

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting**  
**Wednesday, October 23, 2013**  
**and**  
**Wednesday, October 30 Teleconference**

**I. Senate Officers' Announcements**

- 1. ICAS Meeting.** The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) is in charge of implementing SB 1052 and in accordance with the legislation, has appointed members to the California Open Educational Resources Council (COERC), an oversight committee comprising three faculty members from each segment, to identify existing open access online textbooks that could be used across the segments. CSU will host the database of these resources, building upon their existing catalog, MERLOT. No funding was allocated last year to support this effort. Consistent with the legislation, ICAS has submitted a proposal to the Hewlett Foundation for \$275K. If funded, the state will match.
- 2. Little Hoover report.** Chair Jacob brought the Little Hoover report ("A New Plan for A New Economy: Reimagining Higher Education") to the attention of Council.
- 3. Enrollment Issues Workgroup update.** Chair Jacob reported that a group of faculty and administrators has been meeting informally to discuss issues related to enrollment. While the group will not issue a report, their discussions should inform discussions of the long-range enrollment plan this year.
- 4. November 12 Hearing of Assembly Higher Education Committee.** BOARS chair George Johnson will represent the Senate at this hearing which will focus on transfer.
- 5. Graduate Education Item at November Regents Meeting.** Chair Jacob said that he and Provost Dorr will make a presentation to the Regents on doctoral education at the November Regents meeting.

**II. Approval of the agenda**

**ACTION:** The agenda was approved as noticed.

**III. Consent Calendar**

**ACTION:** The consent calendar was unanimously approved as noticed.

**IV. Preparation for Conversation with President**

**DISCUSSION:** Council members suggested issues to raise with the president and focused on a strategy for responding to the Moreno report, which addressed shortcomings in the way that claims by faculty at UCLA regarding racial discrimination are handled.

**V. Report of the President's Privacy and Information Security Steering Committee**

**DISCUSSION:** The report of the President's Privacy and Information Security Steering Committee was issued last January. It made four recommendations: establish privacy values and principles and a balancing process for accountability; establish privacy and information security boards at each campus; establish a systemwide privacy board; and designate a campus privacy official. The report was sent to President Yudof and he endorsed the privacy principles and the idea of designating a campus privacy officer, although he noted it does not have to be a new position. While he did not endorse the creation of new boards, he suggested that existing joint Senate-administration groups on campuses could absorb this responsibility. He did not address the notion of establishing a systemwide privacy board. Council did not find a formal review of the report to be necessary, but asked that the Senate be engaged as governance initiatives are developed. The report will be posted on the systemwide Senate website as a resource.

## **VI. Metrics Work Group**

**ISSUE:** SB 195, which was signed into law last session, requires that UC report on certain performance metrics. Provost Dorr has requested Senate input on metrics that can be used over time to reflect UC's commitment to quality.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Jacob stated that two groups at UC are already working on producing metrics; he will request the data that has been generated thus far. The Provost plans on forming a single committee to discuss this, and Senate representatives will join that group, but Chair Jacob suggested that the Senate group should meet together first. A member suggested mining the data produced for WASC reviews. Another member noted that the metrics should reflect the fundamental difference between UC as a research institution and CSU.

## **VII. Consultation with UCOP Leadership**

President Napolitano. President Napolitano said that the UC presidency is an interesting, exciting, and challenging job and she looks forward to working with the Academic Council as representatives of the faculty in shared governance. President Napolitano said that the opportunity to lead the largest, most prestigious public university in the nation was too good to pass up. She noted that as governor of Arizona from 2003 to 2009 she fought for higher education in a state with a similar youthful and diverse population. Her experience as the Secretary of Homeland Security, a department with 22 agencies, many of which have their own heads, is similar in structure to UC with its president, ten Chancellors, and three national laboratories. She has met with faculty, students and administrators on a listening tour of the campuses and is beginning to formulate ideas about things UC can achieve and how it can meet the challenges of the current environment.

President Napolitano said that the Moreno report is troubling and needs to be considered from a systemwide perspective and must involve an examination of Senate and administrative structures for handling such incidents and ensure that consequences are real. She has asked the Chancellors to report on their existing campus policies. She also called for the formation of a Senate-administration working group to gather information about the process for handling complaints, as well as consequences, consider the three major recommendations of the Moreno report, and critically examine the faculty diversity pipeline. Chair Jacob replied that the Council has discussed ways in which the Senate can respond to the report. Divisional chairs related some best practices used on their campuses, such as training diversity officers in every department and including

diversity in departmental strategic plans. Ensuring that diversity is considered in recruitment, hiring, retention, and mentoring and creating networks of support are also important. Other mechanisms could include assigning a liaison from campus Affirmative Action and Diversity committees to Privilege and Tenure committees, and requiring that an annual diversity report be submitted to the local Affirmative Action and Diversity committee. A member emphasized that administrators at all levels should be trained in diversity and be held accountable to proactively enhance diversity. He noted that ultimately, the responsibility for any consequences rests with the administration. Provost Dorr said she would summarize ongoing efforts to improve diversity, including analysis of how to implement APM 210, the campus salary equity plans, and the recommendations regarding faculty from the President's Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion. President Napolitano thanked Council for a substantive discussion. She would like the working group to issue a report by the end of the calendar year. Chair Jacob added that he has asked UCAAD, UCAP and UCP&T to review the Moreno report and send comments to him. In addition, he has asked the division chairs to meet with their Chancellors.

EVP Brostrom. EVP Brostrom reported that a proposed UC budget for 2014-15 will be presented to the Regents in November. The budget request includes 5% growth, as previously promised, funding for the state portion of UCRP, and funds for enrollment growth. He also aims to have Proposition 30 energy efficiency funds allocated to UC to help with projects such as replacing HVAC systems.

Provost Dorr. Provost Dorr said she and Chair Jacob will give a presentation on doctoral education to the Regents in November. She is also working on a presentation for the January Regents meeting on academic performance indicators. She noted that both the Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition and Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Program policies will go out for review soon. The window for online course proposals through ILTI is currently open, and the spring semester/winter quarter will be a trial period for cross-campus student enrollment for some online courses. The total remuneration study for ladder rank faculty will be done this year. Other projects she is working on include implementing the Open Access policy, beginning long range enrollment planning, monitoring the negotiated salary trial program, following up on the campus salary equity plans, and finishing the campus climate survey.

## **VIII. Debt Restructuring**

**ISSUE:** Council was briefed on the restructuring of UC's lease revenue bond debt.

**DISCUSSION:** EVP Brostrom stated that the state shifted debt service for lease revenue bonds for UC capital improvement projects to the University budget, which will enable UC to refinance the debt at a lower rate and use the resulting savings this year to fund the increase in the employer contribution to UCRP, as required by the budget bill language. The original goal was to save \$80M for 10 years beginning this fiscal year. In July the Regents Committee on Finance approved restructuring \$2.4B and UCOP engaged with the State Public Works Board, Department of Finance and State Treasurer's office. Sandra Kim, Executive Director of Capital Markets Finance, gave a presentation on the restructuring. She said they launched the transaction during the week of September 25 and achieved \$100M in revenue per year. All of that savings will be redirected to UCRP, as directed by AB94. In the future, these funds will provide UC with the flexibility to finance capital projects without needing to ask the state to issue bonds.

## **IX. Executive Session**

*Minutes were not taken for this part of the meeting.*

**ACTION:** Council authorized Chair Jacob to write a letter to the president regarding UC Care.

**ACTION:** Council authorized Chair Jacob to write a letter to the president regarding Composite Benefit Rates.

## **X. Executive Session**

*Minutes were not taken for this part of the meeting.*

## **XI. Public Polling Survey**

**ISSUE:** Council was briefed on the results of a survey about perceptions of the University commissioned by UCOP's External Relations and Communications office.

**DISCUSSION:** Jason Simon, Director of Marketing and Communications Services, gave an overview of a telephone survey of 10,000 alumni and 2,000 non-alumni California voters regarding their perceptions of the University. He stated that UC's marketing efforts have been episodic, at both the systemwide and campus levels. This is the second year the survey has been conducted, providing some longitudinal data, and UCOP intends to continue to administer the survey in future years. General questions, as well as questions that are specific to each campus, are asked. This year, more voters and alumni are feeling positive about the University than last year and there is more agreement that UC is a good value and is connected to the everyday lives of Californians. Questions address familiarity with the UC system, whether UC is a good value, whether it affects people's lives, attitudes toward UC research, and what state budget priorities should be. It also includes open-ended questions that ask survey respondents to define quality. Overall, support for the system and individual campuses, as well as of the research UC conducts, is high. Challenges identified include negative perceptions of the cost of tuition and a weak understanding of the connection of UC to people's lives. UCOP has briefed the campus Communications and Alumni Directors on the initial results and will do a thorough analysis and presentation of the data for any campus that requests it. Campuses can use the data to inform their communications and fundraising strategies. A member asked if there is data on UC's public comparators. Director Simon replied that while the survey firm can provide some general comparative data, proprietary data from specific universities is not available. He stated that his unit is still analyzing the data and plans to present it to the Chancellors at their meeting in December. After that, they will make the data and analysis available to the campuses.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm

Attest: Bill Jacob, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Principal Committee Analyst

## **Minutes of October 30 Teleconference**

### **I. Approval of the Agenda**

**ACTION:** The agenda was approved as noticed

### **II. ILTI and Cross-Campus Enrollment**

**ISSUE:** The Irvine division submitted a letter raising concerns with cross-campus enrollment in the ILTI pilot project.

**DISCUSSION:** The Irvine division raised concerns about the ILTI cross-campus enrollment pilot project in response to a letter sent to the campuses by Provost Dorr. The division is concerned that the pilot is creating a precedent for cross-campus collaboration without having thought through issues of student privacy, faculty academic freedom, and the allocation of teaching credit. Chair Jacob clarified that there is no requirement that any given course be approved for major or GE credit. The provost's aim is to facilitate cross-campus enrollment for select courses in order to identify obstacles to making cross-campus enrollment work smoothly and to find empirical answers to questions about approval processes for major credit, workload credit, and allocation of costs. In addition, for a single pilot year, ILTI will provide financial support to cover the incremental costs of offering a limited number of online courses to UC undergraduates at other UC campuses. UCEP Chair Tim Labor stated that UCEP is working on guidelines for a lean approval process for systemwide courses, without a strict articulation requirement. He hopes to have Council consider the proposal at its next meeting. A member raised concerns that students will not be able to register, given that the online registration hub is not yet activated. A division chair noted that although there are no formal articulation agreements between campuses, a network of articulation officers and counselors across departments perform this function informally. Division chairs at several campuses said they have a similar process and that faculty sit on the committees that determine whether courses offered at other UC campuses meet local requirements and what type of credit students should receive for completing these courses. Chair Jacob asked the division chairs to investigate with their Undergraduate Councils the extent to which their Senates engage in this type of work, noting that we may have better processes in place than previously realized.

### **III. Joint Senate-Administration Work Group on Recommendations of the Moreno Report**

**ISSUE:** Council discussed how to meet the president's request for a joint Senate-administration work group to respond to the recommendations of the Moreno report.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Jacob stated that the president sent a letter requesting three Senate representatives for the joint work group, in addition to him. He suggested appointing the chairs of UCAAD, UCAP and UCP&T, but noted that there would be no division chair on the work group. A member suggested that each UCAAD representative should meet with the division chair and the staff person in charge of discrimination cases to provide input from the divisional perspective to the work group. Chair Jacob stated that the Chancellors are meeting on November 6 and are tasked with outlining campus processes for handling complaints; he has asked for copies of any materials they produce. Council will discuss its progress at its next meeting.

**IV. Draft letter on UC Care**

**ACTION: Council approved the draft letter on UC Care.**

**V. Draft Letter on Composite Benefit Rates**

**ACTION: Council approved the draft letter on Composite Benefit Rates, with some amendments.**

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 am

Attest: Bill Jacob, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Principal Committee Analyst