [See SRs 610, 612, 690.] (Am 9 Mar 83)

Council-approved revision:
Except as provided in SR 694, no graduate student will be recommended for any degree except upon completing at least one year of residence at the University of California, devoted to such a course of study as the Graduate Council concerned regards as a proper year's work, and upon complying with such other regulations as may apply. A minimum period of study of one term in the case of the Master's degree must intervene between formal advancement to candidacy and the conferring of the degree. In the case of the Master’s degree, the terms and deadline for formal advancement to candidacy in anticipation of the conferring of the degree are set in the rules of the specific graduate program; exceptions are under the purview of the local Graduate Council. [See SRs 610, 612, 690.] (Am 9 Mar 83)

An inquiry from the San Diego campus asked CCGA to explain the rationale of the interval specified for the filing of advancement to candidacy for the Master’s degree. Strict adherence to the terms of the regulation requires frequent requests for exceptions at San Diego, requests that can potentially be denied (leading to the need for the student to register for an additional semester in order to receive the degree). On at least one campus, the interval is treated with some discretion and is actually less than one full term; but the regulation does not authorize such discretion.
CCGA has found no reason for the one-term interval to be enforced by the Academic Senate. It is possible that this provision is an accidental remnant of partially revised obsolete practices. At one time, it seems, most graduate students were in a class described as not candidates for degrees until they formally advanced to candidacy for a specific degree shortly before completion of the degree. Nowadays faculty (and funding agencies) consider all regular graduate students to be pursuing a specific degree in a specific program.

CCGA consulted two Graduate Deans about why advancement to candidacy for the Master’s degree mattered at all. They persuaded us that it is indeed useful to have a formal verification of compliance with requirements at some point in advance of adding a student to the degree list for a particular term. But they could suggest no reason why the minimum interval of “one term” was needed. CCGA believes that the mechanism and the timing for advancement to candidacy for the Master’s degree should be left to the discretion of the divisional Graduate Council (in consultation with their Graduate Division).

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Approve revision to SR 682.

2. **Nomination and election of the Vice Chair of the 2015-16 Assembly**

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 James A. Chalfant as 2015-2016 Vice Chair of the Assembly. Professor Chalfant was selected as the Council’s nominee at its April 1, 2015 meeting. Professor Chalfant’s qualifications and personal statement are as follows:

**JAMES A. CHALFANT, CURRICULUM VITAE**

JAMES A. CHALFANT

Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics              (530) 752-9028
University of California, Davis             jim@primal.ucdavis.edu

Education:
B.S., Economics/Agricultural Economics, Kansas State, 1978.

Experience:
Research Awards:
Outstanding Published Research, Western Agricultural Economics Association, 2000.
Outstanding Published Research, Western Agricultural Economics Association, 1992.

Systemwide Service*
- Chair of UCFW-TFIR
- UCRS Advisory Board
- UCFW (6+ years; 2 as vice-chair/chair)
- UCPB (4 years; 2 years as chair)
- UCCC (1 year as chair)
- UCOC (2 years)
- Academic Council (3 years)
- Search Committee for Vice President/UCOP-HR&B
- Member since 2006 of ad hoc working groups on Total Remuneration

Divisional Service*
- Academic Assembly
- Representative Assembly
- Executive Council
- CA&ES Undergraduate Majors and Courses
- Provost’s Task Force on the 2020 Initiative and Budget Transparency
- Member of the Finance Workgroup/President’s Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits
- President’s Task Force on Rebenching
- Academic Council Implementation Committee (chair)
- Ex officio member of ACSCOLI, HCTF, APC, Faculty Salaries Workgroups, UCOE Advisory Committee
- Academic Council Task Force on Competitiveness and Graduate Student Support
- Member and Chair of Committee on Committees, Planning and Budget, Faculty Welfare, and CA&ES Faculty Personnel Committee.
- Task Force on the Future of UC Davis

* bold denotes current service

JAMES A. CHALFANT, CHALLENGES AND PRIORITIES FOR THE UC SYSTEMWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE

The Senate’s chair and vice chair embrace the concerns and collective wisdom of the faculty, engaging on that basis with administration and Regents, the public, students, and staff. The Senate’s strength comes from our deliberative processes and from the fact that we bring our experience and expertise as scholars to every problem. By approaching every policy deliberation the way we would an academic seminar, studying UC itself with the standard of excellence we bring to our teaching and research, the Senate makes the administration and the University better.

The current scrutiny of the University, by people who do not understand us, seems nearly unprecedented. Intense interest and limited understanding generate wrongheaded policy proposals. We can’t over-react to political theater, but we must respond, especially when the administration cannot or will not: of course quality declines at UC when we do not provide competitive compensation and support; of course the state thinks that non-resident students displace residents. UC needs to do a better job documenting the harmful effects of the budget
cuts that caused these problems. It is the faculty who are best at communicating this message, because the Senate is not a faculty union; our overriding concern is the good of the entire UC system. UC’s motto to “Let There Be Light” extends to our need to expand the light of understanding concerning our role. I want to do so by engaging our critics, and I hope to spend the next two years defending UC’s excellence from politicians who think mediocre is good enough for a public university. That is my personal “prime directive” for shared governance.

We do need to compete with private universities, not operate as their farm teams, supplying them with our best faculty who leave mid-career for higher salaries and better support. Our students need realistic student-faculty ratios, not MOOCs. We must restore competitive total remuneration—and meaningful salary scales—while respecting Berkeley’s unique approach to salary-setting, and UCLA’s belief that it is essentially at market. We must invest in buildings at Merced and build graduate enrollments at our younger campuses. We need to keep our system together, while letting every campus pursue its own aspirations, but we cannot make Merced great by making Berkeley less great. The Senate recognized the wisdom in a system approach four years ago, in developing rebenching recommendations that would have allowed all campuses to gain from non-resident tuition revenues. We still need to adopt a model that allows the President to better manage total enrollments of California residents, extending the promise of a UC education—and not in name only—to a new wave of first-generation college students.

We must acknowledge and reverse the real decline in UC’s quality while increasing access and affordability, improving faculty diversity, and addressing years of deferred maintenance and insufficient construction of labs and classrooms. We must defend academic freedom and the research enterprise, enhance support for graduate education, and cope with unfunded liabilities for post-employment benefits totaling nearly $20B. But we must also recognize that the state might prefer that we redirect funding from agriculture or astronomy to financial aid or lower tuition. Such trade-offs have to be confronted, or the wrong reforms will be imposed upon us, negotiated by politicians. We won’t fix these problems quickly, but I would still rather play our role in the Senate than anyone else’s. I want to tell demoralized faculty about the Senate’s past successes, and I want to work hard, 7 days a week, with anyone interested in creating new ones.

ACTION REQUESTED: Election of the 2015-2016 Assembly Vice Chair

V. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT

VI. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

VII. SPECIAL ORDERS
   A. Consent Calendar [NONE]

VIII. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

X. NEW BUSINESS