

## **ACADEMIC COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 2009-10**

**TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:** The Academic Council is the executive committee of the Assembly of the Academic Senate and acts on behalf of the Assembly on non-legislative matters. It advises the President on behalf of the Assembly and has the continuing responsibility through its committee structure to investigate and report to the Assembly on matters of Universitywide concern.

During the 2009-10 year, the Academic Council considered multiple initiatives, proposals, and reports, and responded to all of the recommendations of the Working Groups of the UC Commission on the Future. Its final recommendations and reports can be found on the [Academic Senate website](#). Matters of particular import for the year include:

### **UC COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE**

The Senate expended great effort participating in the proceedings of the UC Commission on the Future. Faculty members Anil Deolalikar (UCR), Cynthia Brown (UCSB) and Chair Henry Powell served as members of the Commission, and Vice Chair Daniel Simmons was an *ex-officio* member. In addition, 46 faculty members served on the Commission's five Working Groups. Numerous faculty on Senate systemwide and divisional committees comprehensively reviewed and commented on two sets of recommendations issued by the Working Groups. Finally, Senate faculty at each campus also had an opportunity to review the recommendations and many commented upon them. See the following links for detailed Senate responses to the [first round](#) and [second round](#) of recommendations.

In general, Council was disappointed that the recommendations did not offer a comprehensive vision of UC's future. Rather, they provided incremental, budget-driven solutions focused on efficiency. They tended to be driven by fiscal expediency, rather than be justified pedagogically. Council also was concerned that many of the proposals would undermine ordinary processes of University governance. Since the proposals lacked implementation details and evaluation of their costs and benefits, Senate endorsement of any of the recommendations will be contingent on further review of well-specified proposals.

### **BUDGETARY ISSUES**

In July 2009, under the newly adopted Regents' Standing Order 100.4, the president declared a fiscal emergency and authorized furloughs systemwide to achieve budgetary savings. Contrary to Council's recommendation, the administration decided to prohibit campuses from implementing furloughs on instructional days. In November, Council wrote a [letter](#) stating that this decision undermined the distinctive mission of the University to pursue research as one of its three principal responsibilities.

The 2000-10 year began with a budgetary summit hosted by Interim Provost Pitts to familiarize Senate committee and divisional chairs with the fiscal challenges facing the University. In the spring, Provost Pitts held regular teleconferences with a subset of divisional and committee chairs to brief them on budget issues.

Throughout the year, UCPB issued a series of papers assessing the larger budgetary framework, evaluating ideas that were suggested in various budget meetings, and suggesting alternatives. In February, it released a white paper on differential fees by campus and major and non-resident tuition, which was distributed for systemwide review. UCPB addressed the three issues in one paper because they all are driven by the imperative to find new revenues. Council felt that the three should not be linked, and chose to address the issues individually through the Senate review of the recommendations of the Commission on the Future Working Groups. In the meantime, UCPB also released the “[Choices](#)” report, which more comprehensively addressed many of the points in the white paper upon which there was agreement. Council decided to circulate UCPB’s “Choices” report widely as a draft for discussion in order to frame the discussion of these issues in the on-going review of the Working Group recommendations to the UC Commission on the Future. It also initiated a systemwide review of the Choices report. In June, Council endorsed the Choices report as a document that provides history, context and analysis supporting future discussion of next steps in the budget process.

In addition, UCPB and UCORP issued a report evaluating the University’s indirect cost recovery practices and advocating changes that would increase the revenues recovered (see Research, below).

## **FACULTY WELFARE**

Since no monies were available to fund the faculty salary plan, Council began to focus on ensuring competitive total remuneration and protecting retirement benefits. In February, the Academic Council endorsed an [update](#) of the May 2009 “TFIR Recommendation to Assure Adequate Funding for UCRP” proposing that, absent state funds, the University could provide the employer contribution to UCRP by issuing Pension Obligation Bonds.

Senate members also served on the Steering Committee of the President’s Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits, which issued a recommendation for restructuring pension and retiree health benefits at the end of August. The faculty and staff members issued a dissenting statement and requested that the president also consider an alternative proposal that the Task Force discussed, but did not include as an option in its recommendation. The president agreed to consider this alternative.

The chairs of UCAP, UCFW, and UCPB recommended to the Academic Council that UC examine cost projections of different scenarios for returning salaries to competitiveness based on UC's Comparison 8 institutions. A joint UCAP-UCFW-UCPB subcommittee met several times between December and May to review salary data provided by UCOP, as well as the costs associated with restoring competitive salaries. Those data highlight that the current faculty salary scales do not serve UC’s merit- or market-based goals to compensate faculty appropriately. The joint UCAP-UCFW-UCPB work group consulted with James Litrownik, Janet Lockwood, and Patricia Price from Academic Personnel, discussed the declining competitiveness of UC's salary scales, and developed three recommendations. The report will be considered by the 2010-11 Academic Council.

## **ADMISSIONS**

In January, BOARS issued a report to the Regents evaluating the extent to which the new SAT aligns with BOARS’ January 2002 [principles for testing](#) and recommending that the Regents remove the provisional status of the SAT-R.

BOARS also wrote a memo, unanimously endorsed by Council, clarifying the [intent of the eligibility policy](#) approved by the Regents in February, 2009. The memo responded to critiques from external groups and outlined BOARS' expectations about the impact it will have on improving the fairness of the UC admissions process and increasing access to the University of California by opening the doors to a larger number of California students from every high school in the state. BOARS members spent considerable time on outreach to community groups explaining the policy and its expected impact.

In June, BOARS submitted a report on the [effectiveness of comprehensive review](#) from 2003 to 2009 to the Regents and, at the request of President Yudof, also completed a special report on holistic review admissions procedures.

Council also [rejected](#) a proposal to include earth, environmental and space sciences in the language of the Area 'd' laboratory science admissions requirement after being reviewed systemwide.

## **GRADUATE EDUCATION**

In November, Council wrote a [letter](#) to President Yudof expressing concern about the impact of graduate student fee increases on students and academic departments and requested that the Regents reconsider fee increases. While this did not occur, the Working Groups of the Commission on the Future recommended that graduate students be shielded from future fee increases. CCGA also produced a [white paper](#) on the contributions of graduate students to research at the University of California.

In June, CCGA and UCPB commented on proposals for new professional degree fees and principles which should guide the approval or disapproval of such fees.

Council also authorized a new degree title, the Master of Professional Accountancy (M.P.Ac.).

## **UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION**

In February, Council [responded to the report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force](#) based on a systemwide review of the report. Council supported the principle that any new campus-wide forms of assessment must remain under the control of the faculty, but was concerned that implementing assessment programs will be a burden on faculty time, and may not be feasible at a time of widespread budget reductions.

In May, Council [endorsed a pilot program](#) initiated through the Office of the President to create and evaluate online courses to ensure academic quality, contingent on the receipt of outside funding. In July, Council endorsed the [report of the Senate Special Committee on Remote and Online Instruction and Residency](#), which was revised based on comments received via systemwide review. The report's conclusions and eight recommendations reflect the same sense of caution coupled with a willingness to proceed that the Academic Council expressed in its endorsement of the online learning pilot project.

## **EDUCATION ABROAD PROGRAM (EAP)**

In 2008-09 a Joint Senate-Administrative Task Force convened to create a new business plan for EAP. The Task Force issued its report in June 2009, which recommended establishing a governance committee with Senate participation charged with devising a viable budget.

In November, Council [requested](#) that the position description for the UOEAP Executive Director be changed to require that an academic administrator who could qualify for a tenured faculty position on a UC campus be appointed and that it be reclassified at the at the level of a Dean (Associate Dean) or Vice Provost. In February, Council requested that the Chair or Vice Chair of the Academic Council be appointed to serve as Co-Chair of the EAP Governing Committee with the Provost in order to reaffirm that EAP is an academic program, appropriately overseen by faculty as part of the Senate's responsibility for courses and curricula. This request was denied.

In March, Council submitted its [comments](#) on the systemwide review of the report of the Joint Task Force on EAP. It reemphasized that EAP is an academic program that should remain under faculty oversight. The Senate's principal concerns about the restructuring of EAP focused on the composition and reporting lines of the EAP Governing Committee, fees, reciprocity students, and course-by-course articulation.

## **RESEARCH ISSUES**

As noted above, Council formally objected to the decision to preclude campuses from implementing furloughs on instructional days because it undermines recognition of research as one of the three principal responsibilities of the faculty and distinctive mission of the University.

In April, Council unanimously endorsed the recommendations of a joint UCORP-UCPB report on the University's [indirect cost recovery](#) practices. The report recommended that UC review its current ICR model and make changes to it, including negotiating higher rates with federal agencies, reexamining the University's waiver policy for other funding sources, and increasing efficiencies.

The Academic Council found that the 2009 review of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources was not as rigorous as expected. Accordingly, Council asked the committees on Planning and Budget and Research Policy to develop [metrics that could guide future reviews](#) and the Division's strategic planning process. Council requested a response from DANR by November 2010 and recommended that this response be used as a benchmark for DANR's next five year review.

In July, Council requested that \$5M in uncommitted laboratory fee income be used to fund a small research grant competition or that the money be used as one-time funding for Graduate Student Health Insurance Programs, rather than to fund salaries of DOE employees with visiting appointments.

## **GOVERNANCE**

In March, Council issued a letter to the president communicating its understanding of the role of [consultation](#) and the forms it should take in the exercise of shared governance. In light of the budgetary crisis and the decisions that may shape the future of the University, Council offered a set of guidelines for meaningful consultation.

In July, after a two-year review, Council approved revisions updating the Compendium, which outlines review processes for academic programs, units and research units. It will be forwarded to the administration for approval.

In June, Council recommended the establishment of a systemwide joint Senate-Administrative Task Force to pursue efficiencies in the compliance programs required by the University. It also recommended the establishment of parallel campus-based task forces to review the mandating authorities and justification, cost, design, and implementation of compliance efforts.

## **SENATE TASK FORCES AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

Senate members participated on the following task forces and special committees:

- Special Committee of the Academic Senate on Remote and Online Instruction and Residency
- Task Force on Academic Senate Membership
- Joint Senate/Administrative Task Force on Revising the Compendium
- Joint Senate-Administrative Task Force on the Education Abroad Program
- President's Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits

## **REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROPOSALS AND INITIATIVES**

In January, the Council wrote to President Yudof strongly opposing [differential fees](#) by major. Although it was removed from the September Regents' agenda, Council initiated a systemwide review of the issue in anticipation that it would be a topic of consideration by the UC Commission on the Future. Council objected to the proposal because it was not adequately supported by data or sufficient information about implementation, could potentially erect barriers that will prevent students, particularly students from low-income families, from selecting certain majors, and would be a major departure from UC's "one University" tradition.

Council also reviewed proposed new [policies for Senior Management Group](#) personnel on absence from work, including transition leave, outside professional activities, and responded to proposed technical changes to the patent policy.

As noted above, Council endorsed a pilot program on online learning initiated by the Office of the President.

## **REVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MANUAL (APM)**

Council reviewed and commented on the following changes to the APM:

- Technical revisions to APMs 015, Part II; 036-0; 140-33-b; 160, Appendix A; 230-20-h; 220-4-b; 310-317-c
- Revisions to APMs 241, 246, 245, 633, 242, 630 and 632 clarifying the role of faculty administrators.

## **SENATE BYLAWS**

- The Assembly repealed SR 764, which had limited credit in special study courses to five units per term for undergraduates.
- The Assembly amended Senate Bylaw 140, B 4 and Bylaw 335, A 2 to conform with newly approved language in the University's non-discrimination policy by including sexual orientation and gender identity.

## **RELATIONS WITH OTHER GOVERNING BODIES**

### Joint Administrative/Senate Retreat

The Academic Council meets in alternate years with the Chancellors and with the Executive Vice Chancellors to discuss matters of joint concern. This year, Council members met with the Chancellors to discuss: 1) ethics and industry support for research; 2) shared governance and administrative-faculty relations; 3) community relations; and 4) program disestablishment and review.

### The Regents

The Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair executed their roles as faculty representatives to The Regents throughout the year, acting in an advisory capacity on Regents' Standing Committees, and to the Committee of the Whole. Regent Gould attended the February Council meeting.

### ICAS

Chair Powell also chaired the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates, a group representing the faculty Senates of the California Community Colleges, California State University, and the University of California. The group was particularly active in advocacy efforts in the state capitol, joining forces, along with student leaders, to make multiple visits to legislators and other policymakers. The Senate chairs also testified at several hearings convened by the Joint Committee on the Master Plan, chaired by Assemblyman Ira Ruskin. ICAS also continued its coordination to improve the transfer process, agreeing to convene faculty across the segments in particular pilot disciplines to try to agree on content for major preparation courses. It approved updated competency statements for the mathematics skills expected of high school applying to California colleges, agreed to form a committee to update the science competency statements, and agreed to form a task force to reexamine the Area 'b' (English) admissions requirements in 2010-11.

## **SENATE POSITIONS ON STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATION**

- After consultation with BOARS, UCAAD and UCEP, the Senate urged the University to remain neutral on AB 2047, which would authorize UC and CSU to consider "race, gender, ethnicity, national origin, geographic origin, and household income, along with other relevant factors" in undergraduate and graduate admissions "so long as no preference is given" because it would be difficult to implement, as written.
- The Senate opposed AB 2302 in its original form, which would have required the creation of a California community college (CCC) transfer degree and guarantee third year status at UC or CSU, and SB 1440, which would create an AA transfer degree in a student's field for completing the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) or another

transfer pathway. Senate representatives met with legislative advocates and provided substitute language more acceptable to the Senate that was accepted and amended into the bill.

- The Senate urged the University to strongly oppose AB 2400, which would authorize the Grossmont-Cuyamaca, San Diego, and San Mateo County Community College Districts to establish baccalaureate degree pilot programs.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We express our sincere gratitude to all members of the University of California Office of the President for their hard work and productive collaboration with the Academic Senate over the past year. In particular, we thank these senior UC managers who, as consultants to the Academic Council, were vital to our meetings: Mark G. Yudof, President; Provost and Executive Vice President Lawrence Pitts; Executive Vice President-Business Operations Nathan Brostrom; and Associate Vice President-Policy and Analysis Marsha Kelman.

Henry Powell, Chair  
Daniel Simmons, Vice Chair

### **Divisional Chairs:**

Christopher Kutz, Berkeley  
Robert Powell, Davis  
Judith Stepan-Norris, Irvine  
Robin Garrell, Los Angeles  
Martha Conklin, Merced  
Anthony Norman, Riverside  
William Hodgkiss, San Diego  
Elena Fuentes-Afflick, San Francisco  
Joel Michaelsen, Santa Barbara  
Lori Kletzer and Susan Gillman, Santa Cruz

### **Senate Committee Chairs:**

Sylvia Hurtado, BOARS  
Farid Chehab, CCGA  
Ines Boechat, UCAAD  
Alison Butler, UCAP  
Keith Williams, UCEP  
Shane White, UCFW  
Gregory Miller, UCORP  
Peter Krapp, UCPB

### **Council Staff:**

Martha Winnacker, Executive Director  
Todd Giedt, Associate Director  
Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst