

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Approved Minutes of the Meeting
March 30-31, 2005

I. Chair's Announcements
George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair

General Announcements. Chair Blumenthal announced that Sr. Vice-President Joe Mullinix and Vice-President Larry Hershman were unavailable to attend the meeting.

Business and Finance Statement of Core Values. The revision to the Statement of Core Values should be completed by the end of this week. The Council Chair will circulate the revised draft to Council members after he and UCFW Chair Oakley review it. They will insist that there be nothing in the Statement that supersedes the Faculty Code of Conduct.

Action: Chair will circulate the revised Statement of Core Values to Council members for review.

March Regents Meeting. 1) **Health Sciences Planning:** Vice President Michael Drake made a presentation on California's future workforce needs in each of the health professions taught by UC, and UC's role in meeting those needs. 2) **Pension issues:** There was an extensive discussion on several pension plan issues in closed session, including the question of when contributions to UCRP might be expected to resume and plans for how those might be implemented. Options for how UC might convert some or all of its employees from a Defined Benefit Plan to a Defined Contribution Plan or Hybrid Plan were also discussed. The regents' position at this time is that they are not prepared to move in the direction of changing UC's Retirement Plan, independent of what may be required by state pension reforms.

CSU Plenary Meeting. Chair Blumenthal recently addressed the CSU plenary meeting. The CSU Provost devoted his address to supporting CSU applied doctorate programs. For his part, Chair Blumenthal's remarks were focused on the issues that UC and CSU have in common, including the decline in student/faculty ratio, salaries for faculty and staff, funding for graduate education, and the threat to their respective pension systems. Chair Blumenthal made note of the UC Senate's responsibility in setting admission policy and emphasized its role in reviewing and approving graduate degrees, which provides quality assurance for UC's graduate programs.

ICAS Meeting. ICAS discussed the WASC issue, which was raised last fall by the UC Senate leadership. ICAS passed a motion to undertake a review of the effectiveness of WASC and the extent to which the organization represents the faculty perspective. The CAN system was also discussed. This is an intersegmental course articulation numbering system that was established some fifteen years ago. CSU and CCC were avid participants in CAN, but UC never adopted the system because it was believed to be ineffective. Recently the CSU system decided to pull out of CAN, withdrawing all of its financial and administrative support. The CSU plans to develop an internal numbering system, which will link the various CSU campuses but which will be independent of the other segments. CCC is now the only participant in CAN.

Legislative Update – Authority for CSU to Award Doctorates (Scott Bill). The Scott bill will be heard in committee on April 13, when Provost Greenwood is scheduled to testify. UC has officially taken an oppose position on this bill. The provost has established two subcommittees to deal with the applied doctorate issue. One is focused on the issues pertaining to the applied doctorate in audiology and the second will deal with more general issues of graduate education, including practitioner doctorates and the appropriate role for UC.

Council Vice-Chair Brunk's Announcement on Regents' Annual Dinner. The regents will not hold its annual dinner for members of the Academic Council this year. Instead, a gala dinner will be scheduled sometime in mid-September to which both the 04/05 and 05/06 Council members will be invited.

Symposium on Civic and Academic Engagement Scheduled for June 10 and 11. This symposium is an initiative of Student Regent Anderson. The focus will be on how UC can become more involved in civic activities. Vice-Chair Brunk urged Council members to attend.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The Academic Council approved the following items:

1. Minutes of the January 26, 2005 meeting
2. Minutes of the February 23, 2005 meeting
3. Draft Agenda for the May 11, 2005 Assembly Meeting

Action: The Academic Council received the following items for filing and web posting:

1. Final Report of the University of California Faculty Outreach Conference

III. BOARS' Report

Michael Brown, BOARS Chair

BOARS Chair Brown announced that the committee had completed its white paper on eligibility and admissions. This is the first of several white papers that BOARS plans to prepare on admissions-related themes that are intended to serve an educational function for the greater UC community. The white paper on admission by exception (AbyE) will be completed in time for the June meeting of Council. Currently BOARS is studying the role of AP and Honors courses in the admission process, and also considering the soundness of the National Merit Scholarship Program's selection procedures. Chair Brown distributed a handout containing a chronology of media clips of recent BOARS' actions on this issue.

Action: BOARS Chair Brown will make available to any interested Council member, Professor Walter Haney's study on the National Merit Scholarship Program.

Action: On behalf of BOARS, Chair Brown moved that the Academic Council receive for filing and web posting, the committee's white paper on eligibility and admissions.

The Academic Council agreed by unanimous consent to accept the white paper.

The Academic Council suggested that when the BOARS white papers are completed, they be compiled in compendium form so that this information is easily accessible to Systemwide and Divisional Senate leaders, campus admissions committees and all UC faculty. So that the compendium stays highly visible, it should be posted on the BOARS' web page, and regularly referenced in the *Senate Source*. The compendium should also be circulated to the regents, as an informational item. In addition to the compendium, it was suggested that BOARS might also consider developing a handbook on admissions for use by campus admissions committees.

IV. Proposed Policy on Recordings of Courses

Issue: At the February meeting, Council discussed the Systemwide Committees' responses on the draft policy on Recordings of Courses. At this meeting, the Council considered the Divisional responses and finalized its recommendation letter to Office of the President (OP) Administration.

Discussion: The Academic Council concluded that certain changes in the Proposed Policy on Recordings of Courses were necessary before it could support the proposal. For example, there is a need to address the unauthorized distribution of course lectures, particularly by commercial lecture notes businesses. The specific concerns and suggested modifications that were raised by

the Senate reviewers were included in a draft letter (agenda enclosure 5), which was intended to form the basis of Council's response to OP Administration. Council members asked that a number of revisions be made to the letter.

Action: A motion to approve the letter as amended was passed. The revised letter will be circulated to Council members for review and approval before it is sent forward.

V. Draft Policy on Excess Units Fee

Issue: The compact with the governor specifies that state funding will not be provided to support an undergraduate student whose credit units exceed a specified threshold above the minimum necessary to complete the baccalaureate. The threshold articulated by the governor's staff is 110 percent of the units needed to graduate. Both CSU and UC have been asked to develop Excess Units Fee policies to implement this mandate. At the February meeting, Council discussed the Systemwide Committees' responses on UC's draft policy. At this meeting, the Council considered the Divisional responses and finalized its response letter to OP administration.

Discussion: Members of the Academic Council were in unanimous agreement not to endorse this policy on the grounds that it was poor educational policy and, if implemented, would have adverse educational consequences for the University. However, should UC be required to implement this state mandate, the Academic Council recommended that it do so in a way that would be the least harmful to the University's educational mission. With that in mind, the Academic Council strongly recommended that the draft policy be revised to exclude specific student categories that in Council's view would be adversely affected by this policy. The Council also recommended that UC act in parallel with the CSU and not implement the Excess Units Fee Policy for at least three years while an assessment of its true effects can be completed.

Action: A motion to endorse the draft letter, as amended, was made and passed. The revised letter will be circulated to Council members for review and comment before it is submitted to OP administration.

Action: If this policy is brought before the regents, the Academic Council agreed that the Council Chair and Vice-Chair were free to distribute Council's letter and/or the divisional and committee response letters to the regents prior to their meeting.

VI. Faculty/Senior Management (Executive Salaries)

Issue: In 1995 and again in 2000, the Academic Council issued a report on executive salary levels at UC. The 1995 report included a recommendation that salaries of senior managers be tied to UC faculty salaries; and the 2000 report recommended that executive raises be based on performance, that merit reviews be instituted, and that the planned raises for senior management not be implemented until such time as faculty salaries are comparable to national levels. This past December, the Council again discussed this issue and reached general agreement that the Senate should be involved to the greatest extent possible in salary decisions affecting executive management. At this meeting, the Council continued its discussion of this issue.

Action: The Academic Council voted to form a sub-group to explore possible options and recommend strategies that would enable the Council to effectively address the executive compensation issue, based on the recommendations contained in Council's 1995 and 2000 reports. Council members Simmons, Yuen, Galloway and Oakley volunteered to serve on the group. Member Oakley agreed to act as chair.

Action: The sub-group was asked to provide Council with an update at the April or May meeting, and submit its final recommendations at the June 22 meeting.

Action: Council Chair Blumenthal will request information on UC's executive salary compensation from the Office of Business and Finance.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President – Senior Managers

- **Robert C. Dynes, President**
- **M.R.C. Greenwood, Provost and SVP**
- **Bruce Darling, SVP-University Affairs**

Senior Vice President Mullinix and Vice President Hershman were not available to attend the meeting.

President Dynes

Regents Meeting. President Dynes reported that Provost Greenwood had made an excellent presentation to the regents on UC financial aid policies. Among other things, it articulated the fact that most UC students are not burdened with unmanageable debt.

State Budget. UC has been receiving assurances that the compact with the governor will be honored. The university is continuing to work on securing funding for its academic preparation programs.

Federal Research Funding. Increasingly, federal research dollars are being tied to “pork” initiatives, as opposed to peer-based grants. This is a major concern for UC, and the university will need to develop a strategy on how to deal with this trend.

Health Sciences Planning. Vice President Michael Drake has prepared a study on California's workforce needs in each of the health professions taught by UC, and UC's role in meeting those needs. It is becoming more difficult for California to attract health professionals from other states, and the state will therefore need to begin producing its own professionals. This could mean that UC should begin planning for another medical school. The health sciences planning report will be submitted to the Long-Range Guidance Team. Similar assessments of other instructional areas are planned.

Strategic Sourcing. It is projected that joint acquisitions have the potential of saving the university many millions of dollars. The Office of Business and Finance continues to explore ways to maximize on this cost savings potential.

Update on the National Labs.

LBNL: DOE's decision on the LBNL contract is expected within the next few weeks.

LANL: Lockheed Martin has announced its intention to compete for the LANL contract. In its attempt to stimulate competition for the contract, the DOE has raised the management fee by a sizable margin from that currently paid to UC. UC has formed a scientific research partnership with the New Mexico universities, since UC's main mission at the labs has been and will continue to be science and technology research.

UC Faculty Honors and Awards. Of the eight National Medal of Science Awards, three were awarded to UC faculty, and ten UC faculty were elected to the National Academy of Engineering.

Provost Greenwood

CSU Applied Doctorates. CSU has made its case for offering doctorate degrees in part on changes in the accreditation requirements of audiologist training programs from the master's degree to the doctorate. Currently UCSD, through the School of Medicine, and San Diego State University offers a joint doctorate in audiology. A UC task force formed to assess the real needs

in this area concurred that the accreditation requirements are such that it is academically appropriate to invite additional collaborations between other UC Schools of Medicine and the six CSU campuses currently offering masters degrees in audiology. Provost Greenwood will convene a joint administrative/senate task force to identify potential licensure and accreditation changes, as well as market demand that will require new applied doctorates, starting with the allied health fields. The task force will also consider various mechanisms for delivering these programs and the appropriate role for UC.

Use of Financial Aid. BOARS has requested an evaluation of UC's use of financial aid funding for National Merit Scholarships. This request will be forwarded to the Education Financing group for an analysis of UC's practices as well as those of other institutions. Provost Greenwood will share the report with the Academic Council when it is completed.

Science and Math Initiative. Efforts to secure funding for the Science and Math Initiative are underway. UC's industry partners have expressed their interest in this program. To develop the programs, the initiative will require the involvement of up to 80 faculty members. To date, every faculty member who has been asked to participate has responded with enthusiasm. Currently, UC produces about 250 science and math teachers. The goal of this initiative is for UC to increase that number to one thousand.

Senior Vice President Darling

Federal Budget. Senior Vice President Darling noted that the president wanted to cut the federal deficit in half by 2009. This translates to significant cuts in domestic discretionary spending, which will affect research agency budgets. Those are expected to remain flat or be slightly decreased. This could create a challenging situation for faculty who are competing for federal research dollars.

Private Support for UC. For the first half of this fiscal year, UC has received about \$650+ million. This is an increase of about 12 percent over last year.

State Issues. UC will be making a major effort to secure funding for its academic preparation program through its *Get Active* advocacy campaign. Other advocacy efforts will be undertaken on behalf of the UC-sponsored bill to change the disclosure requirements in the California Information Act for private equity investment. This would allow UC's endowment and pension plans to have access to private equity funds. UC has reached agreement with the California Newspaper Publishers on what the University would be obliged to disclose. This could be helpful in enabling UC to once again have access to these investments. The Senate Subcommittee on Higher Education chaired by Senator Scott will hold an informational hearing on UC Labor Relations on April 7. UC is continuing its discussions with the governor's office and the DOF on pension reform. Those discussions are going well.

Confidential Information on Laptops. The recent incident at UCB where a laptop containing the private data of 98,000 individuals was stolen from an administrative office has raised major concerns at the state and federal levels about how UC handles confidential information.

Action: Sr. Vice President Darling asked Council members to take the message back to their campus faculties that confidential information or private data should not be stored on laptop computers.

Following their briefings, the senior management took questions from the floor on a range of issues, including congressional marking of research funds, the long-term academic and financial implications of the applied doctorate legislation, if enacted, and the feasibility of systemwide construction contracts for faculty housing. The following actions resulted from that session:

Action: The Academic Council suggested that the Office of the President take the lead in heading off potential problems that could arise on the campuses from Israeli/Palestinian issues. President Dynes agreed that it would be prudent for OP to issue a statement to the general university community on this matter.

Action: In response to a request from the Academic Council on where members could obtain information on UC's academic preparation programs, Provost Greenwood suggested that Council members contact UC's Interim Head of Student Affairs, Winston Dolby.

VIII. Shared Governance Issues

Issue 1. Memo to UCM Chancellor on Support for a Divisional Senate Office. The Academic Council was asked to review and approve a memo to the UC Merced Chancellor regarding the basic resources the campus will need to support a UCM Division, and to decide whether the Assembly should be asked to endorse the letter as part of its approval process for UCM to become a Division.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to approve a draft letter to the UCM Chancellor on the resources needed to establish and support a Division of the UC Academic Senate. In a 15 to 0 vote, with 2 abstentions, the Academic Council approved the draft letter, as amended in discussion. The letter will be modified as follows:

- Clarify that the approval of UCM's proposal to become a division will be conditional on:
1) UCM meeting the minimum resource requirements, as listed on page 2 and re-ordered according to importance, with the full time MSP-level Director appearing first on the list; and 2) UCM having reached an agreement, in writing, with the Academic Council on a timeline for when and how it expects to reach the recommended funding levels to support a divisional operation as outlined in the Academic Council's report, "Framework for Establishing a Divisional Academic Senate Office."

Action: The Academic Council rejected by a wide margin a second motion to approve an alternative letter, which omitted the list of required minimum resources and left open the question of a funding timeline.

Issue 2. Proposed Annual Report on Shared Governance. Chair Blumenthal asked the Academic Council to consider the idea of the Council Chair making an annual report to the President on how shared governance is working on the divisions and at systemwide. This would be an oral report presented to the president at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Council.

Action: The Academic Council unanimously endorsed the idea of an annual report on shared governance, but asked that in addition to the oral report an Executive Summary be prepared that could be distributed to the Council of Chancellors.

Action: An assessment of how shared governance was working on their campuses will be due from the Division Chairs in mid-May, so that the Council Chair can prepare his report in time for the June or July meeting of Council.

IX. Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128

Issue: The Academic Council was asked to finalize its position on a proposed amendment to SB 128 that would require the University Committee on Committees (UCOC) to formally appoint any member of a subcommittee who is not already a member of a Standing Committee of the

Assembly. If the Council approves this amendment, the bylaw change will be placed before the Assembly at its May 2005 meeting.

Introduction: Chair Blumenthal directed Council's attention to a revised version of the proposed amendment to SB 128, Distribution 1. He noted that the language had been redrafted to clarify that task forces were also covered by the amendment. This addition was based on the reviewing committees' request for this clarification. Chair Blumenthal further recommended that the subcommittee of the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) be treated as an additional type of body that would serve in an advisory role to the Systemwide Committee, and whose members would be appointed by the Academic Council Chair. This advisory group designation would be set forth in the Justification for the bylaw change.

Action: The Academic Council voted to approve the redraft of the proposed amendment to SB 128, and endorsed the Chair's recommendation that the subcommittee of the University Committee on Preparatory Education be designated as an advisory body to the Systemwide Committee and that its membership be appointed by the Chair of the Academic Council, as will be set forth in the Justification for the bylaw change.

Action: The proposed amendment to SB 128 will be submitted to the May Assembly for approval.

X. California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs), Proposed Review Process

Issue: Last November, the OP administration forwarded for consideration by the Academic Council a draft of the proposed review process for the Cal ISIs. At that time, the Academic Council asked UCORP, UCPB and CCGA to take the lead in preparing a preliminary Senate response. The three committees completed their review and their recommendations were included in a draft response letter, which the Academic Council was asked to consider and approve for transmittal to OP administration.

Action: The Academic Council unanimously approved the draft letter on the proposed review process for the Cal ISIs, as amended. The letter will be modified to include a request to the provost that she provide clarification on any of the recommendations contained in the letter that she finds unacceptable. The UCORP, UCPB and CCGA review letters will be appended to the letter.

XI. Legislative Rulings

Issue: In accordance with Senate Bylaw 206, the Academic Council was asked to consider and comment on the following two Legislative Rulings:

1. Voting Rights of Non-Senate Faculty in the Academic Personnel Process of Non-Senate Faculty

Action: By unanimous vote, the Academic Council recommended the following proposed modifications to UCR&J's draft Legislative Ruling:

- Strike the last sentence of the draft ruling and replace it with the following sentence, "A department may solicit a recommendation or vote from non-Senate instructional faculty to be used in its deliberations."

Action: The Academic Council Chair will send Council's recommendation to UCR&J.

2. Senate Regulation 904 – Disqualification of Graduate Students

Action: The Academic Council delayed action on UCR&J’s draft ruling until the Council Chair can get clarification on whether Senate Bylaw 30 supersedes Senate Regulation 904.

XII. Restriction of Funding Sources

Issue: At the October meeting, the Academic Council unanimously agreed that the Academic Council’s July 22, 2004 Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources should be distributed for general review to the Systemwide Senate Standing Committees and Divisions. A preliminary discussion of the committees’ responses was held at the February meeting. At this meeting, the Council reviewed the Divisional responses and decided if it was ready to articulate a position on this issue.

Action: Council’s deliberation and final disposition are represented in the following sequence of formal motions and actions:

Motion A: A motion was made and seconded to adopt the revised draft of the Resolution.

Motion B: A motion was made and seconded to amend Motion A to include the insertion of language from the Preamble into the first sentence of the *resolved* section of the Resolution, which would then read: “*Resolved*, That the principles of academic freedom and the policies of the University of California require that individual faculty members and groups of faculty be free to voluntarily accept or refuse research support from any source consistent with their individual judgment and conscience and with University policy”(additions underlined). In a vote of 12 to 4, Council defeated Motion B.

Motion C: A motion was made, seconded, and passed in a vote of 13 to 3 to remove the words “or group of faculty” from the Preamble.

Motion D: A motion was made and seconded to include, verbatim, the last sentence of the Preamble as the last sentence of the *resolved* section. In a vote of 9 to 7, Motion D was defeated.

Motion E: A motion was made and seconded to remove the final sentence of the Preamble and insert it as the second *whereas* clause.

Motion F: A friendly amendment was made to Motion E that would retain the final sentence of the Preamble, and repeat it as the second *whereas* clause. In a vote of 14 to 2, Motion E in its amended form was passed.

Motion G: A motion was made, seconded, to change the term “an individual faculty member” in the Preamble to “individual faculty members” (plural) to be consistent with the language in the *resolved* section. Motion G was passed by majority vote.

Final Action on Motion A: In a vote of 15 in favor with one abstention, the Academic Council adopted the revised Resolution as amended in Motions C, E, and G above.

Action: By majority vote, the Academic Council agreed to forward the approved revised Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources to the May Assembly for its consideration and approval.

XIII. Proposed Updates to the Electronic Communications Policy

Issue: The OP administration has requested Senate comment on the proposed updates to UC’s Electronic Communications Policy.

Action: The Academic Council will consider and formulate a response on the proposed updates at the April meeting.

XIV. UCPB Budget Resolution on the Public Status of the University of California

Issue: The Academic Council considered a request from the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) to endorse its resolution that calls upon the University to convene a joint Senate-Administration Task Force to evaluate the effects on the instruction, research and public

service missions of the increased reliance on private funds, including the long-term implications of the Compact.

Action: By assent, the Academic Council accepted the proposed resolution. Council members did not support the establishment of a task force as proposed by UCPB; however, given that the same issues come under the purview of the administration's Long-Range Guidance Team, Council decided to refer the UCPB resolution to that group.

XV. Assembly Bill 992 – UC-CSU Sponsored Legislation to Amend the California Penal Code to Include UC and CSU Police

Issue: In January 2004, OP administration asked the Academic Council to review and comment on a request from the UC Police Officers Association for UC to sponsor legislation that would allow campus police to use commonly accepted electronic surveillance techniques that are broadly available to other peace officers in the state. At that time, the Academic Council decided by majority vote to defer to the administration on this question, since this was not an academic issue. This past February, a bill (AB 992) jointly sponsored by UC and CSU that would permit electronic surveillance by campus police, was introduced in the Legislature. The Academic Council considered a request from the UCEP Chair to reopen this issue because of concerns he has about the language of the bill.

Discussion: One concern raised was that the bill, as currently written, literally gives the police powers of electronic surveillance to “any officer of the University of California,” which could be interpreted to include a significant number of UC systemwide and campus administrations, such as vice-presidents, deans and chancellors. The same is also true for the CSU.

Action: To prevent any misinterpretation, the Academic Council recommended that AB 992 be amended, as follows, to clearly specify to whom this authority is granted: “...any **police** officer of the University of California, any **police** officer of the California State University...”

Action: Chair Blumenthal will draft a letter to OP administration stating Council's concern and offering the amended language as suggested by the Academic Council.

Action: The Academic Council will continue its discussion of the fundamental issues raised by this proposed legislation at the April meeting.

XVI. Academic Council's Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL)

Cliff Brunk, ACSCONL Chair

Update: UC's proposal for managing the Berkeley lab has gone forward and a decision is anticipated soon. The second draft RFP for management of the Los Alamos lab has been framed to encourage wider competition. UC is still undecided as to whether it will compete for the LANL contract.

XVII. UCPB Proposal for a Graduate and Professional School Aid Steering Committee

Issue: The Academic Council considered a request from UCPB to endorse its recommendation for the establishment of a Graduate and Professional School Aid Steering Committee.

Overview: UCPB believes that it is time for a thorough reconsideration by the Senate and administration of the process and methodology through which support for graduate students, notably return-to-aid, is allocated across the system. At the undergraduate level, a well-defined, transparent process has functioned effectively for some time under the leadership of the Educational Financing Model Steering Committee, an administrative committee on which at least one Senate member and one student sit. UCPB believes that a similar, but expanded structure should be put in place for the allocation of graduate and professional school financial

aid, because the present system lacks transparency and effective collaboration between faculty and administration before allocations are made.

Action: By majority vote, the Academic Council endorsed UCPB's recommendation to establish a Graduate and Professional School Aid Steering Committee, with the provision that it be established on a trial basis as an ad hoc advisory group, which may become a permanent committee.

Action: Chair Blumenthal will notify the provost of this action and ask her to implement the proposal.

XIII. UCEP Update on "Students in Academic Difficulty"

Issue: UCEP asked the campus CEPs to gather information annually on the number of students on academic probation, beginning with this academic year. UCEP will prepare a report for the Academic Council based on the data received.

Action: On behalf of UCEP, Council Chair Blumenthal will send a formal letter of request to Division Chairs for campus information on students in academic difficulty.

XIX. UCAP's Proposed Modifications to APM 220-18

Issue: Last year, the Academic Council asked UCAP to review the APM language on the criteria for advancement from Step V to Step VI and, if necessary and appropriate, recommend changes. UCAP has completed its review and has proposed changes to APM 220-18.

Action: UCAP's proposed modifications to APM 220-18 will be sent out for general Senate review, with a response date that will allow for Council resolution by June of this year.

XX. "Senate Issues/Topics of Concern"

None were raised.

Betty Marton, Policy Analyst
Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst

Attest: George Blumenthal, Chair
Academic Council

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Approved Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the COVC and the Academic Council

March 31, 2005

I. Welcome and Introductions *George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair; M.R.C. Greenwood, Provost; Virginia Hinshaw, EVC at UC Davis and Chair of the COVC.*

Chair Blumenthal welcomed participants to the second biannual joint meeting of the Academic Council and the Council of Executive Vice Chancellors and asked everyone to introduce themselves. He pointed out the three issues discussed at the last the joint meeting: a Senate initiative on phased retirement; university policy on sexual liaisons; and models for the Cal ISI in the context of shared governance, all of which were enlightening discussions that led to progress in policy-making. Each of today's two items will be allotted an hour for presentation and discussion.

Provost Greenwood announced plans to establish a diversity task force that should have its first meeting in the fall. More details on the task force will be forthcoming. She noted that her presentation on graduate education made to the Regents is available on the UCOP website. Although it is not the focus of today's discussion, she offered to answer and questions later relating to the recently formed task force on the issues surrounding CSU's desire to independently grant doctorates.

COVC Chair Hinshaw welcomed the opportunity to have a face to face meeting in which shared values can be recognized and hoped that the meeting would approach an ideal of dynamic focus and passionate engagement.

II. Crisis in Graduate Education *Quentin Williams, CCGA Chair; Daniel Neuman, UCLA EVC/Provost*

The crisis in graduate education at UC is marked by, among other things, a significant decline in foreign student enrollments, under par financial offers to applicants, rising expenses for graduate students. This presentation is aimed at determining whether there are specific and acceptable policy changes that could reverse these trends in the competitiveness of the UC graduate student enterprise.

Daniel Neuman

Undergraduate education can be characterized as a buyer's economy and graduate education as a seller's economy – a difference that is important to keep in mind. Three approaches to achieving adequate support are to: generate more money – the simplest but the most challenging approach; persuade the state of the crucial role graduate education plays both in the delivery of quality undergraduate education and in the state's economy; find new ways of thinking about the resources already available. The last approach, which is the main focus of this presentation, includes:

- Restructuring the return to aid formula so that it better fits with the merit-based nature of graduate education rather than the need-based aid of undergraduate education.
- Strategies for supporting international students:
- Try to achieve resident status for international students, arguing the benefits international students bring by creating cultural diversity at UC, contributing to the state's economy after graduation in the science and technology industries, or as UC trained leaders in their homeland or elsewhere.

- Declare international students residents after one year of study.
- Adopt the IELTS as the language entrance exam.
- Help develop college savings plans in home countries before the students come to UC.
- Work to counteract visa difficulties, both real and perceived.
- Allocate a number of tuition waivers for international students
- Waive fees for TAs or do not charge tuition in the first place.
- Don't tie thinking to the rhetoric of budget, and look at the new models for undergraduate satisfaction.

Quentin Williams

The current crisis is characterized by:

- UC's lack of competitiveness; offers to graduate program applicants are about \$2000 short on the average when compared to offers made by other institutions.
- International student enrollments have declined significantly.
- It is cheaper to hire a post doc than to fund a graduate student.
- Adequate outreach is not in place to compete for the students who are most 'wooded' by top institutions.

Strategies to address the problems include:

- Consider international students residents after one year
- Restructure the return to aid formula
- Increase fund-raising efforts
- Increase state funding and policy-makers' awareness of the importance of graduate education.
- Re-direct existing funds to support graduate education.

Discussion points: Participants discussed the possibilities of using existing resources to support graduate education, with support expressed for the reassignment of TAs as an undergraduate instructional expense. Holding appointments open and using the money for graduate student support was mentioned as another internal way of creating funding internally. Regarding international students, it was suggested that the Regents set lower fees or no fees for international students. It was noted that reallocation strategies would more viable strategies on growth campuses, but not so on the non-growth campuses. The point was made that UC must now look at graduate education issues in the global context, and exchanges and partnering should be developed. Other comments:

- There is a need for data on where fees go, and simulations or models developed for alternate funding strategies.
- A change in the RTA must not be perceived as undergraduate versus graduate education.
- An offer's attractiveness can be based on housing and quality of life, etc, and not solely on the financial package.

III. Strategies to Improve Faculty Diversity *Manuela Martins-Green, UC Riverside Division Chair; Glenn Lucas, UCSB EVC*

Division Chair Martins-Green and EVC Lucas offered a Power Point presentation "Strategies to Improve Faculty Diversity" designed as discussion points on how to improve availability, hiring practices, and effective retention and promotion in order to create a more diverse body of faculty and graduate students at UC. The presentation first outlined historical trends, hiring pools and availability, and assessed UC's success in hiring women and underrepresented minorities (URMs). Elements of successful hiring strategies were highlighted in detail, and the UCI Advance Program described as a possible model for other campuses.

The following points were raised in discussion:

- Departments must be aware of the added service burden on women and URMs.
- How can UC compete with private institutions that can fund effective scouting of quality students?

- The term spousal hiring should be broadened to spousal and partner hiring. This practice is of great value in retention.
- Faculty career development programs are used mostly by women and minorities, and should be strongly supported.
- The role of the department chair is key to the success of many of these strategies.
- Another key element is the selection of search committees.
- Ensuring evaluation of interdisciplinary projects by CAPs.
- A natural pipeline into the departments needs to be developed, which ties in with the intellectual life of the department.

Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst

Attest: George Blumenthal, Chair
Academic Council