

Minutes of Meeting**Wednesday, December 19, 2007****I. Announcements****➤ Michael T. Brown, Academic Council Chair**

- President Dynes and the Chancellors are signatories on an Animal Research Statement that stresses the importance of freedom expression, but makes clear that the University's is opposed to criminal acts directed against animal research.
- January Regents Meeting: The agenda for this meeting includes an appraisal of senior management and a presentation on UCOP work roles by the Monitor Group.
- WASC UCOP Review: Chair Brown has requested a draft copy of this report from WASC. UCOP is also preparing its response to the draft report.
- UC Merced: There is a proposal to be developed to enlist the assistance of senior and emeriti professors across the system to support administrative functions at UC Merced.
- Vice Chair Nominations: These nominations will be finalized by January 4, 2008.

II. Consent Calendar

1. **Approval of the October 31, 2007 Minutes**
2. **Approval of the November 28, 2007 Minutes**
3. **Proposed Regulations Governing Conduct of Non-Affiliates**
ACTION: Council approved the consent calendar.

III. Approval of the Agenda**ACTION: The agenda was approved.****IV. System-wide Senate Review of the Proposed Amendments to SR 636**

In May 2004, UCOPE proposed that the class size for the English language writing requirement (ELWR) courses be reduced to between 15 and 20 students, as many ELWR courses on many campuses were too large by comparison to UC's national competitors and accepted pedagogical practices. [1¹] At the time, then UC Provost Greenwood estimated that \$270,000 in additional funding would be needed to reach this objective. In an August 12, 2004 letter, Council responded to UCOPE, stating that they wanted more information about the effects of the proposed ELWR class size; UCEP was also asked to investigate specific resource implications in reaching this goal. After receiving responses from UCOPE and UCEP in June 2005, Council endorsed the joint UCOPE-UCEP ELWR cap of 20 students and sent it out to the Administration for comments in July 2005. Provost Hume responded that he was unsure about the locus of authority to implement this recommendation however. In light of these comments, Council agreed that a regulation was needed to implement the writing cap; it dictated that courses exceeding the cap would not be approved, which would shift the burden to the campuses. In June 2006, Council asked

¹[1] Only UCB and UCSD met this standard in 2004.

UCOPE/UCEP to draft implementation language for the writing cap in SR 636, as was agreed to in July 2005. In March 2007, UCEP declined to write the regulation's implementation language because it did not want to mandate the cap (the original July 2005 language only recommended the writing cap). Council sent the regulation out for systemwide review, but inadvertently forgot to note that this review only concerned the implementation language. Divisions essentially viewed the regulation as a reconsideration of the entire issue, and they did not agree to the policy as written. Chair Brown proposed that perhaps a motion to rescind the specific implementation language of the regulation imposing the ELWR cap of 20 students.

DISCUSSION: It was noted that the writing cap is not contingent on systemwide funding, as the regulation must be approved before UCOP can provide funding. Members expressed concerns over poor writing skills among undergraduates, opining that communication skills are paramount in today's world. The implementation cost is quite minimal as well; UCOP will need to comply with the regulation if implemented. However, divisions are not in favor of SR 636 because they do not want an unfunded mandate, as there are examples of mandates that were ultimately never funded by UCOP. It was acknowledged that even if UCOP funded the cap, money would simply be diverted from something else. The evidence that smaller classes produce better writers is actually weak as well. A motion was made and seconded to table action on SR 636 indefinitely. One member spoke against the motion on the grounds of the modest costs and argued that it represents a good investment. However, other members added that mitigating class size by legislative/central mandate is the central issue and is wrong. That said, there was general agreement that the names of the tests should be eliminated. Another member remarked that while unfunded mandates are distasteful, it does not seem that campuses have taken any real actions towards reducing class sizes. He added that if the data is sparse, this may mean that more studies need to be completed. **In light of these comments, the motion to table action on SR 636 was withdrawn.** A subsequent motion was made and seconded to send SR 636 forward as written, thereby maintaining the cap. One member spoke against this motion on the grounds that some campuses may already be close to the 20 student cap, suggesting changing the language to "an average of 20 students across the campuses," which was accepted as a friendly amendment. Other members spoke argued that the campuses have specifically stated that they do not want a rigid cap. **The motion failed (five in favor; ten opposed; and one abstention). It was suggested to add the following statement on the pedagogical benefit of small classes in the cover letter, "In principle it readily appreciates the pedagogical advantages of small composition classes, yet in practice it is uneasy about imposing on the system another unfunded mandate, however meritorious. Council therefore strongly encourages the Administration to resolve financial issues involved in limiting all ELWR classes to 20 students."** In the end, Council agreed that it does not want to mandate the cap, but it does sign on to the principle that smaller composition courses are beneficial.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the motion in the agenda, as written, with the addition of the above language in the cover letter and that it be placed on the January Assembly agenda.

V. ACSCOLI Resolution on Limiting UC's Role in Manufacturing Nuclear Weapons

ISSUE: ACSCOLI is asking Council to endorse its resolution and/or send it out for review, which is intended as an advisory document for the President. Vice Chair Croughan presented some background on this issue. It is probably that the Department of Energy (DOE) will request that the Los Alamos National Lab (LANL) to produce 50 to 80 pits per year. The contract does not specify an upper limit on pit production, and binds UC for up to 20 years. The resolution does not specify a particular number given the inherent difficulties in setting a firm number; it states that UC should monitor “the increases in the level of production as well as the increased role of the lab.” language is included that However, lab management and lab representatives have argued that increased pit production means better science.

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that in order to produce nuclear weapons, access to nuclear material is not sufficient; one must also be able to produce perfectly round pits, which is very difficult. Five pits per year seems reasonable for science and/or the maintenance of the technology, but 20-50 pits per year implies warhead replacement. There is a distinction between the activities of ‘designing’ and ‘manufacturing’ nuclear weapons; UC has traditionally been involved in the design of nuclear weapons, but not their manufacture for the stockpile. Vice Chair Croughan commented that the initial resolution specified a number of pits, but it soon became clear that it would be very difficult to determine such a number. One member remarked that it would be a mistake to get caught up in numbers because as technology increases, the number of pits necessary for warhead replacement may decrease as well. The DOE also wants to build the facilities at LANL for producing certifiable pits; in the past, ‘certification’ was not such a significant issue. UC has historically data on how many pits have been produced, but the DOE could classify such data in the future. The onus is on UC to somehow monitor this, and the Senate can request but is not in a position to mandate its enforcement. The resolution should be made more specific by tasking a particular individual (e.g., the President or his/her designate); that person should report back to the Senate annually. Members were also clear however, that simple UC oversight would not ‘cleanse’ pit production for the sole purpose of producing nuclear weapons or warhead replacement. An option to reassess UC's involvement if the level of pit production changes should also be included in the resolution. If information on pit production cannot be accessed, then that in itself should be a trigger for reassessment as well. The lack of a current strategy in terms of how the University will deal with this issue is striking. Most faculty are incredulous that this could play out this way. One member asked what ‘low’ actually means; the suggestion was made to change ‘low’ to ‘that needed for research’ in the last paragraph. From a numbers standpoint, one could make this stronger by using an historical average over the past three or four years. Chair Brown responded that this is why the resolution's language reads “current low levels.”

Members also noted that Rocky Flats, which used to be the pit producing center, is now closed and uninhabitable due to toxic pollution. This speaks to the environmental issues; LANL has not been cleaned in 15 years; the DOE will now be investing in a clean-up and looks to Los Alamos to fulfill its stockpile needs.

It was suggested that a cover letter be drafted to state that UC is now becoming the sole producer of plutonium pits in the United States; take paragraphs one, three, and four, and insert them into this cover letter. In the ‘whereas’ section, shorten paragraphs two, five, six, and seven, making them more concise. It was noted that this resolution needs to stand on its own, so recitals might be preferred over a cover letter. It was also suggested to send the resolution out for systemwide review in order for the divisions to comment on it. Members also discussed the faculty survey that was conducted four years ago. At that time, faculty did support UC’s involvement in the Labs, but was a clear distinction made between designing and building nuclear weapons. It was noted that the survey indicated that the University should be involved in the labs for the scientific reasons, not weapon-making activities. One member wondered if the issue was recast, if the faculty survey today would yield the same results. Chair Brown responded that the survey was conducted at a time when the faculty understood the nature/terms of the contracts with both the limited liability companies that now manage the labs and with the DOE. ASCOLI is considering another survey, but the essential issue is what one would do with the results of a new survey.

Chair Brown summarized the revisions to the resolution as follows: 1) Change the ‘whereas’s’ in paragraphs one, three, and four, while adding a new ‘whereas’ that states UC is now the sole producer of pits, in the form of a recital at the beginning of the document; 2) Task the President, or his/her designee, to monitor pit production and produce an annual report to the Senate; 3) Add a statement that emphasizes that UC should not be involved in pit production for the purpose of nuclear weapons production and/or warhead replacement; and 4) If UC cannot access information on pit production, then that would trigger a reassessment of its involvement in this activity. It was acknowledged that in order for the resolution to be on the January 30th Assembly meeting, Council must approve the resolution by January 15th.

ACTION: Council endorsed the resolution in principle and will review a revised resolution via email for approval.

VI. January 30, 2008 Assembly Agenda and Format

ISSUE: Chair Brown asked members 1) to determine if the agenda is sufficient for an Assembly meeting; 2) Approve the agenda (including the ASCOLI resolution); and 3) determine the format (face-to-face or teleconference).

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that the agenda is sufficient for an Assembly meeting, and approved it with the addition of a budget update informational item. Members agreed that the ASCOLI resolution should be on the agenda of the January 30th Assembly meeting. Members also discussed the format of the January and

February Assembly meetings. **A motion was made and seconded to reconsider holding the January meeting face-to-face in order to give Council more time to review the ASCOLI resolution and/or ask for divisional feedback, the February Assembly meeting would be face-to-face.** The motion to reconsider failed (two in favor; 15 against; and one abstention). Members advised Chair Brown to hold an in-person meeting on January 30th.

ACTION: Members approved 1) A face-to-face meeting on January 30, 2008; and 2) the agenda as written with the addition of an informational budget update item and the ASCOLI resolution.

VII. Regent Monica Lozano

ISSUE: Regent Lozano chairs The Regents' Compensation Committee; she has been a member of the Board of Regents for approximately six years and on the Board of the University of Southern California since 1992. She publishes the nation's largest Spanish-language daily newspaper, *La Opinión*, which boasts 540,000 readers. She is primarily concerned with access, diversity, affordability, admissions, and eligibility; and advocated for comprehensive review in admissions early in her term. She commented that when she first arrived, The Regents were managing UC on a year-by-year basis, and were not necessarily organizing the University to meet the long-term needs of the State. Regarding compensation, in her view it should be a predictable, systematic, and transparent tool allowing UC to meet its long-term strategic goals. Competitiveness is certainly one issue that UC is struggling with in this area. The Regents are committed to use as compensation as a tool to maintain UC's world class stature.

DISCUSSION: Members remarked that the presence of international graduate students at the University is critical; the Senate passed a memorial to eliminate non-resident tuition (NRT), which alleviates some of the financial burden on this class of students. One member suggested that those international students who are involved in teaching undergraduates as teaching assistants (TA) should not have to pay NRT. Regent Lozano responded that in the last two years, The Regents have become more forthright in their commitment to both domestic and international graduate and professional students. That said, there is a sense among The Regents that international and out-of-state students should pay more in fees. President Dynes added that the State is opposed to supporting these students financially. UC has already eliminated NRT for these students after advanced to candidacy. NRT revenue is being tracked and going back to its campus of origin; President Dynes has asked that this revenue be used for graduate support. The next step is increasing state funding for graduate student support, which requires the acknowledgement that educating graduate students is more expensive than educating undergraduate students. UC settled for a fixed per capita funding per student from the State Legislature, regardless of the student's graduate or undergraduate status. Another member added that in addition to international students, attracting high-quality domestic students is also important. Such students are not only less expensive to educate, but also can increase the University's diversity.

Members asked Regent Lozano about the controversy that currently surrounds UC. There is a general perception that UC has a governance problem. Regent Lozano responded that The Regents are in a moment of transition. UC governance structures are in need of transformation and modernization, and The Regents are deeply committed to this. Compensation/personnel systems and business systems are two examples. As a public institution, deliberations need to take place in public. However, the general public and the media cannot capture all of the ‘moving parts’ of the decision-making process, which produces erroneous perceptions. Members also expressed some concerns about the level of involvement of The Regents in UCOP and campus affairs. Regent Lozano believes that The Regents are now taking systematic approaches; if systems did not exist previously, the institution of systems will seem intrusive to some. The reliance on external consultants by The Regents was also raised. She responded that it is necessary to use consultants to establish external benchmarks. That said, there is no one compensation study that meets everyone’s objectives. Besides compensation, members remarked that intangibles are also important in attracting high-quality faculty members, which have suffered over the last couple of years. Excellent graduate students should be counted as one of these intangibles, and play a significant role in attracting the best faculty. Regent Lozano acknowledged that the current external perception is that UC does not really have a fair system of compensation; this has created a somewhat unpleasant campus environment over the short-term. However, once the University moves past the point of systemizing compensation, many of these issues and risks will be eliminated or mitigated. She also emphasized that The Regents do care about these intangibles. However, the State Legislature must be convinced that UC can keep its word with respect to these issues before investment in the University can be reinvigorated. She added that it is important to better articulate the contribution that the University makes to the society; UC has a number of allies out there. President Dynes commented that UC continues to build strong alliances with the high-technology, biotechnology, finance, and agricultural sectors. Regent Lozano closed her remarks by noting that there is simply not the commitment to long-term objectives of the University by the State for the most part. Articulating the detrimental consequences of this scenario is important. Chair Brown responded to Regent Lozano’s request for the Senate’s top priorities, which are faculty salaries and graduate student support. Regent Lozano thanked Council for the opportunity to speak with them.

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

- **Robert C. Dynes, President**
- **Bruce Darling, Executive Vice President, University Affairs**

President Dynes

Provost Dynes reported:

- UC has submitted a proposal to the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC), on behalf of the three higher education segments in California (UC, CSU, and CCC), to create a leadership institute (‘California Institute for Climate Solutions’) to

establish a roadmap for energy consumption and emissions throughout the state (\$600 million over ten years).

- The UCR Chancellor search is ongoing. Vice Chair Croughan is on the committee.
- California Institute for Regenerative Medicine recently awarded \$53 million to faculty throughout the state for stem cell research (\$25 million went to UC faculty).
- The National Math and Science Institute made awards to UCB and UCI (\$2.4 million each).
- Campus visits: UCD is scheduled for the end of January.
- UCM senior faculty are overloaded. President Dynes is looking into the idea of recruiting senior and emeriti faculty systemwide to support the campus in administrative functions and in mentoring roles (e.g., department chairs, etc.).

EVP Bruce Darling

EVP Darling reported that:

- Budget: The current state deficit projection is now \$14 billion.
- Labor: Most of UC's union contracts will expire in 2008; a significant issue is UCRP governance. Senator Yee will be introducing a constitutional amendment that would allow union representatives to sit on UC pension/retirement program boards.
- Student Fees: While the Compact allows UC to raise fees up to 10%, there is pressure to raise student fees. Some student groups are proposing to freeze student fees in 2008, only allowing them to increase at the rate of inflation. The Lt. Governor is expected to introduce a similar motion at the January Regents meeting.
- Capital Outlays: UC is pushing for a capital outlays budget; UC will need the \$345 million called for in the Compact, in addition to \$100 million for medical education facilities.
- Health Reform Plan: The California State Assembly did pass the health reform plan, but the Assembly has not taken it up yet. UCOP is now examining the language in the proposal.
- Governor Schwarzenegger has identified 2008 as the 'Year of Education'.
- Legislation under Consideration (draft legislation that is not available yet): 1) A higher education facilities bond act (on the June or November 2008 ballot); 2) Proposal to allow Science & Math Institute (SMI) students to pay off student loans by teaching; 3) Proposal to strengthen the penalties for attacks on faculty engaged in animal research; and 4) California has not adopted revisions to the Uniform Management of Institutional Fund Act, which allows UC to manage its endowments. It would also allow UC to treat 'underwater endowments' in a more equitable way.
- Federal Issues: \$22 billion in funding has been cut—this will have a negative impact on research and education funding. Pell grant will go up by \$400 per award; TRIO/Gear Up funding will not be cut; NIH funding will be increased .5 %; the Office of Science will only receive a 2.6% increase; NSF will receive a 2.5% increase. This legislation has passed the Senate; the House will take it up today.
- UC is working with a public relations firm to improve its image throughout the state.
- Labs: The DOE released its vision for the future of nuclear weapons facilities, including the scientific roles for LANL and LLNL; LANS would become a center for pit production (50-80 pits per year). Most plutonium materials will be moved from LLNL to LANL.

- Private Giving: UC is up by \$250 million in the first quarter over last year in private giving.

Questions/Answers and Comments

Q: Does the PUC proposal have a timeline and deliverables associated with it?

A: President Dynes responded that this project was originally fielded by Berkeley but has been expanded to the entire UC system, CSU, and the community colleges. The only specific deliverable associated with the original proposal was the construction of an institute at Berkeley. President Dynes does not think that deliverables should really be articulated before an ‘energy road map’ is laid out.

Q: How much weight should UC or The Regents give Senator Yee’s resolution to allow labor unions to sit on retirement/pension boards? Is there any movement among The Regents to respond to Senator Yee?

A: President Dynes responded that The Regents may respond, because they hold a fiduciary responsibility for the University. The Regents are not uneasy about receiving input from various sources either. EVP Darling agreed with this assessment. He noted that the real question is whether The Regents’ response will indicate whether such representatives should hold formal governance responsibilities or if they should serve in purely advisory roles only.

Q: California has suffered from two budgetary crises in the recent past, resulting from the dot com bust and most recently, a financial re-engineering of sorts that is hurting the state. Some of these problems were caused by science and technology; the solutions may not be found through science and technology, but perhaps through the social sciences. UCOP’s focus in this area is actually quite narrow when the solutions are broader. What can be done to address these problems?

A: President Dynes responded that a more stable revenue source is needed. EVP Darling remarked that the real issue is reaching agreement on an equitable model for taxation in California. The current tax system focuses on high-income tax payers and capital gains, which produces dramatic spikes in revenue.

Q: EVP Darling was asked to comment on the legislation that would increase penalties on attacks on faculty involved in animal research.

A: EVP Darling said that there has been growing and increasingly violent efforts to intimidate faculty from engaging in research involving animals. The concerns are twofold: 1) district attorneys may not be prosecuting these cases to the fullest extent of the law; and 2) do current laws provide sufficient deterrents against such behavior? There is a joint UCOP-campus proposal on the table to consider new legislation to strengthen these penalties. At issue is whether this proposal will produce a backlash from animal rights groups, and possibly open up the door to having the current penalties reduced.

Q: Is there a state deficit threshold, above which, the Compact would not hold? Has UC received an order for a 10% across-the-board cut yet?

A: President Dynes is quite concerned about this issue. The Governor recently declared a fiscal state of emergency; a special Assembly meeting is being called on January 7th. He also confirmed that UC has not received an order to cut its budget by 10% yet.

Q: How many pits per year is LANL being asked to produce?

A: EVP Darling said that he has heard that the DOE will ask LANL to produce a range of 50-80 pits per year, which would represent the totality of US pit production. 50 pits is the outside number that LANS is focusing on.

Q: Does UCOP have a pre-emptive strategy to respond to the DOE if a proposal to increase pit production at LANL comes forward? And how do UC's LLC partners feel about this?

A: There has been a briefing to the LANS Board, but nothing further. The LLC partners do not have the same concerns as the University however. It is a far more complex issue for UC. For example, one issue is whether increasing pit production would affect the nature of the lab. If UC opted to try to get out of the LLC agreement over this issue, the University could face significant legal and financial penalties.

Q: What are the implications of the State's health care reform plan for health sciences campuses?

A: UCOP does not yet know the full realities of health reform plan; there is one provision for a four percent tax on health care providers. At the same time UC is being told that this would be offset by state and federal Medicare payments.

IX. General Discussion

DISCUSSION: Members remarked that in relation to the budget, UCOP seems to be planning for the worst, while hoping for the best. That said, UCOP has not received any official communication from the State on this matter. Chair Brown commented that the Senate has had a love-hate relationship with the Compact, not only with the level of funding, but also in the funding shift away from the State and towards private giving. Regarding SMI, it was reported that it is going well on the campuses, but SMI campus directors are worried about its long-term funding.

X. BOARS' Proposed Freshman Eligibility Policy

ISSUE: Chair Brown proposed sending the proposal back to BOARS for revision and re-review before March.

DISCUSSION: A motion was made and seconded to send the proposal back to BOARS for revisions, with the enclosed letter as written. Members noted that 'Pros' should also be underlined; '10th and 11th grade' in the first paragraph should be inserted. Members thanked BOARS Chair Rashid for his committee's efforts to draft the policy. Chair Rashid remarked that BOARS realizes the importance of this policy; he will ask BOARS to take Council's comments in earnest.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved sending the proposal back to BOARS for revision.

XI. Proposed changes to APM 220-18.b(4)

ISSUE: At the end of academic year 2004-05 the Academic Council after a systemwide senate review, forwarded to the administration a proposed revision to APM 220-18.b(4), which incoming Chair Cliff Brunk halted in 2005-06. The 2006-07 Council again sent out a revised APM 220-18.b(4) for review. In response to that version, the Administration raised two issues: 1) the language was not clear; and 2) it suggested that the standards were being lowered for the criteria for Step VI and above scale salaries. Chair Brown and Vice Chair Croughan met with Vice Provost for Academic Personnel Nick Jewell, and made minimal changes to APM 220-18.b(4) to accommodate the Administration's concerns and are noticed in the agenda. Vice Chair Croughan also related that UCAP discovered that Step VI practices were drastically different across the system. The new language builds consensus across the system, and is very consistent with what UCAP put forward.

DISCUSSION: One member expressed concern that service could be the meritorious contribution for Step VI. Chair Brown clarified that one must be distinguished in all three categories (research, teaching, and service), but be 'excellent' in scholarly production. This is highlighted by the addition of "above and beyond that" in paragraph 1, line 8. The administration would not accept service solely as a reason for promotion to Step VI. Another member noted that as mention of salary and pay has been expunged, 'paid' should also be stricken in the paragraph 2, line 2. Members also cautioned that the new APM will not completely align all local campus practices. There also had been some concerns about adding a definition of 'overall career' somewhere in the APM. It was clarified that this cannot be done because different campuses do it differently, and every single campus has their own interpretation of the APM.

A motion was made and seconded, to approve the APM with the following minor changes:

- Paragraph 1, line 9: In the sentence that begins with "Above and beyond (on line 8)...", 'of' should be inserted so that it reads, "at least one **of** these categories."
- Paragraph 2, line 1: Strike out the word 'paid'.
- Paragraph 2, line 1: Change 'which' to 'that'.
- Paragraph 3, line 7: In the sentence that begins with "Moreover (line 6) ...", 'salary' should be deleted so that it reads, "further ~~salary~~ advancement."

ACTION: Council unanimously approved APM 220-18.b(4) with the noted revisions.

XII. Proposed Guidelines on Vendor Relations

ACTION: Members unanimously approved sending Council's letter to Rory Jaffe, Executive Director of Medical Services.

XIII. UCFW Updates

1. UCFW-TFIR Recommendation Regarding the Draft “Agreement on Terms for Transfer of Assets from UCRP to LLNS Plan and Continued Administration and Obligation Related to LLNL Portion of UCRP”

ISSUE: This is a recommendation to make an asset transfer of \$1.74 billion to LLNS. It is similar to the asset transfer to LANS last year, with the exception of retaining an additional \$75 million in UCRP for the retained UCRP segment group². This agreement makes a provision that UCRP will remain 100% funded by the DOE for the “retained segment group”. This item is on the January Regents meeting agenda.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved UCFW’s recommendation.

2. Chancellors’ Salaries Plan

ISSUE: UCFW requested that Chair Brown ask that this issue not be raised at the January Regents meeting, as Council has not seen a concrete plan.

DISCUSSION: Chair Brown clarified that UCOP is not going to The Regents with a plan to raise Chancellors’ salaries. Mercer will present a market analysis on Chancellors’ salaries at this meeting, but The Regents will not be asked to act upon it.

3. California Public Employees Retirement System Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Program (UC-PERS Plus 5 Plan)

ACTION: This item was pulled off the Council agenda as it is not on the January Regents agenda; it will be discussed at a future Council meeting.

XIV. Ongoing Agenda Item: “Senate Issues/Topics of Concern”

Faculty Presence on Campus in Non-Teaching Times: Need For a Good Citizenship Policy?

ISSUE: It was noted that some faculty are not coming to campus as often as had been the general practice in the past when they are not teaching. This might be attributed to advances in technology and broadband access. This issue speaks to collegiality and ‘good citizenship’.

ACTION: This issue will be placed on a future Council agenda.

XV. New Business

ISSUE: Members did not have any new business.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest: Michael T. Brown, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Todd Giedt, Policy Analyst

² The “retained segment group” are those LLNL employees who retired from UC, became disabled, or elected inactive status under UCRP on or before September 30, 2007.

Academic Council Minutes – December 19, 2007

| ACADEMIC COUNCIL | | Key: X=In attendance, \=Absent, Alt=Alternate, T=Teleconference | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|---|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Attendance 2007-2008 | | 9/26 | 10/31 | 11/28 | 12/19 | 1/23 | 2/27 | 3/26 | 4/23 | 5/28 | 6/25 |
| <u>Officers</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Michael Brown, Chair | | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Mary Croughan, Vice Chair | | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| <u>Divisional Chairs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| William Drummond | UCB | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Linda Bisson | UCD | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Timothy Bradley | UCI | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Elizabeth Bjork | UCLA | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Shawn Kantor | UCM | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Thomas Cogswell | UCR | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| James Posakony | UCSD | X | X | X | \ | | | | | | |
| David Gardner | UCSF | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Joel Michaelsen | UCSB | X | X | X | \ | | | | | | |
| Quentin Williams | UCSC | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| <u>Committee Chairs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mark Rashid | BOARS | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Bruce Schumm | CCGA | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Pauline Yahr | UCAAD | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| James Hunt | UCAP | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Keith Williams | UCEP | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| James Chalfant | UCFW | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Jose Wudka | UCORP | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Christopher Newfield | UCPB | X | Alt | X | \ | | | | | | |
| <u>Alternates</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pat Conrad | UCPB | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Daniel Donoghue (UCSD Vice Chair) | UCSD | | | | Alt | | | | | | |
| Vicki Scott (UCSB Divisional Chair Alternate) | UCSB | | | | Alt | | | | | | |
| <u>Guests</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nick Jewell, Vice Provost, Acad Personnel | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Mary-Beth Harhen, SC Senate Director | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Diane Hamann, SD Senate Director | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| Michael Dalby | Monitor | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Jim Hollingshead | Monitor | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Dennis Larsen, Director, HR & Benefits-Resource Administration | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| Sellyna Ehlers (UCR Senate Director) | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| Regent Monica Lozano | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| <u>President & Senior Management</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Robert Dynes, President | | X | X | | X | | | | | | |
| Rory Hume, Provost | | X | X | X | \ | | | | | | |
| Bruce Darling, Exec. VP-UR | | X | | X | X | | | | | | |
| Katie Lapp, Exec VP, Bus Ops | | X | X | X | \ | | | | | | |
| <u>Council Staff</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Director | | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Todd Giedt, Policy Analyst | | X | X | X | X | | | | | | |