

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting
June 26, 2024****I. Consent Calendar**

1. Today's agenda items and their priority
2. Draft Minutes of May 22, 2024
3. UCI Master in Management
4. New Transfer Pathways in Environmental Science, Aerospace Engineering, Bioengineering, Civil Engineering, Environmental Engineering, and Materials Science and Engineering

ACTION: Council approved the consent calendar.

II. Senate Officers' Announcements

- **James Steintrager, Academic Council Chair**
- **Steven W. Cheung, Academic Council Vice Chair**
- **Monica Lin, Executive Director**

Legislation: The Academic Council's [letter](#) opposing Assembly Constitutional Amendment 6 was submitted on June 5, 2024. The bill did not advance through the state Senate Elections and Constitutional Amendments Committee. Academic Senate leadership have asked UC State Governmental Relations to give them as much advance time as possible to respond to requests for comment on proposed bills.

Protests and Encampments: There are no remaining active encampments on UC campuses. UCOP is preparing for potential protests in fall 2024 and wants to ensure more consistent systemwide enforcement of existing time, place, and manner policies. The Senate chair and vice chair will meet with several Senate division chairs to discuss options for enhancing the Senate's voice in planning, including strengthening consultation around campus safety, policing, and emergency moves to remote instruction.

APP Reorganization: Provost Newman announced a reorganization of the Office of Academic Personnel and Programs (APP) into two new units: 1) Systemwide Academic Personnel and 2) Faculty Affairs and Academic Programs. Senate leadership is concerned that the former will be led by a staff administrator rather than a faculty member.

Strategic Plan: A staff workgroup from the systemwide Senate is developing a strategic plan to increase the visibility of the systemwide Senate and enhance Senate service. Executive Director Lin will introduce the plan at the July Council meeting.

During the discussion:

- Council members expressed concern that individual Regents have been influencing campus negotiations with student protestors and discouraging amnesty for students, faculty, and staff cited for UC policy violations during the protests. Council members agreed that the administration should engage the Senate in fall planning.

- Council members also stated their preference for a faculty member to administer the unit that oversees faculty issues such as recruitment, retention, and stewardship of the Academic Personnel Manual.

III. Systemwide Senate Review: Proposed Revisions to APM 016

Council reviewed comments from Senate divisions and committees in response to revisions to APM 016 adding policy language addressing the handling of simultaneous academic misconduct investigations and personnel actions. The revisions respond to the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure's request in 2023, [endorsed by the Council](#), for a uniform policy that applies to all campuses to address inconsistent procedures and practices across campuses. Chair Steintrager summarized the main concerns and points raised during the review:

- The policy does not address the Council's recommendation to initiate a no-fault pause only after an investigation is completed and when formal charges are filed, except for tenure cases where a pause would be allowable earlier. Instead, it allows a pause at the start of a formal investigation for any faculty member.
- By delegating decisions about the timing of the pause to campuses, the policy does not address the Senate's request for a systemwide policy that ensures uniform and consistent standards across campuses.
- The policy could allow a chancellor to deny tenure to an assistant professor by taking no action on an investigation if it extends beyond the eighth year, potentially leading to the faculty member losing their position.
- The policy should include guidance confirming that if no misconduct is found, any advancements and salary increases will be awarded to the faculty member retroactively.

During the discussion

- Members noted that the policy was written without apparent reference to the Council's recommendations, and they expressed support for sending a letter opposing the version of the policy circulated for systemwide review.
- One Council member questioned the need for any policy, but most felt a systemwide policy was needed to address the inconsistent, ad hoc systems used for pauses across campuses.

ACTION: Circulate a draft summary letter to Council for review before sending to APP.

IV. Office of Academic Personnel and Programs (APP)

- **Douglas Haynes, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Programs**
- **Amy K. Lee, Associate Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Programs**

Provost Haynes provided the following updates:

Negotiated Salary Plan: On June 10, Provost Newman issued the new APM 672 on the negotiated salary plan. Prior to issuance, APP sent Senate leadership a letter responding to feedback from the Academic Council, which had opposed the policy.

Faculty Work & Recovery Report: On June 14, Vice Provost Haynes issued the report of the working group on Faculty Work & Recovery Post-Pandemic. It includes recommendations for better aligning faculty workload to support teaching, research, and service excellence.

Presidential Task Force: Vice Provost Haynes is co-chairing a presidential task force on Instructional Modalities and UC Quality Undergraduate Degree Programs with Senate Vice Chair Cheung. The task force is drafting a provisional report to be presented in final form to the Regents in the fall.

V. Consultation with Senior Managers

○ Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer

Operating Budget: The governor's May budget revision included a \$137 million cut to the University. However, UC is hopeful about an alternative budget bill passed by the Legislature. If signed by the governor, it would provide UC with a 5% (\$228 million) base budget adjustment consistent with the compact, as well as \$31 million for the buydown of nonresidents at three campuses. This augmentation would then be subject to a \$125 million cut, netting a \$134 million (2.8%) increase. However, the plan also pencils in an 8% cut to next year's UC budget, and delays restoration of compact funding until 2026-27 and 2027-28. The Legislature's plan also retains funding for the UC Labor Centers, the UCLA Latino Policy & Politics Institute, and the UCD Equine Performance and Rehabilitation Facility, funds 1% growth in undergraduate enrollment for 2024-25, and restores funding for the middle-class scholarship program.

Capital Budget: The capital budget includes continued debt service for a new UC Merced Medical Education Building but no other one-time funding. The Legislature is considering several general obligation bonds for the November ballot that may benefit UC. UC will continue to use lease revenue bonds as a strategy to address capital needs across several campuses.

During the discussion:

- Council members asked how the expansion of the health enterprise and associated capital expenditures/liabilities might affect the general campus. They also requested that the University communicate information about increases to employee health insurance premiums to faculty in a timely manner. Finally, they encouraged further discussion of Council's recommendation to change the default pension option for new employees from "Pension Choice" to "Savings Choice."

CFO Brostrom noted that many of the UC medical center capital projects respond to a state mandate to perform seismic upgrades to hospitals by 2030. UCOP is working with campuses to assess how UC Health's recent acquisition of eight hospitals will impact the finances of UC Health and the general campuses. CFO Brostrom believes the long-term outlook is positive and the new hospitals will generate significant revenues.

CFO Brostrom acknowledged that last year's insurance premium increases were a surprise, and the University is taking steps to ensure that future increases are communicated transparently and have a minimal impact on employees. He also expressed support for a comprehensive review of UC benefits to determine what UC can and should be providing its employees.

VI. Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues

○ Peggy O'Day (UCM), ACSCOLI Chair

Chair O'Day noted that Council established ACSCOLI in 2007 to provide Senate oversight of UC's relationship with three Department of Energy laboratories: Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL), Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), and Los Alamos Laboratory (LANL). ACSCOLI includes 12 faculty representatives, including members of UCORP and UCPB. ACSCOLI consults with the vice president for national laboratories and other senior managers on general lab policies, the dispersal of UC's portion of management fee monies, collaboration and intellectual exchange between the labs and UC faculty/students, research and program review, safety/security, scientific quality and integrity, and the benefits to UC of continued management.

This year ACSCOLI provided guidance on changes proposed for the UC Lab Fees Research Program, discussed UC's bid for the Frederick National Cancer Lab in Maryland, and reviewed LLNL's Early Career UC Faculty Initiative. ACSCOLI also held its January 2024 meeting at LBNL, where it met with the lab director and toured various facilities. Chair O'Day and other members attended meetings of various laboratory advisory boards.

Chair O'Day noted that the labs are successful, perform a wide range of cutting-edge research, and enjoy healthy relationships with UC campuses. ACSCOLI sees opportunities for deeper lab engagement with campuses and students at all levels; improved communication among ACSCOLI, the labs, and campuses; and more standardized campus-lab master agreements to facilitate collaborations.

ACSCOLI is proposing several minor changes to its charter around committee membership and to acknowledge that UC may assume management of additional labs.

During the discussion:

- Council members asked why UC would bid to manage a national laboratory on the East Coast. Chair O'Day responded that UC considered the opportunity to add a national lab with a health sciences profile to its research and managerial portfolios a positive one. Ultimately, the bid was a decision made by the Regents.

VII. A-G Ethnic Studies Follow-up to Systemwide Review

Council invited UC administrators and faculty guests to discuss [questions and concerns](#) raised during the [systemwide review](#) of proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 424 about implementation of a new A-G ethnic studies (Area H) requirement and Area H course criteria.

A-G Ethnic Studies Implementation Issues

Chase Fischerhall, Director of A-G and Transfer Articulation Policy noted that state Assembly Bill 101 (AB 101) mandates all California public high schools offer an ethnic studies course by 2025-26 and makes ethnic studies a high school graduation requirement by 2029-30. Since UC's A-G requirements generally align with high school graduation requirements, it would be consistent with current practice to align Area H with AB 101. Director Fischerhall addressed concerns about under-resourced schools' ability to meet AB 101 by sharing data from a February 2023 survey of 278 California high schools across 43 counties about trends and challenges in creating ethnic studies courses that fulfill AB 101. Key findings include:

- 51% of respondents reported having an ethnic studies course.
- 57% intend to implement the AB 101 graduation requirement.
- 53% plan to offer A-G approved ethnic studies courses.

Survey respondents reported several challenges to AB 101 implementation in the survey. These included: teacher availability (49%), a lack of ethnic studies teaching expertise (48%), existing student course loads (37%), and mixed community support (33%). While these challenges are likely to persist, there has been growth in teacher training programs and course availability through UC Scout since the survey. UC Scout provides online UC-approved A-G high school classes, including free resources and curriculum for California public schools. Additionally, these challenges are not unique to Area H and as the survey demonstrates, have actually arisen in the context of AB 101 implementation. Area H would provide schools struggling with AB 101 more guidance related to ethnic studies course content.

Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Associate Vice Provost & Executive Director of Undergraduate Admissions, discussed the impact of a potential A-G ethnic studies requirement on UC admissions. She noted that implementation will take time, and while any new admission requirement initially creates barriers for some students, historical precedents such as the Visual and Performing Arts requirement (Area F) introduced in 1999 faced similar challenges. She acknowledged that fulfilling the Area H requirement through a standalone course could add to students' course loads and that some high school students may be surprised to learn that their ethnic studies course will not count for Area H unless it is explicitly approved for the requirement. Campuses can use admission by exception (A by E) to admit students who do not fulfill an Area H requirement, including students attending private or out-of-state schools who are not subject to AB 101. However, she cautioned that 13% of California resident UC applicants do not come from California public schools, which could cause much greater use of the A by E policy if private schools do not also offer approved ethnic studies courses, increasing the volume of A by E applicants for campus admissions staff to manage.

Darlene Lee, Faculty Advisor for the UCLA Teacher Education Program and former member of the BOARS Ethnic Studies Faculty Workgroup, noted that in 2021, 50% of California public high school students had access to an ethnic studies course. Schools in areas with higher concentrations of Asian, Hispanic, or Black staff and/or students; in cities; or near colleges, are more likely to offer ethnic studies courses. To meet AB 101's estimated need for 700 new ethnic studies teachers, several colleges and universities have developed new teacher training and credentialing programs, with UCLA training 371 teachers alone. AB 101 specifically mentions A-G approved courses as one way to satisfy the requirement, and the criteria developed by the A-G implementation workgroup will support course development and address other challenges identified in the survey. She noted that the State Board of Education Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum provides sample lessons covering core concepts and themes. The Area H course criteria offer course development guidance to augment these sample lessons.

During the discussion:

- Council members inquired about the benefits of ethnic studies for success at UC and whether high schools will find Area H helpful. Faculty Advisor Lee emphasized that the academic and social benefits of ethnic studies courses are well-documented. They prepare students to interact with diverse individuals, equip them with tools to deal with racism and other hardships, and support their college success and persistence to graduation. In general, California teachers believe that Area H criteria will assist them in meeting AB 101.

A-G Ethnic Studies Course Criteria Questions and Concerns

Professors Christine Hong (UCSC) and Daniel Solorzano (UCLA), both former members of the BOARS Area H Implementation Workgroup, provided an overview of the A-G ethnic studies criteria developed by the Workgroup.

Professor Hong highlighted the involvement of UC faculty content experts in developing the A-G ethnic studies criteria, which will help UC lead educational policy for California. The criteria articulate a college-prep version of ethnic studies, provide broad-based and rigorous standards, and clarify key aspects of the discipline. After five revisions, the current criteria are strong and accessible, and few concerns remain about their integrity or content.

Professor Hong explained that the field of Ethnic Studies originated at CSU in the 1960s, driven by student demand. It is an interdisciplinary field grounded in a critique of systems of power and inequality, and while its foundational disciplines include African American, Chicano/Latino, Native American, and Asian American and Pacific Islander Studies, the Area H criteria are flexible, allowing districts to develop courses that respond to local demographics. Ethnic studies courses equip students with the critical thinking skills and intellectual tools they need to engage with a multiracial society, improving academic outcomes across disciplines.

Professor Solorzano shared his personal history teaching ethnic studies in various departments at the high school level and across the three segments of California public higher education. He noted that Ethnic Studies offers students of color the self-affirming chance to see themselves in the curriculum, and all students a non-stereotypic view of others. A variety of quantitative and qualitative data show ethnic studies' benefits for academic success.

During the discussion:

- A Council member asked how UC's expectations for ethnic studies course content would differ, with or without an Area H requirement. Another asked how the Area H criteria would help students succeed at UC. Professors Hong and Solorzano noted that AB 101 identifies A-G as one pathway to meeting the ethnic studies high school graduation requirement. Professors Hong and Solorzano expressed that ethnic studies improves academic outcomes, and AB 101 in tandem with Area H, will expand the UC applicant pool.
- Council members emphasized the need to center UC student preparation in the consideration of Area H. The Senate should also consider whether an ethnic studies course that is not Area H compliant can prepare students for success at UC. Council members noted that high schools outside of coastal areas are struggling to offer AB 101 compliant ethnic studies courses, much less to offer courses that meet the Area H criteria. It may be challenging for some schools to offer both a basic ethnic studies course and a college-prep ethnic studies course.

VIII. Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI)

○ Onuttom Narayan, ACSCOTI Vice Chair

Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulation 479 (Cal-GETC)

The Special Committee on Transfer Issues has proposed two amendments to SR 479 (Cal-GETC) aimed at enhancing transfer opportunities in majors where Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs) that fully align with UC's Transfer Pathways do not currently exist:

- The first relaxes the Cal-GETC Area 5 – Physical and Biological Sciences requirement by not requiring one course in the physical sciences and one in the biological sciences. Rather, two courses in different disciplines would suffice to fulfill the Area 5 requirement. This adjustment will help create ADTs that meet the 66-unit cap as mandated by state legislation (AB 928) while including all UC Transfer Pathway courses for majors like Chemistry.
- The second proposed amendment will allow students to defer up to four general education (GE) courses after transfer, instead of the current limit of two. This adjustment will enable students to better prepare for UC major requirements without delaying their transfer. It also accommodates the option to switch from following Cal-GETC to following a campus-specific GE pattern, providing students with the same flexibility already enjoyed by others.

ACTION: Council agreed to circulate the proposal for systemwide review.

IX. Reports from Senate Division Chairs

Encampments and protests:

- Several campuses are dealing with the aftermath of protest encampments and subsequent agreements between administrations and students. Faculty perspectives on these agreements and the protests are divided. Some are unhappy with the agreements. Others disapprove of decisions to involve police in dispersing encampments. There is also discontent over decisions to suspend students and faculty who participated in actions that violated UC policies. These concerns led divisional Senates to consider motions of censure and/or no confidence in chancellors at UCLA, UCI, and UCSD, all of which did not pass.

Policy and legal clarifications:

- Campuses are reviewing their time, place, and manner policies to ensure clarity.
- Campus Senates also seek clarity on California Penal Code 626.4., which allows campuses to exclude disruptive persons for up to 14 days, especially concerning its application to faculty and students barred from campus for failing to disperse.
- Senates also seek clarification about faculty rights and responsibilities regarding instruction, exams, and grading during a graduate student strike.

Other campus issues:

- A UCD Task Force charged with reviewing all aspects of campus operations is finalizing its report, and the Senate expects to dedicate significant time to the review of the report.
- The UCD Committee on Committees reviewed and revised its recruitment and appointment processes to ensure that the criteria and selection process are transparent and equitable.
- UCI implemented a new decentralized budget model that has resulted in cuts to individual schools.
- UCSB and other campuses are struggling with a lack of childcare options on or near campus.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director

Attest: James Steintrager, Academic Council Chair