

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Wednesday March 22, 2006

Minutes of Meeting

I. Chair's Announcements

Chair Oakley welcomed BOARS Vice Chair Mark Rashid, who was sitting in for the BOARS Chair.

Status of April 5, 2006 Joint Meeting of the Academic Council and Chancellors If Council members agree, a meeting of the Academic Council will be held on April 5 from 10am until 4pm that will break from noon until 3 pm for the joint meeting with the Chancellors. Chair Oakley suggested that topics for discussion with the Chancellors should focus on two issues of greatest concern, rather than on all four of the proposed topics. The two topics would be salary slotting (which would come under the general category of the 'UC Budget'), and the planned reorganization of the Office of the President (which would be in place of the 'academic planning' topic). There was a mixed response to this suggestion. One member saw the academic planning topic more relevant and timely a discussion to hold with the Chancellors. It was pointed out that the diversity issues were discussed with the EVCs last year, so that may not be as critical a topic to address again this year. Another member noted that the 3 hour time allotment for the meeting should be used strategically to bring attention to an issue the really needs discussion. Additionally, the budget-related topics of privatization and graduate education were suggested as more appropriate than slotting for a discussion with the Chancellors.

Regents Update. The Regents continued the process of slotting senior management positions, although it is seen as an interim process that will include consultation with the Senate. Committees are urged to pursue the issues surrounding slotting to engage in continued dialogue with the Regents on this matter.

Memorial to the Regents on Non-Resident Tuition. It is planned to have the memorial ballot materials prepared and sent out by Friday for the faculty vote.

Action: Council agreed to convene on April 5, 2006 from 10:00 a.m. to 4 p.m. The Joint Meeting of the Academic Council and the Chancellors will be held as planned from noon until 3 p.m. on that date; with the remaining time to be used to conduct Council business.

Action: The four basic topics for the joint meeting with the Chancellors, proposed in the January 12, 2006 letter to President Dynes, will be slated for the meeting. Council members assigned as facilitators for each topic are asked to forward the following to Executive Director Bertero-Barcelo by Tuesday March 28: 1) the specific discussion topic as it will appear on the agenda; 2) any supporting materials they wish to be included in the agenda.

II. Approval of the Agenda

Action: The agenda was approved.

III. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes of the November 30, 2005 meeting were approved as revised.

Action: The minutes of the February 22, 2006 meeting were taken off of the consent calendar for revision. They will be put on the April 5, 2006 meeting agenda for approval.

IV. Follow up on March 13, 2006 Assembly Meeting - Executive Session

V. Formal Review of APM 220-18.b (4): Criteria for Advancement to Professor VI and to Professor Above-Scale Salary Levels

Issue: General review of the proposed revisions by Systemwide Committees and the Divisions, which included the review by some Divisions of UCAP's new proposed version of APM 220-18.b (4), shows a lack of consensus in several areas, in particular in regard to the question of how to denote the teaching criterion.

Discussion: Members reported on the positions of their respective constituencies the proposed revised language and the issue of whether great distinction in teaching either: 1) should be a possible sole criterion for advancement to Step VI; or 2) could be achieved at the national/international level. The UCAP Chair reported support from among the campus CAPs for UCAP's new modifications. Because of the general lack of consensus on these main points and on UCAP's revision, members agreed to refer the matter back to UCAP and request that committee to make recommendations to the Council, taking as its starting point the current APM language, but also taking into account last year's Council position and all subsequent comments that grew from this year's formal review of the proposed changes.

Action: In view of the lack of consensus on this issue, the Academic Council will not forward a position on the proposed revision of APM 220-18.b (4) at this time. UCAP will review all comments submitted by Senate bodies in the informal and formal review of this APM that were conducted in 2004-05 and 2005-06, and make recommendations to the Academic Council on the need for any change to the current language of APM 220-18.b (4).

Action: Chair Oakley will send a letter to Associate Vice President Switkes, notifying her of the Council's decision to discontinue the current review of APM 220-18.b (4), pending the outcome of UCAP's deliberations.

VI. Funding for On-Campus Childcare Centers, Policies Related to Work and Family

Anthony Norman, UCAP Chair, Rusty Russell UCFW Chair

Issue: UCAP has submitted a letter for Council's endorsement that calls attention to the need for and benefits of on campus childcare centers, and advises that increasing resources associated with child care be seen as a top priority.

Discussion: Members expressed support for the main intent of the letter, suggesting two changes: 1) that the language be altered to refer not just to women, but all faculty who have or are interested having children; and 2) that the second paragraph of the UCFW letter, which notes policies that address the parenting needs of faculty, be quoted in the transmittal letter to President Dynes.

Action: The Academic Council voted unanimously to endorse UCAP's letter on funding for On-campus Child Care and forward it to President Dynes. A transmittal letter will be drafted that points out the benefits of child care for all UC faculty who have or plan to have children, and that quotes from the 3/10/06 UCFW letter

Issue: UCFW has submitted a letter for Council's endorsement that also calls attention to the family/parenting needs of faculty, including childcare, adoption benefits, and tuition waivers for dependents.

Discussion: While members agreed with UCFW's recommendations, it was felt that childcare should not necessarily be characterized as the most pressing need of faculty, but should be placed in a context of other high priorities.

Action: The Academic Council voted to endorse UCFW's letter of March 10, 2006 (addressed to Executive Director Randy Scott) to be sent to President Dynes. A transmittal letter will be drafted that places the importance of child care in a frame of other high priorities affecting recruitment and retention of faculty, such as salaries and housing.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President – Senior Managers

- **Rory Hume, Acting Provost and Senior Vice President, Academic and Health Affairs**
- **Bruce Darling, Senior Vice President, University Affairs**
- **Lawrence C. Hershman, Vice President for Budget**

Remarks from President Dynes

Regents Issues:

- The Regents continue their consideration of senior leadership compensation practices and are proceeding with the interim salary slotting of positions. Under consideration is a re-organization of the Office of President, which may entail hiring a chief operating officer, a chief financial officer and an outside compliance officer. These issues and others relating to new limits on compensation will be on the May Regents agenda.
- The UCRP funding level target will be set at 100%, and contributions will be phased in gradually to reach combined employer-employee contribution of 16% of covered earnings.
- The Regents have acted to divest UC holdings in companies doing business with Sudan.

Budget issues:

- The State budget cycle: In testimony before the senate subcommittee on education, President Dynes emphasized UC's successes in meeting the terms of the Compact. The Federal budget may flatten in terms of the amount of funds available for competitive grants, but there will be other funding opportunities.

Other:

- Last weekend, senior leaders met at UCI for the UC Senior Leadership Forum, to discuss strong ongoing stewardship of UC, which will include succession planning, building more diverse leadership, and focusing on how to nurture and leverage leadership talent.
- UC Merced Chancellor Tomlinson-Keasey announced she will be stepping down from her post in August, but will remain on the UCM faculty.

Acting Provost Hume

- *Long Range Guidance Team.* The LRGT is looking at plans and projections through 2025, has had six meetings and will soon begin drafting a report based on information gathered and input from various areas, including the UCPB "Futures" report, a draft of which has been reviewed by the LRGT. The LRGT report should be ready for comment by July.
- *Systemwide Academic Planning:* President Dynes has sent a letter to the Chancellors focusing on what actions will be taken to encourage existing campus planning, and the need to gain a greater understanding of collective needs. Campus visits are planned for

early to mid-fall, then collective discussions will be held with EVCs, the Senate, and the Chancellors, and then with the Regents. In year two, more targeted questions will be addressed, such as undergraduate and graduate enrollment and campus profiles.

- *SMI*. The effort to embed the program at the campus level is proving a challenging transition. Campus leaders need to be identified, but at the same time campuses see a need for more systemwide coordination. OP is willing to work with the Council and SMIG to identify and carry out what needs to be done centrally. Additional funding resources are being sought.
- Re-organization of OP. The structure of OP should best serve the campus needs. In view of the Regents' consideration of re-organization options, OP will be widely consulting with the Council of Chancellors, EVCs, Vice Chancellors of Administration, and with the Senate.

Action: President Dynes' letter to the Chancellors will be forwarded as information to the Academic Council.

Senior Vice President Darling

- More than 400 UC alumni and others recently made a compelling case in support of UC academic programs to legislators in Sacramento
- A number of federal bills have been introduced responding to the needs identifies in the National Academies' "Gathering Storm" report. The bills would mean \$1B in new money, granted mostly through DOE and NSF, and \$1M for NIH. A student aid bill was pulled and Pell Grant funding is frozen for the 5th straight year. Cuts to Medical and Medicaid may have a significant effect on hospital support.
- A conference call was held to discuss compensation issues with Regent Hopkinson, in which the chairs of the Academic Council, UCPB and UCFW participated. Regent Hopkinson plans to attend Senate committee meetings, if scheduling allows, in order to further discuss this issue.

Vice President Hershman

Budget hearings have commenced. According to the Legislative Analyst, the revenue situation has improved, but there is still a \$4 to \$5B structural problem. The LAO report recommends \$8500 per student marginal cost, which is arrived at using a different methodology than that used in the Governor's budget, student fee increases of 3.5%, and a total of \$7M is cuts to the UC budget. The report also criticizes UC on research space, recommending that it be entirely funded through federal overhead. UC will oppose the LAO's recommendations. Academic preparation funding will likely be an issue negotiated later in the budget process. In general the Legislature seems supportive of the needs of students, staff and faculty, but there are questions about administrative compensation. More information will be coming out on compensations practices soon resulting from the audits and studies that are nearing completion.

Q and A

Q: What will be the Senate's opportunity to comment on the Regents' plan to re-organize OP?

A: The Regents are acting to maintain a strong system of checks and balances within UC operations. A discussion among the Regents, the chancellors and the Senate may be possible. It may be most effective for the Senate to have as much informal dialogue with the Regents as opportunity allows, rather than drafting a formal position.

Q: In regard to the SMI, there are university-wide functions that need to move forward. How can this be done effectively and swiftly?

A: For best communication with OP and among campuses, there should be a single point person from each campus. From among these, lead people can be identified to work with OP on key issues, e.g., credentialing or the summer institutes.

Comment: The Regents should be urged no to put SMG salary slotting on their agenda for the next few months, pending a full consultation with the Senate and the outcome of the current audits and studies, and the development of a consensus.

VIII. General Discussion (*Follow-up discussion on issues raised during the consultation with the President and Senior Management.*)

Re-organization of the Office of the President: One member suggested that Council draft a letter to the President and the Regents urging great caution in making changes in OP organization before seeing and weighing the outcome of the reviews and audits that are currently being conducted. Others agreed that the Senate must weigh in on this issue, either in direct discussions with the Regents or through formal statements.

Action: Council members agreed that Chair Oakley shall invite Regents Parsky and Hopkinson to either the April 5 or the April 19 Council meeting for a discussion of the organization of the Office of the President. If neither Regent is available to meet with the Council in April, a letter will be sent to President Dynes, for presentation to the Regents that briefly and forcefully states the Council's views on the planned re-organization of the Office of the President.

IX. Update: Academic Council Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL),

John Oakley, ACSCONL Chair

Chair Oakley updated Council on three matters:

1. Membership on ACSCONL is by appointment; therefore Council is asked to officially appoint Academic Vice Chair pro tem Michael Brown to the special committee to replace former Council Chair Brunk.
2. UC is planning to file an "Expression of Interest" with the DHS in a proposed National Bio-Agro Containment Facility. UC will propose a suitable site near Tracy, CA for the facility, which will be associated with LLNL.
3. The transition to new management of LANL is nearing completion. LANS may choose to replicate the current structure of oversight panels on science as subgroups of the governing board, and ACSCONL is working with the LANS board on this and other issues related to DOE-UC personnel relations.

Action: By unanimous vote, the Academic Council removed Clifford Brunk from membership on ACSCONL, and added Academic Council Vice Chair pro tem Michael Brown as a member on ACSCONL.

X. University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity

1. UCAAD Recommendations for Local Diversity Committee Empowerment

Issue: The Senate has completed its general review of UCAAD's recommendations.

Discussion: Division chairs expressed general support for the recommendations and reported on the degree to which UCAAD's recommended actions are appropriate or are already in place on

the campuses. There was general agreement that putting the recommendations into practice is up to the divisions, and that the role of the Council is now to formally refer them to the divisions for implementation and monitoring.

Action: Council voted unanimously to refer UCAAD's *Recommendations for Local Diversity Committee Empowerment* to the Divisions for implementation as they deem appropriate and feasible.

2. UCAAD Proposed Systemwide Academic Senate Statement on Diversity

Issue: UCAAD has revised its proposed statement on diversity based on comments received from Senate committees and divisions. Once the Council approves, the statement will go to the Assembly for consideration and action.

Discussion: Members made suggestions for revising the statement, as reflected in the series of motions and actions below. Although most members agreed to the suggested language changes, the view was expressed that altering the work of UCAAD at this point may be disrespectful, especially after the committee had in its revision already considered the Senate's comments.

Motion: Moved and seconded to endorse the proposed statement and send it to the Assembly for adoption.

Action: Moved, seconded, and passed with one opposing vote, to substitute the first two paragraphs of UCAAD's proposed statement with the first paragraph of the UC Davis Proposed UC Academic Diversity

Action: Moved, seconded and passed with one abstention to delete the words "excluded or currently" from the last paragraph of the proposed statement as revised above.

Action: A motion was made, seconded, and passed with one opposing vote and 2 abstentions to reverse the order of the sentences of the last paragraph, deleting the word "particularly" from what becomes the first sentence and the word "therefore" from the beginning of what becomes the last sentence.

Action: Council voted unanimously to:

- 1) Approve the proposed UC Statement on Academic Diversity with these revisions:
 - Substitute the first two paragraphs of UCAAD's proposed statement with the first paragraph of the UC Davis Proposed UC Academic Diversity
 - Delete the words "excluded or currently" from the last paragraph
 - Reverse the order of the sentences of the last paragraph, deleting the word "particularly" from what becomes the first sentence and the word "therefore" from the beginning of what becomes the last sentence.
- 2) Instruct Chair Oakley to communicate these actions to UCAAD Chair Weiss, letting him know that, with his concurrence, the revised version will be put before the Assembly for adoption. If there are objections, UCAAD will be asked to report to Council on the nature of the objections.

Action: UCAAD Chair Daniel Weiss will be invited to the April 19, 2006 Council meeting to discuss the role of UCAAD on systemwide committees.

XI. Academic Council Subcommittee on the Systemwide Academic Senate Leadership and Office Structure

Issue: At its February 22 meeting, the Council approved the establishment of an ad-hoc committee that will bring to Council by the end of the present academic year recommendations about procedures and structures that can be put in place to provide oversight and support of the Senate office and to regulate relations among the Chair of Assembly, the Vice Chair of Assembly, the Executive Director of the Senate, and the senior management of the Office of the President. Then-Vice Chair Oakley was given the task of constituting the committee by the time of the next Council meeting.

Chair Oakley announced the membership of the Academic Council Subcommittee on Senate Governance Structure and Reform, which includes members of the previous subcommittee on Senate Governance and is diverse in terms of committee and divisional input, gender, and north-south representation. He then read this proposed charge:

“Review the roles and responsibilities of the Chair, Vice Chair and Executive Director as described in the bylaws, and determine if: 1) they adequately define the duties and responsibilities of the Chair, Vice Chair and Executive Director; and 2) provide clear reporting mechanisms or procedures to ensure continuity in the work of the Academic Senate, and to address and remedy conflicts or lapses if they arise in the performance of their duties by the Chair, Vice Chair and Executive Director. Propose new bylaws as may be needed.”

Discussion: When asked to comment, Academic Council staff concurred with the substance of the proposed charge in terms of addressing the issues of Senate leadership accountability and the need for continuity and oversight, but: 1) stressed the need to identify an effective avenue of recourse for Senate staff when faced with a serious transgression on the part of a member of the faculty; and 2) questioned whether the membership of the committee should not be broadened. A Council member suggested including a staff person on the group. Chair Oakley responded that outside members would need to be approved by UCOC and that staff input may be sought, but may not be necessary to this charge, which is to focus on strengthening the bylaws and establishing a desired oversight structure. In response to a separate question, he noted that the proposed bylaw making the executive director an officer of the Senate would be considered. Another member saw the need to include reporting lines of staff and director in the charge, and another commented that while the charge does not explicitly include these other issues, it invites and allows for attention to be paid to them. Chair Oakley anticipates the subgroup’s recommendations will be completed by the end of this year and then go before next year’s Assembly for endorsement. He mentioned the charge was to some extent flexible and may be amended or refined with Council’s guidance. He also invited other members to let him know if they had interest in serving on the group.

Action: Council unanimously approved the membership and proposed charge of the Special Subcommittee on Senate Governance and Structural Reform, as proposed by Chair Oakley. Members are: Michael Brown (Subcommittee Chair), John Oakley, Adrienne Lavine (LA), Dan Simmons (D), Ken Janda (I), Deborah Greenspan (SF).

XII. Senate Review of SCSC’s White Papers and Proposal – Responding to the Challenges

Facing Scholarly Communications

Issue: Council discussion of systemwide committee responses to SCSC's white papers and proposal. Divisional responses are due April 5.

Action: This item was deferred until the divisional responses have been received.

XIII. UCEP Report and Proposal on the Role of Graduate Student Instructors in Undergraduate Education , Denise Segura, UCEP Chair

Issue: UCEP and CCGA were asked to consider whether policies, practices, and quality control mechanisms for graduate students teaching with independent course responsibility were appropriate, or whether changes were needed. UCEP has submitted a report and proposal on the role of graduate students in undergraduate instruction at UC.

UCEP Chair Segura reported that the information gathered by UCEP indicates differing campus approaches to the role of GSIs, and the need for more monitoring of GSI responsibilities, especially for lower division courses. UCEP is recommending an amendment to Senate Regulation 740 to address these issues, and would prefer to wait for the outcome of CCGA's inquiry to create a coordinated review and formulate ultimate recommended actions. CCGA is proposing a related change to the APM.

Action: CCGA and UCEP will draft a coordinated single response for submission to the Council

XIV. Approval of the April 12, 2006 Academic Assembly Teleconference Agenda

Action: Council approved the following items for inclusion on the April 12, 2006 Assembly agenda:

1. UCAAD Proposed Systemwide Academic Senate Statement on Diversity
2. Election of Michael T. Brown as Vice Chair of the Academic Assembly for the term ending September 1, 2006
3. Updates from BOARS, UCFW, and UCPB

XV. Report: University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), Rusty Russell, UCFW Chair

UCFW has drafted a letter for the Council's endorsement that makes additional recommendations on senior leadership salaries, and asks that it be considered at the next Council meeting.

UCFW has been discussing how best to bring faculty expertise more directly to bear on administrative deliberations of policy. It is important to make this resource available and effective, but not circumvent the Senate review process at the same time.

Action: The UCFW letter of 3/21/06 proposing additional recommendations on senior management pay will be placed on the Council's April 5, 2006 agenda.

XVI. Update: Science Mathematics Initiative Group (SMIG)

The respective roles and responsibilities of systemwide versus campus management of the SMI need to be clarified. SMIG will be making recommendations on issues that call for systemwide coordination. SMIG is also concerned that timely preparations be made in order to secure

funding for the summer institute program. A new SMIG chair needs to be appointed, but the current chair will serve through the group's April meeting.

XVII. Update: University Committee on Planning and Budget

Issue: UCPB requests Council's endorsement of a letter to be forwarded to Acting Provost Hume and GSAC Chair Attiyeh, calling on GSAC to "reactivate its deliberations with the goal of reaching a consensus on relief of graduate student fees in time for recommendations to take effect in the 06-07 year academic year.

Action: The Academic Council will send a letter to Provost Hume, with a request that it be forwarded to GSAC Chair Attiyeh, and incorporating the request of UCPB that GSAC reactivate its deliberations with the goal of reaching a consensus on relief of graduate student fees in time for recommendations to take effect in the 06-07 year academic year.

XVIII. Update: Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools

Action: This item was deferred to the April 19 Council meeting.

XIX New Business

None.

Attest: John Oakley, Chair
Academic Council

Minutes prepared by:
Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst

Distributions:

1. 3/15/06 ltr. Minster/Oakley re: Review of APM 220-18-b(40
2. 3/9/06 ltr. Gardner/Brunk re: Review of APM 220-18-b(4)
3. 3/3/06 ltr. Agogino/Brunk re: Review of APM 220-18-b(4)
4. UC Childcare Centers (2 tables: total capacity by age group; percent distribution by client group).
5. 3/21/06 ltr. UCFW/Oakley re: Additional Recommendations on Senior Management Pay.