

**ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MINUTES OF MEETING
May 10, 2006**

I. Chair's and Vice Chair's Announcements

Chair Oakley noted that the bulk of the meeting would be spent in detailed discussion of item III. In order to include the greatest number of members in that discussion, he proposed re-ordering the agenda to address items IV and VI agenda first.

II. Approval of the Agenda

Action: Council members agreed to re-order the agenda to address items IV and VI first. [Actual order of agenda items was: IV, III, VI, V.]

III. The Academic Council's Comments on Task Force on UC Compensation, Accountability and Transparency

Issue: Council will discuss the draft point-by-point response to the Task Force Report's recommendations submitted by Chair Oakley and Vice Chair Brown. UCPB's Comments on Compensation Task Force Report and Audits (May 9, 2006) will also be considered. Chair Oakley requests that Council reach consensus on a strong Senate response which, pending final modification, will be presented to the Regents at their May 17 meeting.

Discussion: Each draft response was considered in order. Aside from comments focused on points 3, 4, 8 and 21 (indicated below), members expressed general support for the draft response. In reply to a concern about repetitiveness, Chair Oakley clarified that Senate involvement in policy development and implementation should be explicit in each response, in case they are taken out of context.

Point #3

- Several members saw the proposed language as politically untenable.

Action: The language of Point #3 will be revised to read: "The Academic Council endorses this recommendation in principle, but is concerned that the associated costs may divert funds away from the University's educational mission."

Point #4

- The draft response appears to except faculty base salaries from being reported, which looks self-serving and even hypocritical. The same scrutiny should be applied to faculty as to other employees.
- The draft language should be changed to indicate that Senate will take the recommendation under consideration and wants to work out the policy details that would adequately and fairly address privacy and disclosure issues.
 - Suggested language: "The Academic Council endorses the recommendation and would like to take an active role in fashioning the implementation of the policy."

- Public posting of salaries should be limited to salaries including and on a level with those of executives. Full reporting may obfuscate the issue of executive compensation.
- This Task Force recommendation goes beyond the report's finding in calling for the disclosure all employee salaries, so the Senate response should note this and speak to the finding by focusing on disclosure of executive compensation only.
- Salary information is public, and reporting base salaries at other public universities has been non-problematic.
- The Senate response should clearly indicate that the Senate feels there is a lot at stake, and that as implementation of full disclosure of executive salary goes forward, we need to carefully deliberate the first bullet point (reporting of all employee salaries) before acting on it.
- A critical question is the impact of easily accessible salary information about colleagues. Further, the consequences of revealing salaries include the question of how salaries will be perceived from the outside.
- The UCPB letter addresses most of the points being raised.
 - Salary information is public, but a big concern is that easy access to the information would unnecessarily publicly embarrass some people. Therefore, the information should be made available in a way that is sensitive to privacy issues and keeps the focus on where the real problems lie (on executive compensation).
 - Not disclosing "total compensation" will perpetuate abuses. ('Total' = all compensation excluding the benefits available to all university employees.)

Motion: Moved and seconded to revise the language of point #4 as follows: "The Academic Council endorses this recommendation and wants to work with the administration and the Regents to ensure sensitivity to privacy concerns and proper scope."

Friendly amendment: "The Academic Council endorses this recommendation. Council stresses that reporting of executive compensation should be separate and clear. Council also believes that reporting of employee base or other compensation is appropriate but requires careful consideration. The Academic Council wants to work with the administration and the Regents to ensure sensitivity to privacy concerns and proper scope. The Academic Council would like to have an active role in forming the implementation of the policy."

Inserting the second sentence of the suggested amendment into the language of the motion was suggested to make a more concise statement.

Action: Chair Oakley and Vice Chair Brown will revise the draft response to point #4 to reflect a consensus position.

Point #8

- One member urged altering the tone of the language to be more appropriate to the respective roles of the Regents and the Academic Senate.

Action: Language in the Senate responses denoting conditions of endorsement, i.e., “The Academic Council endorses this recommendation with the understanding that the Academic Senate will have an active role in ...” will be replaced where appropriate with this or similar language: “The Academic Council endorses this recommendation. The Academic Senate anticipates that it will have an active role in ...”

Point #21

Action: The term “faculty” will be replaced with ‘academic personnel’

Summary Actions

Action The draft responses to points #1 and #2 and points #5 through #20 were approved as written, assuming the above change, where applicable, of language referring to the role of the Academic Senate in further deliberations and implementation.

Action: Chair Oakley and Vice Chair Brown will revise the draft Council response to the recommendations of the Task Force on UC Compensation, Accountability and Transparency to reflect a consensus of the Council based on today’s discussion. In order to have a final approved document by Monday May 15, the revised draft will be sent to members for review by the end of business tomorrow (May 11). Members are asked to respond by Sunday evening (May 14). Much of the substance of the UCPB letter will be used in a background document that will discursively support the Council’s point by point responses and that will go forward with the responses to the President and the Regents.

IV. DANR Review

Issue: In June 2004, the Academic council called for a broad formal review of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR) and submitted names to be considered for a blue ribbon panel. In view of a planned imminent national search for a new Vice President of DANR, UCORP is recommending that a thorough review of DANR, including the Agriculture Experiment Station (AES) and Cooperative Extension, be initiated now, in order to inform considerations of a future head of the Division.

Discussion: Chair Oakley reported on a discussion held with President Dynes, who is now anticipating receipt of Council’s recommendations on this matter, and is in general agreement that a search shall be launched after initiation of a review of DANR. One member felt that a highlight of Council’s letter should be the question of decentralizing DANR. Another member suggested that discussion of (de)centralization be approached in a way that does not privilege one campus over another. Another comment was that all the parts of the organization be looked at both separately and together, including AES and Cooperative Extension. Members agreed that the main points of the previous Council communications should be reiterated in summary.

Action: Council unanimously agreed to send a letter to President Dynes reiterating the Senate’s request for a review of DANR and summarizing the main recommendations of the 5/10/06 UCORP letter and the 6/22/04 of Past Council Chair Pitts. The letter will

also indicate concern that any plans for the de-centralization of DANR be carefully considered and avoid prioritizing one campus over another.

Action: UCORP will take the lead in updating the list of suggested members to sit on a blue ribbon panel for the review of DANR.

V. Campus Stratification

Action: Due to lack of time, this item was deferred to the May 24 Academic Council meeting.

VI. Academic Affairs Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of International Education

Issue: UCPB and UCEP would like Council to formally request that the Acting Provost increase Senate representation on this ad hoc committee by adding three new Senate members: one from each UCPB and UCEP, plus an additional Senate representative.

Discussion: The UCPB and UCEP chairs each reported they had a nomination from their respective committees, and a name was proposed for the third additional member. A Council member suggested that UCOC should approve the nominations to ensure balance. Chair Oakley clarified that he would make the appointments with the consensus of Council, and that best practice is also to receive input from UCOC.

Action: Council agreed to request the addition of three Senate members to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of International Education. UCPB and UCEP will each forward to Chair Oakley the name of a committee member. Nominations for the third person will also be forwarded. The Chair will seek Council's concurrence on the appointments, and, if possible, also get input from UCOC.

Attest: John Oakley, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst