

Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, February 27, 2013

I. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this part of the meeting.

II. Senate Officers' Announcements

1. Update on spring online meetings. Discussion was postponed to the Senior Management consultation period.

2. UCORP meeting in Sacramento. Chair Powell reported that UCORP will be meeting in Sacramento with legislators and their staffs in March to convey to them the importance of research to the UC mission. UCORP will emphasize that UC researchers bring \$2.9B federal dollars into the California economy annually and that a healthy higher education ecosystem also includes the creative production of Humanities faculty, which is not always easily measured in dollars. A member noted that the economy benefits greatly from the work of arts graduates in the California entertainment industry. Additionally, research is intertwined with both graduate and undergraduate teaching. A recent student survey indicated that half of UC undergraduates are involved in faculty research.

III. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was approved as noticed.

IV. Consent Calendar

1. Approve draft January Council minutes and iLinc minutes

ACTION: The consent calendar was unanimously approved.

V. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

VI. Update on Systemwide Course Approvals

DISCUSSION: UCEP Chair Yoder said his committee has been charged with approving courses with a systemwide designation. Approved courses will be listed in all campus catalogs as well as in a common UC catalog. They are already approved by a campus, so UCEP does not review them for approval, but rather its role is to ensure that they are actually available across campuses and that the units are appropriately assigned (e.g., between quarters and semesters). UCEP has evaluated twelve courses so far. Some issues have not yet been resolved, such as how to allocate

student credit hour credit to departments and individual faculty for students taking a class at a different campus.

VII. Proposed Revision to SR 478

ISSUE: BOARS proposed revisions to SR 478 to accommodate IGETC for STEM majors, which Council previously approved in concept as part of the new transfer admissions policy (SR 476) approved by the Assembly in June 2012. BOARS also proposed additional technical revisions and changes for clarity.

DISCUSSION: BOARS Chair Johnson noted that IGETC is primarily used in non-STEM majors and that majors that require greater preparation have not been accepting IGETC. But SB1440, which established AA transfer degrees, requires that transfer curricula include IGETC. To accommodate this, BOARS developed a version of IGETC that reduces the number of required courses to enable students in STEM fields to take science preparation classes. A member requested time for divisional admissions and undergraduate councils to review the proposal. Chair Johnson agreed, and noted that BOARS hopes to send the proposal to the Academic Assembly for consideration in June.

ACTION: Action was deferred to allow divisional consultation. BOARS will bring this matter back to Council in April.

VIII. Consultation with Senior Mangers – President Yudof

President Yudof reported that the presidential selection committee has been formed and a search firm used in several chancellor searches has been retained. The process is moving quickly.

President Yudof said he decided not to provide raises in 2012-13, but hopes to do so in 2013-14. The Board of Regents has already approved the raises, but that budget assumed increases in tuition, which are now off the table. The Budget Office has to figure out what UC can afford, and it will have to be in line with increases for state employees.

Provost Dorr said that the Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition and the Self-Supporting Program policies are under review by two different joint Senate-administration committees. Approval of the 2013-14 PDST levels has been postponed. Although the item was ready to go before the Regents in November 2012, the governor asked that it be removed from the agenda because of the tax increase approved by the voters under Proposition 30. The PDST task force is discussing what kinds of programs qualify as professional, how to establish a reasonable fee level and ensure meaningful consultation with students and faculty, and what the timetable for the process should be. The Academic Planning Council is reviewing the SSP policy. The two groups will have a chance to review the other's draft. Provost Dorr said she hopes that both policies can be completed by the end of the academic year.

Provost Dorr reported on plans for the systemwide meetings on online education in the spring. She is meeting weekly with Senate leadership on this subject. Two working meetings will be convened simultaneously (one in the north and one in the south). Invitations will be sent to faculty, staff, students and administrators who are involved in online education, including some who have submitted a letter of interest in response to the RFP. If Council members identify additional faculty

who are interested in attending, please inform Chair Powell so an invitation can be extended. Attendees will break into work groups to discuss different issues. Ten days later, the provost will convene a reconciliation committee to synthesize the work of the two groups. The RFP will be released soon. It is written broadly, but encourages the development of undergraduate lower-division, high-enrollment gateway courses that can be used at multiple campuses. However, there is room for innovative graduate courses or courses that are so specialized that there are not enough students or faculty expertise on a single campus to allow them to be offered. Provost Dorr emphasized that UCOE will not control the funds or make the decisions.

Q: Will there be an effort to not duplicate courses funded by the RFP? For instance, would only one online chemistry course be approved?

A: Provost Dorr said that if they received more than one proposal for similar courses, she would encourage the faculty to work together to develop one course. One desired outcome will be to develop an articulation process for courses offered on other UC campuses to ensure that they count for major or GE credit.

Comment: Faculty are concerned about external pressures to increase teaching loads. We must persuade politicians and the public of the value of research and emphasize that a significant part of the faculty's workload is doing research. This is what distinguishes UC from CSU.

A: President Yudof agreed and noted that at the next Regents meeting they will present film clips of faculty talking about their research as well as data on the value of research.

Q: What opportunities are there for student input on the changes to UC SHIP (Student Health Insurance Plan)?

A: President Yudof responded that UC SHIP advisory committee has one student representative from each campus, and a student also is on the executive committee. In addition, he talked with the student body presidents and UCSA. There are also efforts on the campuses to reevaluate their participation in the program and there are opportunities to participate in those discussions.

IX. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

X. Response to Rebenching

ACTION: Council unanimously approved the draft response to the report of the Rebenching Budget Committee, as included in the agenda packet.

XI. Senate Representation on the Executive Budget Committee

ISSUE: UCFW submitted a letter recommending Senate representation on UCOP's Executive Budget Committee.

DISCUSSION: UCFW Chair Hare stated that the Executive Budget Committee was disbanded in the mid-2000s and was recently reconstituted to discuss Funding Streams. Given the academic implications of the significant changes to UC's budgeting process, UCFW believes that Senate representation on this committee is critical to shared governance. He referred to the recent defunding of the Health Care Facilitator program and the decision to restore its funding as a result of pushback from

the Senate. Senate input would facilitate discussion of how any particular cuts would affect the faculty. As in prior iterations, UCFW recommends that the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Senate and the Chair of the University Committee on Planning and Budget represent the Senate.

ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed UCFW's recommendation that the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Council and the Chair of UCPB represent the Senate on the Executive Budget Committee.

XII. Negotiated Salary Plan Update and Process

ISSUE: The chairs of the divisions at UCI, UCLA and UCSD briefed Council on the status of the NSP implementation plans on their campuses.

DISCUSSION: UCI Divisional Chair Gilly reported that despite Senate opposition, the campus Interim EVC decided to proceed with the trial program. Approximately a dozen faculty will be eligible. UCLA Divisional Chair Sarna stated that while her division initially responded to the review negatively, she later received letters of support from potentially affected units and a decision was made to support participation. She estimates that approximately 50 faculty will be eligible, 30 of whom are in the School of Public Health, which has run a similar program successfully for the past decade. UCSD Divisional Chair Masters said that an implementation plan has been developed, but the Senate has not yet approved it because metrics to assess the trial program's success or failure have not been defined. Members agreed that establishing in advance what constitutes success is crucial. A member clarified that Vice Provost Carlson is convening a work group of representatives from the three campuses and the chair of UCFW to ensure that the evaluation metrics are uniform. Chair Powell said that UCAP, UCAAD, UCPB, CCGA, and UCFW should review the proposed metrics. The evaluation should include the effects on faculty who are not participating.

XIII. Proposed revisions to the Compendium

(A) Multicampus Research Units. UCORP's chair said he has worked with a subcommittee of the Academic Planning Council to revise the Compendium section regarding the appointment of MRU directors and to add a subsection on Multicampus Research Programs. UCORP has reviewed and approved the draft revisions. There is a conflict between the APM and Regental policies regarding who appoints MRU directors. The subcommittee feels that the Regental policy should be retained and that the APM should be changed. He summarized other suggested revisions.

(B) Self-Supporting Programs. Council discussed a draft of proposed revisions to the section of the Compendium on SSPs. A member objected that the role of the Senate is minimized and almost eliminated in the case of conversions. Members discussed whether the funds generated on the campus should remain on the campus and whether students in self-supporting programs should count for the purpose of allocating state general funds. Some campuses are better situated to generate funds from SSPs. A member objected to reopening the issue of rebenching. Instead, the focus should be on the Senate's role of ensuring academic quality. Another member argued that conversions should be treated as the creation of a new SSP. This approach would not implicate rebenching. A member argued that the proposed revisions strip the required criteria from the policy and suggest that SSPs are merely a financial strategy. But policy should be derived from an educational vision and a set of principles. We must first define what SSPs are as well as the

justification for establishing them. A member stated that the differences between PDSTs and SSPs must be clearly explicated. As currently written, every PDST could convert to SSP status. However, the governor and legislature are opposed to PDST increases, and if they see a proliferation of SSPs, they may begin to cut state funds to offset new fee revenues. Clear language about the criteria that justify the establishment of an SSP as the best choice is needed. A member opined that conversions privatize public resources that have been invested in state-supported programs. A member raised the example of a SSP which charged students in a traditional program additional fees to take a course that they offered and that was required for the traditional program. The interface between SSPs and other campus programs must be addressed. Several divisions have established Senate-administration task forces to provide guidance on the establishment of SSPs; these reports should be made available.

XIV. UCPB Statement on Quality Initiatives

ISSUE: UCPB submitted a statement on the importance of pursuing the quality initiatives proposed in the University's 2013-14 budget.

DISCUSSION: Some members noted that since the budget was approved, discussion at Regents meetings has been antithetical to investment; the letter seems outdated and unrealistic. Other members felt it important to go on record in support of quality. UCPB Chair Minster acknowledged the need for an ongoing discussion of the University's priorities.

XV. Review of Salary Equity Plans

DISCUSSION: Council discussed how to review the salary equity plans submitted by campus administrations. It decided to ask for review by the divisional Senates as well as by UCAAD, UCAP and UCFW.

XVI. New Business

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm

Attest: Robert Powell, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Principal Committee Analyst