

ACADEMIC COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 2006-07

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE: The Academic Council is the administrative arm of the Assembly of the Academic Senate and acts in lieu of the Assembly on non-legislative matters. It 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 considered more than sixty initiatives, proposals, and reports during the 2006-07 year, making recommendations on a range of issues and University policies that included UC faculty and senior management compensation, the University budget, academic programs, systemwide research units, and amendments to the Manual of the Academic Senate and to the Academic Personnel Manual. The final recommendations and reports issued by the Academic Council in 2006-07 can be found on the [Academic Senate website](#). Matters of particular import for the year are noted below.

UC FACULTY AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT COMPENSATION

Deliberations continued from last year on proposed changes in the compensation structures for both UC senior management and UC faculty. The Academic Council formulated these related recommendations as initiatives or in response to administrative proposals:

[Total Remuneration and the 2007-2008 Budget: An Academic Council Analysis and Recommendation](#). In November 2006, the Council forwarded this analysis of faculty compensation to President Dynes, urging the President and The Regents to seek sufficient funding for faculty salaries in order to match increases at competitor institutions and to offset the anticipated resumption of employee contributions to the UC Retirement Plan.

[Resolution of the Academic Senate Calling for the Rejection of the Senior Leadership Compensation Group \(SLCG\) Salary Structure that Differentiates Grades by Campus](#). This resolution calls on the Office of the President and The Regents to reject differentiation of the campuses caused by tiered senior leadership compensation, and to avoid adopting any policies that will lead to the stratification of UC campuses. The resolution in particular opposes the interim job slotting and salary scales that were adopted by The Regents and resulted in creating different salary scales for the same jobs on the various campuses. The resolution was adopted by the Assembly in May 2007.

Council reviewed a report authored by the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) entitled [Synopsis of the Present Status of the UC Merit and Promotion System and Principles of and Policy Recommendations for UC Faculty Compensation](#). UCAP's report was forwarded, along with committee and divisional responses received during the systemwide Senate review process, to the President's Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales to inform their deliberations and final recommendations, reported on below.

[The President's Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales](#). This joint administrative/Senate group, which includes four members of the Council, formulated a preliminary plan for raising faculty salaries and reforming the faculty salary scales. As an initial step of that plan, the

group proposed changes to [APM 620 – Policy on Off-Scale Salaries](#) – that would remove language making off-scale salaries exceptional and would re-define the salary scale as a series of ranges rather than points. After conducting a systemwide review of the proposal, the Council forwarded all [comments](#) on the proposed changes to the Work Group, requesting that revised language amending APM 620 be drafted that would retain off-scale decisions as exceptions within the context of the new scale, and requesting as well that a full proposal for the planned salary increases and scale reform be developed.

UCOP Proposed Principles for Policy Setting and Compensation Governance. The Council recommended changes to the proposed principles to adequately recognize the role of the Academic Senate in policy setting and compensation governance applying to senior management.

UC OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT ORGANIZATION

FTE Growth. The Academic Council requested that the Joint Work Group on Trends in Administrative FTE and Expenditure, which was established last year but remained dormant, be revived to pursue its charge of conducting an in-depth study of data to explain FTE trends and disparities. The Council believes this task is important in light of the fact that the Office of the President has entered a protracted period of reorganization, involving the creation of a number of new, elevated, or redefined senior management positions.

Assignment of the Budget Function at the Office of the President. In reaction to organizational changes at UCOP that included a planned reassignment of the budgetary functions, the Academic Council stated in a memo to President Dynes its belief that the primary budget function for the University should flow from the academic planning process, and urged that the University's senior budget officer be located within the Office of Academic Affairs.

Proposed New Vice President Positions. The Council approved the creation of the proposed Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies position, with the understanding that the Senate leadership would continue to work with the Provost in refining the job description and advising on the administrative structure of UCOP during the restructuring efforts. The Council did not endorse a proposed job description for a new position of Vice President for International Affairs, and recommended that prior to filling such a position, a plan be developed that would coordinate the many aspects of existing and future international programs and offer a concrete approach to solving the present financial and planning needs of the UC Education Abroad Program.

BUDGETARY ISSUES

Safeguarding the University's Future: A Resolution of the Academic Council on Returning UC to a Sound Fiscal Basis. This resolution of the Council expressed concurrence with The Regents' declared budget priorities of restoring adequate funding for graduate and undergraduate education, for competitive salaries, and for core academic support. The resolution requests that specific steps be taken for restoring UC's financial base and establishing a shared basis of understanding among The Regents, the administration, and the Senate for attaining immediate and long-term budget goals.

The 'Futures' Report. This report, authored by the University Committee on Planning and Budget and entitled [Current Budget Trends and the Future of the University of California](#), was endorsed by the Council in December 2006. A summary of its key findings and conclusions was presented orally at the May 2007 meeting of The Regents. The report evaluates the long-term implications of the Higher Education Compact with the Governor, and those of three other budgetary scenarios that are based on varying degrees of state and private support.

Academic Council Policy on Receiving Estimates of Fiscal Impact. The Academic Council adopted this statement as an internal policy: "Whenever practicable, all policies or proposals submitted to the Academic Council should be accompanied by an estimation of fiscal impact." The Council is initiating this practice as a one-year pilot program to be conducted in coordination with the Office of the President.

RESEARCH ISSUES

Review of Multi-campus Research Units (MRUs). The Academic Council commented on the [Recommendations of the Joint Academic Senate/UC Office of Research Multicampus Research Unit \(MRU\) Workgroup](#), expressing broad support for the workgroup's overarching recommendation to "introduce greater flexibility into the provision of multi-campus research funding to allow new opportunities to emerge on a competitive basis." Senate representatives have been appointed to an Advisory Board that will be developing new guidelines for the review and funding of MRUs, which will reflect the Council's long-held view that UCOP funds should be re-cycled to support new research initiatives.

The Regents' Consideration of a Ban on the Acceptance of Tobacco Industry Funding.

In September 2006, the UC Board of Regents requested input from the Academic Senate as to whether a recent federal district court ruling that found the tobacco industry to have engaged in racketeering would warrant instituting a University-wide ban on accepting funding from the tobacco industry (or agencies acting on behalf of the tobacco industry). The Academic Council drafted a position that emphasized the primacy of safeguarding academic freedom and also stated in part that the Academic Council believes that "Regental intervention on the basis of assumptions about the moral or political standing of the donor is unwarranted." That statement and two additional statements were endorsed by the Assembly and transmitted to the Regents in November as [The Academic Senate's Resolutions on the Research-Funding Issue](#). Another request from The Regents came in January 2007, asking the Senate for a response to a specific proposal before the board – RE-89 – that would institute a University-wide ban on the acceptance of research funding from the tobacco industry. The Academic Council sent RE-89 out for systemwide Senate review. The great majority of responses from divisions and standing committees opposed adopting the proposal; therefore, the Council resolved to recommend that the Assembly oppose RE-89, which it did at its [May 9, 2007 meeting](#). During this same period, Regent Moores submitted to the Senate Chair a set of questions concerning the faculty's opinion on RE-89. An Academic Council work group drafted a [response](#) to Regent Moores' questions. The group's response was also circulated to all agencies of the systemwide Academic Senate to assist in their review of RE-89.

[Institutional Review Boards \(IRBs\) at UC](#). The Council endorsed a report drafted by the University Committee on Research Policy that makes recommendations for improved IRB operations, and forwarded it to the Provost for consideration and implementation. The report suggests a number of measures to improve facilitation of interactions between IRBs and researchers, to refine the review process, and generally to increase awareness of the nature and function of IRBs.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

The Council declined to endorse UCOP's [Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees](#). Senate reviewers noted several concerns with the proposed principles, including the ramifications of greater dependency on private resources, and stratification effects of allowing fees to vary significantly from campus to campus.

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), and the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), authored a report entitled *The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction*. Council considered the report in July 2007 and approved it to be distributed for systemwide Senate review in the fall.

REVIEW OF SENATE PROPOSALS

Affirmative Action and Diversity

Council [appointed](#) the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) to assist the President in monitoring implementation efforts related to recommendations of the President's Task Force on Faculty Diversity. UCAAD took on the task of working with campus leaders in developing a report card, which will detail actions taken at each campus throughout the academic year.

UCAAD also became a standing committee of the Academic Council via passage of [Senate Bylaw 125](#) by the Assembly in May, upon recommendation of the Council in February 2007.

Admissions

Council approved the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools' (BOARS) recommendation to modify the mathematics requirement from three to two years for determination of Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) status for students in their junior year of high school. BOARS' *Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy* was approved by Council in July to be distributed for systemwide Senate review in fall 2007. Council approved a slate of Senate nominees to participate in the joint Senate/Administrative task force on the mathematics and laboratory subject requirements for UC eligibility, a group that was first approved by the 2005-06 Council. Council also approved a [resolution](#) presented by BOARS expressing support for the continuation of UCOP funding of the Transcript Evaluation Service.

Faculty Welfare

Council received regular updates from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) on its work this year in critiquing the Mercer Report on Total Remuneration, so as to ensure its accurate representation of faculty salary and University employee benefit data in relation to UC's competition eight universities. Council reviewed and approved the UCFW-initiated

report, [Academic Council Statement on the University of California Retirement Plan \(UCRP\)](#), providing information to the UC community about the management and investment performance of UCRP. Council also approved recommendations provided by UCFW regarding UCOP's plans to [establish a trust](#) to comply with new Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) reporting requirements relating to annuitant health benefit obligations; [recommendations](#) on modifications to the Mortgage Origination Program; endorsement of the UCRP benefit proposal for UC ladder rank faculty on leave without pay at the Howard Hughes Medical Institute and the Ludwig Institute for Cancer Research; and endorsement of a nominee to serve a four-year term on the UCRS Advisory Board.

Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy

Council received for distribution a report from the University Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy (ITTP) entitled [Ten Grand Challenges](#), a list of long-term information technology goals for UC.

Review of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM)

Council reviewed and approved changes to [APM 220-18.b\(4\) – Professor Step VI and Above Scale](#), concluding a two-year process by which the University Committee on Academic Personnel and the Council sought to amend this APM language. Council's recommendations were forwarded to the Provost for further action.

Review of the Academic Senate Manual

The Academic Council Subcommittee on Systemwide Senate Leadership and Office Structure was charged in 2005-06 to, among other activities, write and recommend appropriate bylaw provisions to address all of the concerns voiced during the period leading up to the removal of the 2005-06 Academic Council Chair. The task force subsequently developed [Senate Bylaw 110.A.4](#) – Officers of the Assembly-Suspension and Removal, and [Senate Bylaw 16](#) – Executive Director. Council approved and recommended both bylaws, which were adopted by the Assembly in February and May 2007, respectively.

- [Senate Bylaw 185](#): Amends the name of the former University Committee on Library, to the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication, as well as a new charge and membership for the committee. Approved by the Assembly, May 2007.
- [Senate Regulation 636](#): The University Committee on Preparatory Education has proposed amendments to the Senate regulation pertaining to the UC Entry Level Writing Requirement. Approved by the Council to be distributed for Senate review, May 2007.
- [Senate Bylaw 181](#): Proposes a new charge and new name for the University Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy, to the University Committee on Computing and Communications. Endorsed by the Council and forwarded to the Assembly, June 2007.
- [Senate Regulation 458](#): The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools has proposed the repeal of the Senate regulation pertaining to course requirements for certain international students attending UC. Approved by Council to be distributed for Senate review, June 2007.

REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROPOSALS

- [Draft Proposal on Guidelines Regarding Vendor Relations](#). Council's review culminated in a request for a revised proposal that considers the comments submitted from Senate committees and divisions.
- [Policy for Addressing Religious Holiday Conflicts with Residence Hall "Move-In" Days](#). Council supported UCOP's plan to establish a joint administrative/Senate committee that will undertake to develop and complete the policy guidelines by June 1, 2008.
- [Proposed Draft UC Open Access Policy](#). Council reviewers expressed significant concerns with the draft policy, and requested a revised policy be prepared for Council's consideration.
- [Proposed Presidential Policy and Guidelines on Stewardship of Electronic Information Resources](#). Council expressed qualified approval of the proposed policy.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Academic Council Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL)

Council received regular updates on the activities of the Academic Council Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL). ACSCONL's [Statement on the Interaction Between UC's Faculty and UC-Associated National Laboratories](#), endorsed by Council last academic year, was unanimously endorsed by the Assembly in October 2007 and forwarded to the President. In July 2007, Council approved a statement to President Dynes outlining [priorities for the 2007-08 allocation of net fee income](#) received by UC from LANS LLC incident to the contract between the federal Department of Energy and LANS LLC for the management and operation of the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Council also approved the transition of ACSCONL to the [Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues \(ACSCOLI\)](#) in May 2007, in accordance with the October 2006 ACSCONL statement referenced above. ACSCOLI's primary charge is to provide Senate oversight of UC's relationship with Los Alamos National Laboratory and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. In June 2007, Council approved a slate of faculty members to be appointed as Senate members of ACSCOLI.

At the request of the Council, the Chair of the Council worked with the Office of General Counsel to prepare [An Introductory Guide to UC's Ties to LANS LLC and LLNS LLC and their Management of the Weapons Labs at Los Alamos and Livermore](#), which was posted on the Academic Senate's website on August 31, 2007.

Task Force on Faculty Compensation Determinations & Comparisons

Council approved the formation of a special task force to develop a methodology for accurately measuring the value of UC compensation and comparing it to compensation offered by UC's competitors. The task force was initiated upon the recommendation of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW). Council endorsed a charge and membership list in July 2007, and a progress report is expected in the fall.

RELATIONS WITH OTHER GOVERNING BODIES

Joint Administrative/Senate Retreat

Council has established the practice of meeting in alternate years with the chancellors and with the executive vice chancellors to discuss matters of joint concern. This year, Council members met with the executive vice chancellors to discuss: (1) issues of budget priorities and process, including graduate student support, non-resident tuition remission for academic graduate students, campus childcare centers, and campus support for divisional Senate offices; and (2) issues of systemwide uniformity or disparity: including job slotting, stratification, and local variations in faculty salaries, and systemwide training requirements imposed on faculty (e.g., ethics, sexual harassment trainings, etc.).

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS)

This year, the Council Vice Chair served as Chair of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), a position that rotates among California's three segments of higher education each year. Council reviewed and expressed an "unable to support" position on the ICAS-proposed [Resolution on the Proper Use of the California High School Exit Exam \(CAHSEE\)](#).

The Regents

The Academic Council Chair and the Academic Council 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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

We express our sincere gratitude to all members of the University of California Office of the President for their hard work and productive collaboration with the Senate over the past year. In particular, we thank these senior UC managers whose roles as consultants to the Academic Council were a vital and engaging part of our meetings: Robert C. Dynes; President; Wyatt R. Hume, Provost and Executive Vice President-Academic and Health Affairs; Katherine Lapp, Executive Vice President-Business Operations; Bruce Darling, Executive Vice President-University Affairs; and Lawrence Hershman, Vice President for Budget.

Respectfully submitted:

John Oakley, Chair
Michael Brown, Vice Chair

Divisional Chairs:

William Drummond, Berkeley
Linda Bisson, Davis
Martha Mecartney, Irvine
Vivek Shetty, Los Angeles
Shawn Kantor, Merced
Thomas Cogswell, Riverside
Henry Powell, San Diego
Deborah Greenspan, San Francisco
Joel Michaelsen, Santa Barbara
Faye Crosby, Santa Cruz

Senate Committee Chairs:

Mark Rashid, BOARS
Reen Wu, CCGA
Gibor Basri, UCAAD
Mary Croughan, UCAP
Richard Weiss, UCEP
Susan French, UCFW
Wendy Max, UCORP
Christopher Newfield, UCPB

Council Staff:

María Bertero-Barceló, Executive Director
Brenda Foust, Senior Policy Analyst
Michelle Ruskofsky, Senior Policy Analyst