

ACADEMIC COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 2002-2003

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

2002-2003 ISSUES:

During the 2002-2003 academic year, the Academic Council took under review and made recommendations on a total of over fifty initiatives, proposals, reports, variances, and APM policy changes covering a wide range of topics and programs. These included retirement benefits for the health sciences faculty; phased retirement; undergraduate admissions; tobacco funding; copyright; Senate structure and resources; Subject A; postdoctoral scholars; sabbatical leave; family medical leave; and first five-year review of the Agriculture Experiment Station. The Academic Council's comments and final recommendations on many of these issues are posted on the Senate's website at: <http://www.Universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/>. While each one of these was important in giving direction to overall University policy, the following three additional analyses stand out as being particularly significant.

Classification by Race, Ethnicity, Color or National Origin (CRECNO). Popularly known as the Racial Privacy Initiative, this proposed amendment to the State Constitution would prohibit the collection and/or maintenance of most data on race and ethnicity by the State of California, including the University. Normally the Senate does not take positions on political issues, but it felt compelled to do so in this case. The adverse consequences of this Initiative for the University's research missions, as well as public policy, were too severe to be overlooked. Among our most serious concerns were that CRECNO would impair the University's ability to measure how well it is serving the diverse population of the state, and may impede research involving race and ethnicity. These and other concerns were expressed in the Council's letter to President Atkinson (<http://www.Universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/crecnoresp.pdf>), and were conveyed to the Regents. At their May meeting, the Regents voted 15 to 3, with one abstention, to oppose CRECNO. The Senate had expected to take an active role in educating the public about the detrimental effects this amendment would have on the people of the state but the change in date for the matter to be considered (from March 2004 to October 2003) has restricted our ability to do so.

Faculty-Student Relations Policy- APM 015. In spring of 2002, the Academic Council re-endorsed a resolution on faculty-student relationships that was passed

in 1983 by the Academic Senate, and asked the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure (UCP&T) to draft an addition to the Faculty Code of Conduct concerning legislation on faculty-student sexual liaisons. UCP&T began a discussion of this matter in January 2002 and developed a draft amendment to APM 015 that was sent out for general Senate review in January 2003. The proposed amendment made it a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct for a faculty member to engage in a romantic or sexual relationship with a student for whom he or she has academic responsibility or should reasonably expect to have such in the future. Following a lively debate, the Assembly approved the policy change on May 28, and the Regents, at their July meeting, voted to adopt the amendment. It was issued by President Atkinson shortly thereafter. To see the new policy: (<http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-015.pdf>).

University Statement on Academic Freedom - APM 010. In the process of reviewing events surrounding a controversial writing course at Berkeley last fall, it became clear to President Atkinson that the University's Statement on Academic Freedom, which was issued by President Sproul in 1934, was not useful in addressing contemporary questions. As a result, the President asked Boalt Hall Law Professor, Robert Post, to work with faculty colleagues and the Office of the General Counsel to draft a new statement for the University. When the draft was completed, it was reviewed over a four-month period by the campuses, the Standing Committees of the Systemwide Senate, and the Academic Council. The Senate's discussions, together with a close collaboration between the University Committee on Academic Freedom and Professor Post, resulted in a final version that was endorsed by a vote of 45 to 3 at the Assembly meeting on July 30. We currently await President Atkinson's action on this matter. The final version that was endorsed by the Assembly can be found at: (<http://www.Universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/jul2003/jul2003ii.pdf>)

TASK FORCES AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

It is the practice of the Academic Council to empanel a task force or special committee to address questions that require intensive work that do not fall entirely within the jurisdiction of one Senate committee. This year, the Council utilized an especially large number of these groups to advise the Council on many significant issues.

Course Descriptions. At the request of President Atkinson, the Academic Council empanelled a task force to review the experience of the English R1A course taught at Berkeley in fall semester 2002; to review how (non-standard) courses, such as "umbrella," single-offer," or "varying subject" are reviewed for content; and to review the operant norms for faculty with respect to how they describe their courses. The task force completed its work and the final reports can be found at: <http://www.Universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/englishr1a.pdf>, and <http://www.Universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/council/coursetaskforce.pdf>

Graduate/Professional Admissions. The Academic Council convened a task force to review graduate and professional school admissions guidelines and principles. While this was done in part in response to a resolution of the State Legislature calling upon the University to implement comprehensive review at the graduate and professional school level, it was a subject deserving of Senate attention. The task force was asked to consider whether it is possible to frame a set of criteria for the various departments, schools and programs to consider in determining proper reliance on GRE, MCAT, LSAT or GMAT. The work of this task force will continue into the next academic year.

Honors/AP. A task force was empanelled by the Academic Council to formulate a recommendation on the appropriate role of Honors/AP/IB and community college courses in the admissions process and, in the case of AP and IB courses, the credit given by the campuses. It is expected that the work of this task force will be completed during 2003-04.

Professorial Steps. In response to concerns that have been raised in recent years about the rationale behind the step system at the Professor level, the Academic Council created a task force to consider whether a step with uniquely high standards should be maintained, and, if so, whether Step VI is the right point in a professorial career to place a review of that nature. This group's work will continue into next year.

Academic Council's Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSONL). Because of recent events concerning the Labs, and UC's future relationship with them, the Academic Council felt that it was now more important than ever for the Senate to be active participants in discussions involving the future of the Labs. It was decided that this could be achieved most easily if the Academic Council established a task force with greater centrality at the Office of the President, which would report regularly to the Academic Council. As a result, the former UCORP subcommittee on the Labs was reconstituted as a Special Committee of the Academic Council and the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Council are included in the membership. The immediate focus is on the issues currently surrounding the relationship between UC and the Labs.

REORGANIZATION:

Council Organization. Since 1999, when the southern office in Irvine was closed and all of the administrative activities were consolidated in a single location at the Office of the President (UCOP) building in Oakland, the Academic Council has been undergoing a reorganization. As of this past academic year, the office is fully staffed and with a redesigned website (<http://www.Universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/>) and the introduction of a new online newsletter, *The Senate Source*, the reorganization is now close to complete.

The increased visibility and ease of access afforded by the new location at UCOP has enabled the Senate to become more actively involved in all of the important decision making at the Systemwide level and to be more pro-active on issues of particular interest to the faculty and Senate.

Senate Bylaws. Consistent with the reorganization was a three-year effort to revise the Systemwide Senate's Bylaws. The goal was to streamline and update the bylaws affecting the operations of the Academic Assembly and to standardize the composition, service term and procedures governing the work of Senate's standing committees. The Assembly at the May 2003 meeting approved the revised bylaws. Those bylaws having to do with Assembly operations will become effective on September 1, 2003, and those governing the standing committees will go into effect in September 2004. It is the hope that these changes will both improve the efficiency and lower the cost of Senate operations.

Joint Administrative/Senate Retreat: Under the leadership of Council Chair Binion and with the cooperation of Provost King, the Academic Council held its first joint retreat with the executive vice chancellors. The goal of the retreat was to foster a greater communication on matters of shared interest between the campus EVCs and the Systemwide Academic Senate. The three discussion topics, which were each facilitated jointly by a faculty and EVC member, included: UCFW's proposal on Phased Employment/Phased Retirement; Ethics and Integrity: Faculty-Student Relations; and Shared Governance: Models of Effective Academic Senate-Administration Interaction. Because the retreat was found to be both useful and informative, the Academic Council plans to make this an annual event meeting in alternate years with the chancellors and the executive vice chancellors.

Relationship with the Regents. Last fall, the Senate leadership sought to become more fully integrated in the newly restructured meetings of the Regents. This included the Senate Chair and Vice Chair now serving as advisory members on all Regental committees. While substantial progress has been made, the Senate leadership is still not as fully incorporated into the consultation process between meetings as would be desirable. During the July meeting, the Council discussed whether this could be improved if the Senate Chair and Vice Chair were voting members of the Regents. In a straw vote taken at the conclusion of the discussion, the majority of the Council members were in strong support of the faculty representatives being granted voting status. It was their view that this would greatly enhance the Senate's involvement in decision-making processes. The Council recommended, however, that the non-voting status be maintained for another year during which time the Senate Chair and Vice Chair would work informally to be included in more of the Regents' pre-meeting discussions. Their progress will be assessed at the end of the year when the Council will make a final decision on this issue.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

The Academic Council acknowledges and expresses its gratitude to the following members of the Senior Administration who have taken time from their demanding schedules each month to brief Council members and answer their questions on all of the current issues: President Richard Atkinson; C. Judson King, Provost and Sr. Vice President-Academic Affairs; Bruce Darling, Sr. Vice President-University Affairs; Joseph Mullinix, Sr. Vice President-Business and Finance; and Lawrence Hershman, Vice President for Budget. This fall, the University will lose two of its chief leaders – Richard Atkinson and Jud King. The number and nature of the contributions these leaders have made to the University of California are too numerous to list here, but one of their important legacies is an unquestioned support of shared governance and their willingness to work closely with the Senate on the challenging issues faced by the University. The Academic Council wishes Richard Atkinson and Jud King well in the next chapter of their lives.

Respectfully Submitted:

Gayle Binion, Chair
Lawrence Pitts, Vice Chair

Divisional Chairs:

Catherine Koshland, Berkeley
Bruce Madewell, Davis
Philip DiSaia, Irvine
Duncan Lindsey, Los Angeles
Irwin Sherman, Riverside
Joel Dimsdale, San Diego
Daniel Bikle, San Francisco

Walter Yuen, Santa Barbara
George Blumenthal, Santa Cruz

Guest:

Peter Berck, UC Merced Task Force

Senate Committee Chairs:

Barbara Sawrey, BOARS
Richard Church, CCGA
Michelle Yeh, UCAP
Andrew Grosovsky, UCEP
Mark Traugott, UCFW
Janis Ingham, UCORP (Vice Chair)
Richard Price, UCPB

Council Staff:

Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Executive Director
Betty Marton, Policy Analyst
Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst