UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
                        ACADEMIC COUNCIL

                          Minutes of Meeting
                            April 30, 2014

I.   Consent Calendar

1. April 30, 2014 Academic Council Agenda
2. April 2, 2014 Academic Council Minutes

Action: Council approved the April 30 Council agenda and the April 2 Council minutes.

II.   Senate Officer's Announcements
   o   Bill Jacob, Chair, Academic Council
   o   Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate

Academic Planning Council: The APC has approved new revisions to the policy on Self-
Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs), based on comments and
concerns generated in the initial systemwide review. The revisions will be released for a 60-day
Senate review, in time for a Council response in July. The APC is also discussing enrollment
management principles, a presidential Open Access policy, and an analysis of instructional costs
required by the state.

ICAS Meeting: The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) held its annual
Legislative Day meeting in Sacramento on April 29. The meeting featured a series of visits with
legislators, legislative aides, and staff members from the Department of Finance (DOF) and the
Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO). ICAS discussed an education facilities bond measure
intended for the November 2014 ballot, efforts to redesign remedial English and math curriculum
at the community colleges to increase student completion rates, higher education performance
outcome measures, and several bills intended to encourage students to take more computer
science courses in high school and to increase the recognition of those courses in college
admission, one of which asks UC to create guidelines for high school computer science courses
that can satisfy the area "c" requirement for UC and CSU admission.

III.   Blue Ribbon Panel Report
   o   Tim Labor, Chair, UCEP

Issue: The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) has responded to the report of
the Blue Ribbon Panel (BRP), a special Senate Committee that was charged with evaluating the
commissioned assessment of the Online Instruction Pilot Project (OIPP) by the UC Educational
Evaluation Center (UCEC) at UC Santa Barbara.

UCEP has endorsed the BRP's main findings, and its conclusion that the UCEC's evaluation
report did not provide sufficient information about student performance and learning outcomes
for an appropriate evaluation of the OIPP program, now known as UC Online Education
(UCOE). UCEP endorses, in principle, a mechanism to enable central support and coordination
of online course development, including some courses strategically selected to serve major
systemwide needs and goals, but it also notes the limitations of that model to meet those needs. It

recommends that OIPP/UCOE be integrated into the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) and that ILTI be held to a higher standard than OIPP/UCOE for ongoing evaluation.

UCEP also says that UC should think of online education as a kind of capital investment and expresses support for online education as one part of an overall educational strategy that is also evolving and requires governance and evaluation mechanisms that are adaptive and flexible to fast-changing models.

Discussion: It was noted that the Provost intends to establish an advisory council to guide next steps for ILTI and UCOE, including a proposed communications "hub" that will help enable and streamline cross-campus registration and enrollment processes for systemwide online courses. A Council member noted that some elements of the UCOE project were misguided, particularly the $4 million contract with Blackboard, Inc. to recruit and provide services to non-matriculated students. It was noted that the UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP) enrolls 5,000 students across campuses without the benefit of a hub (although UCEAP's system may also present problems). It was noted that the Governor $10 million budget carve-out for online education technologies at UC, currently managed by ILTI, has an uncertain future.

Action: Council voted to endorse UCEP's letter and forward it to the Provost.

IV.   Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 55

Issue: Council reviewed responses from Senate divisions and committees to a second round of review of a proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 55 put forward by the San Diego Division. In February, Council decided to send two revised versions of the proposed amendment for a second review: the first, as proposed by San Diego, would permit the Senate members of an academic department in the health sciences to extend advisory voting rights on personnel cases to specified classes of non-Senate faculty colleagues in that department upon a two-thirds vote of the department's faculty, and require reconsideration of the privilege after a year if requested by a Senate member of the department. The second would eliminate the phrase "in Health Sciences." Several reviewing bodies voted in favor of one or both of the revisions, and several voted against both.

Several Council members spoke in support of the amendment, noting that the advisory vote would help empower non-Senate faculty who are growing in number but lack access to Senate privileges and proceedings. The language of Senate bylaws can have a significant impact on climate and morale. The bylaws currently provide a means of extending this privilege to emeriti and assistant professors. The amendment would allow Senate faculty in a department to decide whether to extend the privilege to non-Senate faculty, and also provides a mechanism for them to revoke it. A division may also place additional restrictions on the systemwide bylaw or choose not to implement it. Codifying the advisory vote mechanism formally in bylaw would help legitimize it in departments where there may be resistance.

Several Council members spoke against the amendments, noting that the non-Senate advisory vote mechanism is already available, and that many schools or departments take advantage of it. One member reported that the practice of one department is to report votes separately as advisory but to include non-Senate members in the review committees and to blend their comments into the review committee's assessment of the case, effectively giving non-Senate members the opportunity to participate substantially in most aspects of hiring and advancements. One member

noted that the amendment would not help address campus climate, and another characterized the proposal as a surreptitious way to expand Senate membership.

It was suggested that Council issue a letter to faculty about the advisory vote mechanism stating that it is a common practice the Senate does not oppose. However, it would be important to first verify with the UC Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction that the mechanism is, in fact, consistent with Senate bylaws.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to support a version of the amendment. The motion failed in a 6 to 9 vote, with one abstention.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to send forward a letter to faculty at all divisions stating that the advisory vote mechanism reflects a diversity in practice that the Council finds acceptable. The motion passed in a 14 to 1 vote.

V.   **Consultation with Senior Managers**
  o   Aimée Dorr, Provost and Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs
  o   Patrick Lenz, Vice President, Budget and Capital Resources

Vice President Lenz: UC is optimistic that the Governor's May Budget Revision will direct some of an expected $3 billion general fund surplus to the University. UC officials have been working hard to convey to state policymakers the short and long-term funding challenges facing the University, and they have shared a long-term budget model with the Department of Finance and the Governor detailing different levels of tuition and state funding needed to return UC to a sustainable fiscal path. UC also has asked the Governor to provide additional funding specifically for enrollment growth.

The Governor wants to direct at least a portion of the budget surplus to a "rainy day" reserve. The existing reserve requirement that was established in 2004 has been suspended most years since, but a proposed constitutional amendment, ACA 4, is scheduled to appear on the November 2014 ballot, and is far more restrictive about the Governor's ability to suspend Rainy Day Fund contributions. Governor Brown's version of ACA 4 would tie the Rainy Day Fund to capital gains growth, increase from 5% to 10% the amount of general fund revenue that must be directed to the Fund, and would add the Proposition 98 guarantee, in addition to debt service and state retirement obligations, to the list of permitted uses. Other state officials support a more balanced approach to the surplus—using one-third to fund the budget reserve, one-third to reduce debt and other existing liabilities, and one-third to restore funding to programs that were cut during the budget crisis.

Provost Dorr:

Doctoral Education Conference: Several Senate and administrative committees have been asked to provide feedback on the best practices and recommendations for supporting doctoral students generated at the all-UC Doctoral Student Support Conference held at UC Irvine on April 15. Many of the recommendations are based on ideas submitted by the Council of Graduate Deans, the Graduate Students Association, and CCGA that were vetted and refined at the conference by four break-out groups – Professional Development and Partnerships, Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition (NRST), Competitiveness in Net Stipends, and Competitiveness in Diversity and Student Recruitment. Each recommendation comes with an approximate price tag.

Conference participants expressed strong support for a proposal to eliminate NRST charged to students in doctoral and MFA programs, or at least to eliminate NRST after the first year. There was support for building a website to connect alumni, students, potential employers, and campus career officers, for best practices related to generating money as a source for matching funds for graduate fellowships, and for a multi-year funding guarantee. Students also requested clearer and more transparent information about offer packages and expectations for fellowships and teaching in subsequent years.

UC Observatories: UCOP supports three optical and infrared observatories – Lick, Keck, and the future Thirty-Meter Telescope through the UC Observatories, a multi-campus research unit based at UCSC. UCOP recently announced its intention to end systemwide financial support for Lick Observatory after 2018 due to fiscal constraints and the need to prioritize next-generation astronomy facilities. The announcement has created controversy in the astronomy community because it is perceived as jeopardizing the continued operation of the Lick Observatory.

UCOP Budget: The proposed 2014-15 UCOP unrestricted budget includes an across-the-board 1.53% cut for all UCOP units, reflecting the reductions necessary to absorb mandatory cost increases and externally driven cost increases, and to meet the president's request that the UCOP budget remain flat. Provost Dorr emphasized that final decisions about cuts to specific departments have not yet been made.

VI. Executive Session:

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

VII. Consultation with the Chief Information Officer
   o Tom Andriola

Issue: Council invited UC's Chief Information Officer to discuss his work and the scope of issues on which he wishes to seek advice from a revitalized University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC) and/or other Senate committees.

CIO Andriola noted that Information Technology touches every aspect of the University and its work. He views his systemwide role as coordinating campus best practice-sharing around IT topics, and shifting the systemwide IT Leadership Council's (ITLC) focus away from administrative functions to the core teaching and research missions. He wants to engage the Senate in discussions about where technology will have the biggest impact on the core missions and the extent to which technology investments are appropriately geared to achieving and enhancing them. He noted that his office is not currently engaged in developing the data hub for cross-campus online course enrollment.

It was noted that in addition to UCCC – UCEP, UCOLASC, UCPB, and other Senate committees share an interest in IT topics. It was agreed that the CIO would potentially be a consultant to each of those committees. Council members noted that potential topics for collaboration include identifying best practices for software and hardware purchasing priorities, addressing aging IT infrastructure on the campuses, the online education hub, and facilitating the confidential transfer of big files across campuses. A Council member noted that the Senate could

work more effectively if it had access to better data, and that the StatFinder website had provided the Senate – and the larger public – with a user-friendly platform for viewing admissions and student outcome statistics, but that UCOP had decided in 2010 to defund it.

VIII. Amendment to Bylaw 155: University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC)

University Committee on Committees (UCOC) vice chair Edwina Barvosa joined the meeting by phone. She noted that the Council had recommended disbanding UCCC and reassigning parts of its charge last year, based on poor functioning and a lack of clarity about its purpose, but the Assembly asked UCOC to instead update the UCCC bylaws to render the committee more directly useful to the Senate and the university. UCOC is now seeking Council's approval on proposed amendments to the UCCC bylaw. All ten divisional COCs have reviewed and support the revised charge—to focus on issues arising at the interface of computing technology, education, and research, especially but not exclusively regarding online education, intellectual property, and privacy. The current bylaws are out of sync with the technology issues the university is dealing with today, but it is clear that there are issues to be discussed and that UCCC can be a place for productive, ongoing discussion about issues that are important to all faculty.

A Council member noted that there should be a clear separation of Senate committee duties regarding the broad topic of online education, and that emphasizing online education in the UCCC charge risks dating the committee due to the rapidly changing nature of that topic. There was also concern that it may be difficult to recruit divisional faculty to a reconstituted UCCC because the required knowledge set may be very broad. Vice Chair Barvosa noted that UCOC has considered the relationship between a revitalized UCCC and other systemwide committees. UCEP, in particular, has stressed it does not have the time or resources to conduct a thorough investigation of issues at the interface of new technology, research, and education. It welcomes a revitalized UCCC as an independent but highly collaborative entity that can offer pre-investigation and pre-analysis of the issues to help inform policymaking on UCEP. In addition, the UCCC charge allows flexibility with regard to appointing at-large members with appropriate expertise to the UCCC from the divisional committee.

Action: Council voted unanimously to charge UCOC with populating the UCCC for 2014-15, with the understanding that the revised UCCC charge will be modified slightly and finalized this year and put on the Assembly agenda next year. The final revised UCCC charge will appear on the May Council agenda as a consent item.

IX. Faculty Salary Equity Studies
   o Susan Carlson, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

Campuses have submitted updated plans for analyzing local salary equity. The original impetus behind the effort was a [Salary Equity Study](#) prepared by a former University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity chair in 2011, which provided evidence that female faculty are paid less than their male colleagues at UC with similar years of experience. There were questions raised about the methodology of that study, but President Yudof asked campuses to define a campus-based methodology for assessing salary equity on the basis of gender and ethnicity, and

to conduct a study at least once before 2015. The initial campus study plans were submitted last year and reviewed by the Senate.

Vice Provost Carlson said the updated plans are encouraging because they indicate that campuses take the issue seriously and intend to conduct serious studies if they do not already do so regularly. Several campuses noted that they do conduct equity studies regularly, and although some reported that they have not found differences attributable to gender or race, others reported that they take action when they find salary outliers. Several campuses also indicated that they intend to look beyond salary to career advancement rate differentials and to salary and career equity for Health Sciences faculty and part-time faculty.

Council members noted that on some campuses, faculty have several avenues for requesting an equity review: through CAPs, from campus equity advisors, or from a dean or department. It was noted that sharing best practices among campuses is helpful, but there is also a benefit to having a single approach to a problem rather than ten different approaches.

X.   Composite Benefit Rates
   o   Bill Jacob, Chair, Academic Council

Shortly after the April 2 Council meeting, President Napolitano asked a joint Senate-Administration Advisory Group to provide information to help guide her decision on the composite benefit rates (CBR) project in time for discussion at the May 7 Council of Chancellors meeting. The Senate members of the Advisory Group received all data they requested from UCOP about employee categories, funding sources, and salary/benefits costs. Chair Jacob used these data to build an interactive worksheet that allows users to model the degree to which different CBR plans would shift funds from activities supported by one fund source to activities supported by other fund sources in relation to the projected actual costs for each activity on each campus. The models help illuminate a fuller range of possibilities for CBRs and the pros and cons of each. Chair Jacob will send the administration a final report with recommendations by the end of this week.

Council members remarked that it will be important for the report to articulate basic principles supported by the Senate for the final CBR plan—for example, the plan should minimize fund shifts across departments and fund sources, and align benefit charges on salary payments to the actual benefits received. It was noted that Ohio State and other universities have CBR plans in place that include multiple rates for different types of faculty, including faculty on summer salary, distinct from other university employee groups.

XI.   UCRP Funding Recommendation
   o   Dan Hare, UCFW Chair

Issue: UCFW and its Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) have approved a "Resolution on Borrowing to Reduce the Unfunded Liability in the University of California Retirement Plan."

Chair hare said UCFW is asking Council to consider adopting the resolution as Senate policy after the Governor releases his May Budget Revision. UCFW is concerned that although the UCRP employer contribution is scheduled to rise from 12% to 14% on July 1, 2014, there are no

plans to continue the ramp-up to meet the Annual Required Contribution (ARC) and the Regents policy target of 18% by 2018. Failing to meet that target will increase the Plan's unfunded liability to $20 billion by 2042. UCFW's proposal calls for internal borrowing to meet ARC over the next two years (the equivalent of a 16% employer contribution level beginning July 1, 2014) and to pay off the loan over ten years with an additional 2% surcharge on the employer contribution.

The proposal benefits UC over the long term by addressing the problem and freeing up money to support UC's teaching and research missions. UCPB Chair Senear noted that UCPB has also submitted a letter in support of the proposal. The committee considered that there may be other funding areas that should have as high a priority as UCRP, but came to the conclusion that there is no better place to invest the money.

So far, administrators have been somewhat resistant to the proposal. Some are concerned about the opportunity cost of moving to a 16% employer contribution--that is, the extent to which borrowing could constrain the university's need to grow after years of restriction.

Action: Council will review the proposal at the May meeting.

XII. Admissions Outcomes
   o George Johnson, BOARS Chair

Chair Johnson noted that fall 2014 admissions outcomes have been released. UC campuses admitted a record number of freshmen applicants for fall 2014, although the overall admission rate declined. The number of admissions offers to nonresidents also increased on a number of campuses.

XIII. Proposed Change to Approval Process for New Degree Titles
   o Donald Mastronarde, CCGA Chair

CCGA recently began recommending that new self-supporting professional master's degree programs use new titles (Master of X) rather than existing titles such as M.A. or M.S. Senate bylaws require that new degree titles on a campus be approved by both the Divisional Senate and the Assembly or the Academic Council; however, these steps add time to the overall approval process. CCGA is looking for ways to streamline the process and is asking the Senate to consider reducing from 60 days to 30 days the interval within which Council can give final approval of a new degree title without referring it to the Assembly. CCGA is also willing to entertain questions about whether it should maintain its professional master's degree titles policy.

It was suggested that the Master of X title be given a blanket systemwide approval similar to the Master of Advanced Study in X that is currently approved for use at every campus. Council members urged caution, noting that the review target of 60 days is not important in and of itself, but it is important for new degree titles to undergo due diligence.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm
Attest: Bill Jacob, Academic Council Chair
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst