

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, October 26, 2011**I. Senate Officers' Announcements****▪ Robert Anderson, Academic Council Chair**

1. Oliver Johnson Award. The Senate's Oliver Johnson Award will be given at the end of this academic year. Chair Anderson will send a formal request to the divisions for nominations. Nominees are eligible if they are members of the Senate who have not served on Council in the three previous years.

2. Competitiveness in Graduate Student Support. Provost Pitts has appointed administrative members of a joint task force on graduate student support and requested that we name four Senate members. Chair Anderson proposed that the Senate members be selected from Council's Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support.

3. UC Online Education (UCOE). The first seven courses in the Online Pilot Project will be offered in January. UCOE is moving ahead with plans for expansion prior to completing the evaluation of the pilot project. They plan to release a request for letters of intent for a second round of courses soon. UCEP and UCPB may draft a letter in response to UCOE's rapid expansion.

4. Provost search. A committee is being formed to search for a new provost; it will be announced soon.

5. Academic Planning Council. The next meeting of the Academic Planning Council (APC) has been canceled for lack of an agenda. The APC is intended to be a high-level joint planning group for academic issues. It is responsible for the Compendium, but has not been influential in recent years. It has been superseded by a proliferation of ad hoc committees. Looking ahead to next year, we may want to consider recommendations on the proper role of APC .

6. Privacy Information Steering Committee. This presidential committee is expected to issue a report in December. The Medical Centers are required by federal law to protect personal health information and use regular machine monitoring of faculty and staff emails to detect patterns, such as Social Security numbers, that suggest that private information is being transmitted. However, such monitoring should not be extended farther than it needs to be. UCLA's divisional chair noted that his campus also has a joint Senate-administrative task force formulating a policy on these issues. Chair Anderson noted that faculty members should be careful with the use of their laptops and computers, as their emails are subject to the Public Records Act. Laptop hard drives should be encrypted. It would be helpful to have a statement of what the university will do to defend faculty in the case of a lawsuit. He advocated that the Senate should take a leading role on this issue.

7. ACSCOLI update. Vice Chair Powell reported on the recent ACSCOLI meeting. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) is evaluating proposals to build a second campus in the Bay Area which would consolidate a half dozen satellite facilities. They are also discussing building a Next Generation Light Source facility, and are negotiating with the Department of Energy on the issuance of and responsibility for construction. A new director of Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) will be announced in the next two

weeks. UCOP will be issuing a new request for proposals for projects to be funded by the fees UC receives for managing the national laboratories. Letters of Intent will be due in early December and decisions will be made by April. LANL wants to build a new “exoscale” computing facility.

II. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was unanimously approved as noticed.

III. Consent Calendar

- 1. Approve draft September Council minutes**
- 2. Approve UCD Master of Professional Accountancy (M.P.Ac.) degree**, consistent with [Bylaw 125.B.7](#), which empowers Council to approve new degrees if the Academic Assembly does not convene within 60 days of CCGA’s recommendation.

ACTION: The consent calendar was unanimously approved with corrections to the minutes.

IV. UCR Medical School HCSP Implementation

ISSUE: Responding to a request from the provost, UCFW reviewed the Riverside campus’ proposal to implement the Health Sciences Compensation Plan for its future Medical School faculty. While the UCR Senate Executive Committee approved the plan, UCFW raised issues of systemwide import.

DISCUSSION: In the summer, UCR submitted a plan to implement a HCSP at its School of Medicine based on the framework outlined in APM 670. Provost Pitts forwarded it to UCAP and UCFW. UCFW’s Chair stated that his committee is concerned about balancing the rights and protections for the faculty against the responsibilities of the dean. The document provides significant responsibilities to the dean without a clear statement of faculty rights and protections. Procedures for handling disputes are not clearly outlined. Similarly, the document leaves the decision for assigning faculty to APUs largely to the dean, advised by a committee of 8 individuals with 1-year terms, half of whom will be appointed by the dean and half of whom will be chosen by the faculty using an unspecified mechanism. The one-year terms will create rapid turnover and allow the composition of the committee to be easily manipulated. The determination of whether a faculty member is in “good standing” also is left up to the dean. Appeals are made to an advisory committee, which has no final authority. UCFW recognizes, however, that a compensation plan is needed so that the School of Medicine can begin to hire faculty. Therefore, it recommends conditional approval of the implementation plan and reexamination of the plan in three years or when a revision of APM 670 is issued. The Riverside division chair noted that UCR’s Senate felt that the plan was adequate given the current transition of APM 670, but stated that she was in favor of temporary approval and supported UCFW’s recommendation since it articulates the critical issues that must be addressed in a final plan. UCAP’s Chair said that her committee will discuss whether it concurs with UCFW’s recommendation and will report the committee’s conclusion to Chair Anderson within the next week.

ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed UCFW’s recommendation on the condition that UCAP does not object.

V. Implementation of New Admissions Policy

ISSUE: Beginning this year, the University will implement a new admissions policy developed by the Senate and adopted by the Regents in 2008. It broadens the pool of applications that are entitled to review. BOARS vice chair George Johnson reviewed the changes and discussed campus-level implementation.

DISCUSSION: George Johnson, BOARS' Vice Chair, explained the new eligibility policy. Changes in eligibility have been made regularly due to demographic shifts. BOARS wanted to open the admissions process to more well-qualified students by taking into consideration factors beyond narrow measures such as high school GPA and test scores. In fact taking the right tests qualified students for eligibility rather than achieving a high test score. BOARS found that a number of students with strong academic records were technically ineligible because they did not take the right number of tests. Furthermore, changes in the SAT reasoning tests had made the SAT subject tests less important in predicting success at UC. The eligibility index served more to limit the pool than to identify top performers. BOARS also wanted to expand opportunity by expanding eligibility in the local context from the top 4% of graduates of each high school to the top 9% (these students are guaranteed admission to a UC campus, but not necessarily the one to which they applied). In addition, the top 9% of high school students statewide are guaranteed admission, also through referral. Because of the considerable overlap between the two groups of students, it is expected that these two guarantees will comprise about 10% of all high school graduates.

This is the first year in which the new policy will be in effect. BOARS does not know how many additional students will apply under the new policy; some estimate the increase to be between 10% and 15%. In addition, in response to the Regents' resolution of last January, campuses are revising the way they conduct comprehensive review, moving from matrices of numerical measures on a list of factors toward holistic review of applications by human readers who are trained to evaluate them consistently. Berkeley and UCLA have been doing this for a number of years, and Irvine and San Diego used single score reviews last year in slightly different ways. Both Davis and Santa Cruz will use holistic review this year for the first time. BOARS examined the time and personnel required to do holistic review. Both BOARS and President Yudof have encouraged campuses to ensure that sufficient resources are available to the admissions offices to ensure successful implementation of the University's new admissions policy. BOARS also will be closely monitoring the effects of the new policy. A member warned against deemphasizing guarantees of admission because through them, UC has tremendous influence over the high school curriculum.

VI. Consultation with Office the President Senior Management

President Yudof told Council members that he sent a letter to WASC asking them to delay Commission action on proposed changes to their guidelines to allow the University community sufficient time to comment on the revisions. President Yudof stated that he has recently spoken to a number of groups on anti-Semitism on the campuses, reporting what the University is doing to address these issues. He commented that the campus climate committee at the systemwide level is doing excellent work.

Provost Pitts stated that he requested four nominees from the Senate for the joint task force on graduate student support. He hopes that the group will issue a report by February 1st for consideration by the Regents in March. He stated that as a result of the recent Supreme Court case,

Stanford v. Roche, the University plans to ask all employees to sign a revision of the patent agreement that they signed when they were first hired. He noted that there is no change to University policy. He asked Council's advice regarding the wording of the request to faculty. UCORP's chair stated that his committee discussed this in 2009 and suggested providing a case study to illustrate the need for the new wording. He noted that most faculty do not perform research that results in patents, and that perhaps the signing of the new agreement could be done as part of the merit review process or when a faculty member files outside professional activity forms. UCORP also suggested that the process be handled by the deans, as they know which faculty members are most likely to produce patentable work and could focus compliance efforts on that population. Chair Anderson recommended that any compliance mechanisms should be discussed with UCFW and UCORP.

EVP Brostrom stated that his office continues to discuss the university's budget with the Department of Finance and that while he feels they are making progress on discussions of the operational budget, the capital discussions are discouraging. He noted that there are positive developments in labor negotiations; the University settled with AFSCME and is on the verge of settling with another union. AFSCME agreed to a 3% salary increase, merit raises in the range of 1.2-1.5%, and they agreed to UCRP contributions and health and welfare contributions for the next two years. President Yudof instituted a Labor Council, which has led to less *ad hoc* bargaining. He reported that the Rebenching Committee will meet again soon and that he hopes to have a recommendation to the president by the holidays. He noted that there is little disagreement over the principles for rebenching.

Comment: A Council member who serves on the Rebenching Committee disagreed that there is a common understanding of the principles for rebenching among committee members. He noted that one counter-proposal rebenches only new money and does not address base budgets. The counter-proposal is based on the principle of "do no harm" to existing programs. By definition, that is not rebenching; it preserves the status quo, particularly in a budget environment when additional state funding is not forthcoming.

Comment: A member countered that there is consensus on the principles, but not on their priority. He noted that it would be helpful to assign numbers to different scenarios to understand how much funding would be shifted among campuses. It would be difficult for campuses to deal with major swings in funding because they have established programs, so any significant shifts need to be phased in.

Comment: A member replied that rebenching is about how UC, as a system, manages the harm done to it by the state. The only way a campus loses under the Senate recommendations is if it already is getting more money than another campus for doing the same thing, or if it is not meeting its target enrollments for California residents.

Comment: The subgroups of the Rebenching Committee that are focusing on the health sciences and agriculture seem to view their mission as helping those constituencies make their case why they should be treated specially.

A: Provost Pitts replied that he has just appointed co-chairs who are not part of either of those constituencies so that they do not act as advocacy groups. He also noted that both are so complex that the issues may not be resolved in time to be included in the Committee's recommendations to the president. The Rebenching Committee can reconvene to address the size of the allocation and mechanisms for distributing the funds. Since health sciences and agriculture are not related to

student enrollments, the issue can be set aside. The question is if the funding for these areas should come off the top of the state general fund allocation or if it should be embedded in the amount that is assigned to the campuses. Rebenching will be phased in, regardless of the solution chosen.

Comment: Regardless of whether funding for ANR is earmarked or provided through the campus assessments, certain fundamental issues should be addressed. Should there be a maintenance of effort provision for the Agricultural Experiment Stations? Should we continue to fund ANR at a higher rate than required to get federal matching funds?

Q: Will seismic upgrades be included in the rebenching calculations?

A: EVP Brostrom responded that capital needs are not part of the rebenching discussions.

Q: Will the governor's pension proposal affect UC's retirement benefits?

A: President Yudof replied that it is unclear if the governor intends his proposal to apply to UC. He noted that Governor Brown asked him questions about the new tier but did not reveal his thoughts on UC. President Yudof stated that UC has led the way among state agencies in reining in costs and ensuring that its pension program can meet its obligations.

Q: How do you view the progress of the online education initiative? Is it still a pilot program, or has it moved beyond that?

A: Provost Pitts responded that it is still in the pilot phase. The first courses will be rolled out in January. A request for proposals will be issued soon to fund an additional 15 courses focused on the lower division. A member commented that there is concern among the faculty that the evaluation is a foregone conclusion and that its quality may be in doubt. A member added that the project is building an infrastructure that assumes that it will continue, which makes faculty skeptical. Provost Pitts invited the faculty to view the webinar on the evaluation posted on the project website. He noted that the faculty who are involved in the process are comfortable with the evaluation and with the project overall. President Yudof added that the project has to be run with leadership on a business model. It would be irresponsible not to assign an executive with business acumen to head up the marketing and financial aspects of the program. How can we spend money without a plan? An existing staff member has been loaned to the program at 75% time to fulfill this function. The academic leadership comes from the faculty. President Yudof noted that initial descriptions of the online project were overreaching, but that the project is being carefully executed with plenty of oversight.

Q: What is the project's measure of success beyond the dollars? When would you pull the plug?

A: Provost Pitts replied that UCOP has defined a number of financial benchmarks that must be met.

Comment: Most faculty view the online project as another way that we provide courses that will benefit our campuses. But the revenue generation aspirations are a diversion. President Yudof agreed that if the expansion of the project to non-UC students fails, we still will have 25 top quality courses to show for it. However, he hopes that it will be a revenue generator. The Regents want the University to exhaust all options before raising tuition, and this could be part of the solution. The university is exploring innovative ways to raise revenue.

VII. General Discussion

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

VIII. WASC Handbook Revisions

ISSUE: In February 2011, WASC President Ralph Wolff visited the Academic Council to report on proposed revisions to the WASC handbook governing accreditation. This was a briefing, and Council was not presented with a final document. The final document was issued earlier this month and contains provisions have raised serious concerns among major universities. Mr. Wolff was scheduled to meet with UCEP on November 7, but the WASC Governing Board plans to vote to approve the revisions on November 3. Chair Anderson wrote a letter to Mr. Wolff requesting a postponement of that vote to allow the higher education institutions to discuss the final document and advise WASC of their concerns. President Yudof also wrote a letter requesting that the Commission delay adoption of the handbook. Mr. Wolff replied that any decision to delay adoption is in the purview of the board.

DISCUSSION: UCEP Chair Jose Wudka summarized UCEP's concerns about the latest proposed revision, which was released on October 12. He stated that the goals of the revision are admirable: to ensure quality regardless of the nature of the institution, streamline and provide greater transparency in the review process, and address demands for better student performance through specific measurements. However, UCEP is concerned that the parameters of the review are unspecified. In the past, faculty defined the learning goals for degrees and courses, how to measure them, and the actions taken to remedy any deficiencies. The revision proposes greater external involvement in the reviews by an "expert panel," but does not specify this involvement, nor does it adequately define "student success." WASC received a \$1.5 M grant from the Lumina Foundation and has included as a voluntary pilot program a Lumina-proposed degree qualification profile as a way to measure the quality of education. UCEP is not comfortable with this framework. Such accountability measures are a response to federal consumer protection legislation, which has required accreditation agencies to implement safeguards to ensure quality education. UCEP also critiques the WASC proposal because it does not take into consideration the great variance among the institutions it accredits, yet attempts to impose a common measurement rubric. UCEP emphasizes the importance of local determination of learning goals and how to measure them. Institutions must be given flexibility in how they interpret, apply and measure benchmarking categories. A member commented that would be more effective to build on existing assessment frameworks. If WASC significantly changes the review process, it will undermine the lessons from prior reviews. Council discussed a draft statement to WASC, agreeing on its substance and authorized Chair Anderson and UCEP Chair Wudka to refine the language, as discussed, and send the statement to WASC.

ACTION: Council unanimously approved the content of a statement to WASC regarding its proposed revisions to its review handbook.

IX. UCORP Research Mission Statement

ISSUE: UCORP submitted a draft statement on the centrality of research to UC's educational mission intended for adoption by the Regents.

DISCUSSION: UCORP Chair John Crawford stated that his committee wants to ensure that research is recognized as central to the mission of the University. A series of statements and decisions by the systemwide and campus administrations has caused concern among UCORP's members and many faculty. The research mission statement emphasizes that research and instruction are intertwined. UCORP has discussed the wording of the statement on multiple occasions with Vice President Beckwith and his staff members and has incorporated their

suggestions. Vice President Beckwith supports the current statement. UCORP wants it to be presented to and adopted by the Regents. Council discussed the process for obtaining Regental endorsement and whether it should be reviewed systemwide or if it should undergo review by the Senate and administration simultaneously. Several divisional chairs spoke in favor of conducting a systemwide review to raise the profile of this issue on the campuses. Council members agreed that a simultaneous review by the Senate and administration would facilitate the statement's adoption by the end of this academic year.

ACTION: Council unanimously voted to support presentation to the Regents of a statement highlighting the University's research mission. Council delegated to the chair and vice chair to consult with the administration on the most expeditious way to accomplish this goal.

X. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

XI. Update on President's Budget Rebenching Task Force

ISSUE: Last spring, Council endorsed the recommendations of its own Implementation Task Force and forwarded the report to the joint Senate-administrative President's Budget Rebenching Task Force for consideration as they draft a proposal.

DISCUSSION: Chair Chalfant briefed current Council members on the report's recommendations and on recent discussions of the Rebenching Task Force. Members discussed differing views of the progress that has been made by the Rebenching Committee. EVP Brostrom is trying to find a middle ground. A member urged that the allocation for ANR be examined; ANR is different from other systemwide budget priorities like the Keck telescope and should not be shielded from budgetary review.

XII. New Business

ISSUE: Chair Anderson requested Council's approval to cancel the December 7 Assembly meeting per Senate Bylaw 110.A.3.b. Assembly meetings are also scheduled for February 15, April 11, and June 6 and at least one will be held in person.

ACTION: Council approved the cancelation of the December 7 Assembly meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest: Robert Anderson, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst