

## ACADEMIC COUNCIL

## Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, November 30, 2005

**I. Chair's Announcements**

Chair Brunk called the meeting to order, welcomed Roland Winston, the new Merced Division Chair, and made the following announcements:

*Senior Management.* In the absence today of President Dynes, Acting Provost Hume will deliver his remarks during the consultation period. Senior Vice President Darling is scheduled to call in to the meeting at noon. Questions for senior management were collected in advance, which will help focus discussion and provide senior management time to prepare materials, if necessary.

*Regents.* Chair of the Board of Regents Gerald Parsky will be a visitor at the December Council meeting. Recently some faculty have put questions directly to the Regents without availing themselves of the Senate as an appropriate channel for communication. As important questions emerge, the Senate and faculty at large should discuss concerns and address them in a coordinated effort as colleagues. The Academic Council Resolutions on University-wide Compensation and on RE-61 C were read and distributed to the Regents at their November meeting.

*OP transition.* Provost Greenwood's resignation and other personnel actions have necessitated changes at OP, but the shift in responsibilities to the Acting Provost and in other areas is proceeding as a smooth transition.

*Cal ISI review.* Despite the departure of the Provost, the effort to establish review guidelines for the Institutes and possibly initiate a pilot review of IT 2 is still on track.

**New Business**

**Issue:** A member raised the question of how matters of concern to Council members can be placed on the Council agenda, and suggested that this issue be discussed as an item of new business.

**Action:** A motion was made, seconded and passed to discuss under Item XIII the process of setting the Academic Council agenda.

**Action:** A motion was made and seconded to change the order of the agenda so that the above item of new business – the process of setting the Academic Council agenda -- be discussed directly after Agenda Item III rather than under Item XIII.

The above motion was amended to discuss the new item directly after Agenda Item IV.

The motion, as amended, was passed.

**II. Consent Calendar****1. Approval of the October 26, 2005 Minutes****2. Draft Guidelines on Non-Competitive Funding**

**Action:** The October 26, 2005 Minutes were approved.

**Action:** The Draft Guidelines on Non-Competitive Funding were taken off of the consent calendar and put under Item XIII for discussion.

**New Business**

**Issue:** The Academic Council Task Force on the AP/Honors/IB/CC “Grade Bump”, chaired by former Council Chair Gail Binion, submitted its completed report to Council last spring. Chair Brunk suggested that Council agree to publish the report on the Senate web site.

**Action:** A motion was made, seconded and passed to receive for posting on the Senate web site the June 2005 *Report of the Academic Senate Task Force on Honors/AP/IB/CCC “Grade Bump.”*

### **III. The Science and Mathematics Initiative (SMI)**

**Issue:** Council agreed to establish a Senate SMI work group (SMIG) to oversee and coordinate SMI implementation activities on the campuses, and to promote the success of the SMI both in the short and long term. At the October Council meeting it was decided that each campus would nominate a representative member to be on SMIG, and that Berkeley Division Chair Agogino would Chair the SMIG on an interim basis for its first three meetings.

**Report:** Division Chair Agogino reported that nominations have been received from all campuses except San Francisco. There will be a UCEP member on the group. A range of disciplines will be represented on the group, however there is no member in the physical sciences. Questions about resources for SMI implementation and about staff support for the work group need to be addressed. The group will use conference calls and email for much of its consultation, but an in-person meeting will also be held.

**Discussion:** UCSF Division Chair Greenspan reported that she discussed with Professor Bruce Alberts his possible nomination to SMIG, but there was some question about whether his participation would constitute a conflict of interest since he is currently an advisor to the UC president on SMI. It was noted that some campuses have existing institutes that will need to integrate with the structure of the SMI. Concerning the budget, there are questions about where the funding is, what projected expenditures are, and how funding will be deployed to meet unequal needs across campuses. It was also suggested that campuses eventually create and share ‘best practices.’ A member made the point that a five year program is more desirable than the planned four year structure, since there is clear evidence that five year teacher preparation programs build a stronger commitment to teaching.

**Action:** It was the sense of the Academic Council that, should Professor Bruce Alberts of UCSF accept a nomination to the SMI group, his participation would not create a conflict of interest with his role as advisor to President Dynes on SMI matters. UCSF Division Chair Greenspan will convey the Council’s sentiment to Professor Alberts.

### **IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Senior Managers**

- Robert Dynes, President
- Rory Hume, Vice President for Academic & Health Affairs & Acting Provost
- Joe Mullinix, Senior Vice President, Business and Finance
- Lawrence C. Hershman, Vice President for Budget

#### President Dynes’ remarks (presented by Acting Provost Hume)

*OP leadership.* The transition in leadership at the Office of the President is going smoothly. OP priorities remain the same, and current initiatives are going forward.

*Compensation issues.* Press coverage of compensation issues has not adequately conveyed the

context of the market; however UC does need to do a better job in terms of disclosure and transparency. A regental task force on compensation is being established, and the Senate's input will be sought.

*SMI.* This is a high priority initiative and is going ahead as, but in doing so, it is vital to fully engage the Academic Senate. The Senate work group will be a great aid in coordination and implementation.

*UCI Liver Transplant program.* The transplant program has been closed and a blue ribbon panel has been set up to look into recent events. The panel plans to have a public report in 90 days.

*LANL.* Since UCs' proposal is based on research excellence, we believe it offers the best option for management of the lab. The decision on the bid is expected soon.

*UC Budget.* At their November meeting, the Regents adopted a 2006-07 budget that provides for enrollment growth and expanded support for graduate students, increases student fees, and raises the return-to-aid to students.

*RE-61.* The Senate's input on this proposal has been welcome. Part A provides a good platform for achieving market parity for all UC employees over time. In particular, the faculty views on Part C, concerning the use of private funds to augment senior management salaries, and on transparency in salary processes, have been clearly heard.

#### Acting Provost Hume

*SMI.* This is an ambitious program; challenges include coordination of the academic program with the campuses, preparation in K-12, the structure of the program, and financing. The program needs to be recast to reflect more campus-based control and to focus on coordination with campuses for implementation.

*Academic planning and coordination.* A more focused effort is being made to look at what UC is becoming. Priorities are being discussed with the Regents, and a comprehensive plan will be presented to the Regents in the future that will include a vision of how to emphasize and build on the different strengths of the individual campuses. Long-range planning is the key element for future success and should also be a regular part of consultation with the Senate.

*Reviews.* The Cal ISI review structure is still in draft form and the Acting Provost will work with the Senate to ensure that academic concerns are correctly prominent in the review. The recommendations of the advisory council on the health sciences enrollment growth will soon be ready for review by the Senate. That review was done in response to the work force report that came before the Regents earlier this year.

*Task Force on Graduate and Professional Education.* The round of Campus visits by the task force is nearly completed. The group will meet again in December to review input to date. In advising on potential enrollment growth, the work of the task force will align well with the health sciences review.

**Action:** Acting Provost Hume and Academic Council Chair Brunk will work jointly to prepare by Friday of this week a draft review protocol for the Cal ISIs along with a revised review process flowchart. These will be forwarded for review to UCPB and UCORP for consideration at their respective meetings next week.

#### SVP Mullinix

*Labor issues.* Negotiations are continuing with the California Nurses Association.

*Strategic Sourcing Initiative.* Compliance is high, at between 80% and 90%. There is no central plan for applying the savings to programs on campuses. Each campus will develop ways to recapture and reallocate savings.

*RE-61.* A presentation will be made to the Regents in January on slotting of salaries, with straightforward grade structures for senior management that will allow easier comparison of positions and greater transparency.

*Capital budget.* The Grounds and Buildings committee has simplified the approval process for design and planning so there will be more analytical work up front and less delay, which will help UC be a 'client of choice' in the procurement arena.

*UCRS.* According to the actuaries, the UCRS is at present 10% over-funded, but contributions will resume in 07-08 with a phase-in plan. A range of possible retirement plans for new employees is being considered. The University has not set aside funds for retiree health plan, which is typical of most employers, but that funding strategy will be revisited.

*Ethics briefing.* Implementation of the ethics "briefing" for UC employees, which was developed as training supplementary to the *University Statement on Ethical Conduct*, is proceeding and will be conducted in phases using in a more flexible format than previous mandatory trainings.

#### VP Hershman

*Meeting with Director of Finance and Staff.* This was an annual budget meeting that included the following topics: the importance of honoring the terms of the compact; marginal costs funding; the proposal to buy out student fee increases; student academic preparation, on which there is a preliminary OP report; the labor centers; and one-time funding for Merced; and how to structure the currently contemplated bond issue.

*Regents meeting.* The 06-07 Budget proposal was presented and received good support. Its provisions include: a 4% fund for salary increases; a return-to aid of 33%; funding for enrollment growth; funding for improving the student-faculty ratio; and student fee increases in accordance with the Compact. In the context of the Regents' discussion of planned increases in student fees, the possibility was raised of a state buy-out of fees in this budget cycle. Such action has been taken by the state in the past.

*The LAO report.* The report indicates increased revenue that over three years could zero-out the current deficit. There is still an ongoing problem of several billion dollars.

[President Dynes joined the meeting late in the consultation period.]

#### **Q and A**

**Q:** Where will resources for the implementation of the SMI come from?

**A:** The SMI will require about \$24M/yr.(more than originally projected) if it is to meet expectations. The K-12 budget is an appropriate source of funding, and additional funding will come from private sources.

**Q:** Capital development at the medical schools seems out of balance with the lack of enrollments. What is being done in terms of education and research?

**A:** There is a demand for UC health care facilities and UC trained health professionals, and providing those is arguably a part of the UC mission. The matter is also a question of delivery and growth of health care, with the trend going towards out patient care and short term facilities. UC also plays a key role in the growth of research.

**Q:** Is access to UC for lower income students now limited because of fee increases?

**A:** No. The combination of a high return to aid formula plus funding from Cal Grants keeps UC very accessible for lower income students.

**Q:** Will there be reduced funds going to campuses because of the waiver of non-resident tuition for graduate students who are advanced to candidacy?

**A:** Yes. This is incorporated into the budget. The decrease is, however, also attributable to lower enrollment numbers.

**Q:** Is the return-to-aid amount that goes back to the campuses the same for all campuses?

**A:** Allocation of return-to-aid funds to campuses is not directly proportional

**Action:** For a future Council meeting, VP Hershman will arrange a workshop/presentation on student support, to be given in part by Director of Student Financial Support Kate Jeffrey.

**Action:** Council agreed to defer the briefing from Senior Vice President Darling to the December 14 meeting, so he would not need to call in to today's meeting.

**Action:** Chair Brunk will invite Michael Reese, Associate Vice President of Strategic Communications, to a future Council meeting to discuss the proposed state hearings on UC compensation.

### **New Business – Setting the Academic Council Agenda**

**Issue:** It was agreed to discuss how the Council agenda is set.

#### **Comments and suggestions:**

- Council members have extensive discussion of issues via email, but there isn't always an opportunity to act on them.
- A period of time should be included in all agendas to discuss topics of concern.
- The Council agenda could be circulated to members 1 or 2 days ahead of the current schedule of distribution for comments and suggestions.
- The discussions that are underway need to be prioritized.

Senate Director Bertero-Barcelo made the following procedural clarifications:

- Members have until two weeks before a meeting to send in suggested agenda items.
- Meeting time is limited, and the current agendas already evidence longer discussions on items than in the past. Members should be aware that a choice is made between efficiency and having full discussions.
- Whenever there is ambiguity regarding the outcome of a discussion, an action, or the 'sense of the Council', clarification will be asked for.

**Action:** A motion was made and seconded to: 1) Circulate a draft agenda to Council members 48 hours before the final agenda is normally sent out; and 2) add to the consent calendar of each Academic Council agenda the approval of the present agenda.

The motion was amended to change the comment period from 48 hours to 24 hours (point #1).

The motion was amended to include a "discussion" section in each agenda under which will be a list of current topics that members can add to or comment on in the 24 hour comment period.

The motion was withdrawn.

**Action:** It was the sense of the Council that the following procedures will be followed with regard to the setting and approval of the Academic Council agenda:

- The approval of the agenda will be placed at the beginning of each agenda, directly following ‘announcements.’
- Each agenda will include a 30 minute discussion period directly after the regular mid-day consultation with OP senior managers and (when applicable) visiting Regents. The purpose of this new agenda item is to allow follow-up discussion relating to the preceding consultation.
- Included on each agenda will be the date for Council members’ submissions of items for the next agenda. An email reminder will also be sent out to Council members for agenda submissions. Members will have available for the meeting any materials necessary for discussion of new agenda items.
- There will be no change in the current practice followed for the setting and finalizing of the agenda prior to distribution.

#### **V. The Selection of the 2006-07 Academic Senate/Council Vice Chair**

**Issue:** Council is reviewing the process and schedule for selecting the next Academic Senate Vice Chair. Vice Chair Oakley presented a draft nomination and selection process for this year, along with the relevant Academic Senate legislation and a short history of the procedures that have been followed for the past three successions. Timing is a crucial element in order to give the successful candidate adequate lead time to arrange course release and research or other obligations for the following year, but still to allow enough time for deliberation and getting to know potential candidates on the Council. Among other points, the proposal maintains the period of end of December/beginning of January as the period for submissions; requires that candidates send in a “declaration of candidacy” consisting of a one-page cv and a one-page statement on goals and challenges; and proposes the dates for submission of declarations and for their distribution to Council members.

#### **Discussion points:**

- More time is needed to get to know potential candidates on the Council.
- A strict deadline, especially around holiday time will make it difficult for candidates.
- The need was noted for explicit criteria to use in the selection of a Vice Chair, as well as the need for guidelines that would be in place from year to year.
- A September notification was suggested in order to get the broadest participation.
- Some procedural concern should be shown for gender and balanced campus representation.

**Motion A::** A motion was made and seconded to approve the draft background material and proposed 2005-06 procedures for the nomination and selection of an Academic Council Vice Chair, and amend the proposed procedures to: 1) replace the last two sentences of Section I with: “Candidates are urged to submit their completed declarations of candidacy by January 2.”; and 2) change Section II to read: “Completed declarations of candidacy will be e-mailed to all Council members starting on January 4, 2006, and later submissions will be distributed as they arrive.”

Motion A was amended to change the submission date to January 4, 2006 and the emailing date to January 6, 2006.

**Motion B:** A motion was made and seconded to add a closing date of January 18, 2006 for

accepting submissions. Motion B failed.

**Motion C:** A motion was made and seconded to hold the Council's vote on the Vice Chair at its February meeting, keeping the dates for submission and distribution as proposed in Motion A. Motion C failed.

**Action:** The Council passed motion A as amended, and in so doing approved the draft background material and proposed 2005-06 procedures for the nomination and selection of an Academic Council Vice Chair with the following changes: 1) the last two sentences of Section I will be replaced with: "Candidates are urged to submit their completed declarations of candidacy by January 4."; and 2) Section II will be changed to read: "Completed declarations of candidacy will be e-mailed to all Council members starting on January 6, 2006, and later submissions will be distributed as they arrive."

**Action:** The background on the selection process, as drafted by Vice Chair Oakley, and the approved 2005-06 procedures will be posted on the Senate web site and distributed to divisions for broad dissemination among faculty.

## **VI. BOARS Activities , *Michael Brown, Chair, BOARS***

### **Earth and Space Science Eligibility Subject Requirement Proposal**

**Issue:** BOARS has drafted a Resolution of the Proposal Regarding Earth and Space Science (ESS) Courses in Fulfillment of the University of California's Laboratory Science ('d') Requirement. BOARS is responding to a proposal to add Earth and Space Science (ESS) to the subject (a-g) requirements for UC eligibility. BOARS' position is that no change should be made in the requirements.

**Action:** The request for Council action on this item was withdrawn.

### **Honors Level Bonus Grade Point Policy**

**Issue:** An update on BOARS' review of the Report of The Academic Senate Task Force on the Honors/AP/IB/CC Grade Bump.

**Report:** A letter was sent out to campus admissions committees asking them to: comment on BOARS' findings; describe how they currently consider participation in honors level courses; and recommend 'best practices' for considering indices of academic rigor such as honors level course participation. Once the committee receives information back from the campuses, a formal recommendation will be formulated and brought to Council. Five possible concerns were raised about changing the current policy: (1) that the proposed change would discourage students from taking and schools from offering "honors-level" courses; (2) that the proposed change would alter the quality of the eligibility pool; (3) that the proposed change would not alter the demographics of the eligibility pool so why support it; (4) that the proposed change would harm students currently disadvantaged by the policy; and (5) that the proposed change would harm students that are advantaged by the current policy. Council members noted that BOARS has heard these concerns and has prepared responses to each.

**Action:** Chair Brunk will invite Sue Wilbur, Director of Undergraduate Admission, to make a presentation on this issue when Council discusses BOARS' report on UC's use of the honors level bonus grade point. Prior to her visit, Director Wilbur will provide for Council's

information a document articulating and supporting her concerns.

### **VII. Joint Senate/Chancellors Meeting**

**Issue:** The Academic Council and Chancellors joint meeting is scheduled for April 5, 2006 from Noon to 3:00p.m. Members have been asked to submit suggested issues for discussion with the Chancellors, as well as Council presenters for each topic. The Chancellors will do likewise and then both groups will finalize the April 5 agenda.

**Action:** Due to lack of time, this item was not addressed.

### **VIII. University of California Statement of Ethical Values and Standards of Ethical Conduct**

**Issue:** A proposed program for implementation of the policy and dissemination of the Statement requests that the Academic Council: 1) Appoint an Ad Hoc Committee on Ethics Rollout; 2) Endorse a Resolution in Support of Ethics Training. Council will discuss the two requests and determine a course of action and relevant timelines.

**Action:** This item was deferred to the December 14, 2005 Academic Council meeting for review and action.

### **IX. University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD)**

**Issue:** Due to lack of time at the end of last year for divisional responses, the 2004-05 Academic Council voted to forward the following UCAAD requests to the 2005-06 Council for its consideration:

#### **1. Recommendations for a Strong Divisional Diversity Committee**

**Action:** The Academic Council's disposition on this issue is deferred pending full and sufficient response from reviewing bodies.

#### **2. UCAAD's Participation/Role on Systemwide Committees**

**Action:** This item was deferred to a later meeting for deliberation.

### **X. Transfer Issues: The Next Steps for UC Facilitating CCC Transfer Students**

**Issue:** UCEP with respect to its consideration in facilitating the transfer of CCC students to UC, including implementation of Regulations 476 and 477, and a focus on ASSIST.

**Action:** This item was withdrawn from the agenda and will be addressed at a future Council meeting.

### **XI. Academic Council Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL)**

*An update on ACSCONL's current and future plans*

**Action:** ACSCONL Chair Oakley will present an update on the Labs and ACSCONL activities at the December 14 Council meeting.

### **XII. Proposed Change to UC Policy on Faculty Copyright of Scholarly Publications**

**Issue:** In preparation for a December presentation to Council, Larry Pitts, Special Committee on Scholarly Communications (SCSC) Chair, has provided Council with a proposed policy change that is congruent with the SCSC position papers. The papers are forthcoming and will be

presented to Council at the January meeting for endorsement.

**Action:** The proposed policy change will be presented to Council for consideration in December.

### **XIII. New Business**

**Issue:** UCORP and UCPB were asked to take the lead in reviewing a proposed University Guidelines on Non-competitive Funding, which were developed by an ad hoc administrative work group.

**Discussion:** A Council member questioned whether UCORP's comments on the campus level practices had been adequately represented in the draft Council transmittal letter. It was reported that UCORP may want to look at campus earmarking practices in more depth in the future. A suggestion was made to change the language of the letter in order to indicate an agreement with the policy of peer reviewed competitive funding in general, but not an actual endorsement of the of the draft guidelines.

**Action:** The draft Council comments on the proposed Guidelines on Non-competitive Funding were approved with an amended final sentence of the first paragraph.

Meeting adjourned, 4:30 p.m.

Attest: Clifford Brunk,  
Chair, Academic Council

Minutes prepared by  
Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst