

Minutes of Meeting**July 26, 2017****I. Consent Calendar**

1. Today's agenda items and their priority
2. Draft Academic Council minutes of June 28, 2017
3. Master of Public Health (MPH degree program at UC San Diego)
4. UCOPE recommendations on the revised SAT/ACT and UC's Entry Level Writing Requirement

ACTION: Council approved the consent calendar.**II. BOARS Issues**

- o Henry Sanchez, BOARS Chair

1. UC Undergraduate Admissions Augmented Review Policy

At their July 2017 meeting, the UC Regents voted unanimously to adopt the Academic Senate's proposed policy on Augmented Review in Undergraduate Admissions. BOARS will monitor outcomes from the policy and report them in the Committee's Annual Report to the Regents on Comprehensive Review.

2. Report to President Napolitano on the Compare Favorably Policy for Nonresident Admission

BOARS's report on the "Compare Favorably" policy for nonresident admission responds to the President's fall 2016 request to the Senate to clarify the policy's (1) compliance with the California Master Plan for Higher Education; and (2) its consistency with the University's overall freshman admission goals, comprehensive review policy, and holistic review processes in place on UC campuses. A 2016 State audit criticized the policy and the University's nonresident admission and enrollment practices. BOARS's report summarizes the Committee's work over the past year to discuss the complex issues associated with comparing residents and nonresidents and to analyze several alternative measures for the compare favorably evaluation. BOARS concludes in the report that the existing policy provides appropriate flexibility for campuses while maintaining the University's primary responsibility to California students and ensuring that campuses are admitting nonresidents who perform at least as well as California residents.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the report and forward it to the President. The motion passed unanimously.**3. Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (Area D)**

BOARS is requesting a systemwide Senate review of proposed revisions to the area "d" (laboratory science) requirement for freshman admission ([Senate Regulation 424.A.3.d](#)). The revisions are intended to align UC's expectations for high school science preparation more closely with the expectations for high school science curricula based on California's adoption of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) for K-12. The revisions were recommended to

BOARS by a UC faculty working group that was composed of Senate faculty from all ten campuses and representing a broad range of science and science education disciplines.

The revisions include: 1) Increasing the minimum area “d” requirement from 2 units (3 recommended) to 3 units, while continuing to require 2 units of coursework that “provide basic knowledge in at least two of the fundamental disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics”; and 2) Changing the name of the area “d” subject requirement from “Laboratory Science” to “Science.” BOARS also approved the working group’s recommendation to broaden options for science disciplines that can fulfill the third year area “d” requirement. Under the new rules, high school students could take a third course from the three fundamental disciplines listed in the regulation, or select a third course from other disciplines reflected in the NGSS, including earth and space sciences, interdisciplinary sciences, computer science, engineering, and applied sciences. The options would be listed in the A-G Guide (<http://www.ucop.edu/agguide/a-g-requirements/d-lab-science/index.html>).

UCOP analysts would continue to review individual high school courses for area “d” approval against the faculty-approved criteria in the A-G guide. Any area “d” course, including courses from the expanded discipline options, would have to meet the nine specific course criteria and eight NGSS science and engineering practices articulated in the A-G Guide, including a requirement that the course has a laboratory component that incorporates “authentic investigations consistent with the practices of the scientific field.”

Discussion: To help prevent confusion about courses from the additional disciplines that are eligible to qualify for area “d,” Council members recommended clarifying that “The third year of the requirement can be met with a yearlong course in any one of the following disciplines as long as the course meets the goals and criteria of area “d.” It was noted that the list of newly allowable disciplines should align with what is available at under-resourced schools to ensure that moving to a three course requirement does not create an undue burden for disadvantaged high schools. Finally, the documents should clarify when the new requirements will take effect; it is assumed they will affect freshmen entering high school in fall 2018. Chair Sanchez noted that 95% of UC applicants currently take more than the two-year area “d” minimum. He added that the state will support high schools’ transition to the NGSS, and it is expected that high schools will most frequently adopt a three-course integrated model for the NGSS that incorporates Earth and Space Science into each of three years of Biology, Chemistry, and Physics.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to send the proposal for systemwide review.

III. CCGA Handbook Revisions

- **Kwai Ng, CCGA Chair**

CCGA is discussing revisions to Appendix K of its [Handbook](#), which lists guidelines for the divisional Senate review of new and continuing Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs). The draft revisions update Appendix K to align with the University’s new SSGPDP policy released in fall 2016, and clarify other guidelines adopted in 2016 that ask SSGPDP proposers to provide a financial viability analysis that assesses budgetary impacts to state-supported programs.

Chair Ng noted that some campus and UCOP administrators are concerned that CCGA is singling out SSGPDPs for additional scrutiny beyond what is expected of other graduate programs. However, SSGPDPs represented over half of the degree proposals CCGA received this year. SSGPDPs are different from other graduate programs, and CCGA is sensitive to concerns that they could divert resources away from UC's core state-supported academic mission. The cost analysis provides important information about these potential effects. CCGA wrote the guidelines to accommodate a variety of existing campus review practices. The revised guidelines clarifying CCGA's expectations will help campuses perform a complete and rigorous review.

Administrators have also expressed concerns about the length of the CCGA review and asked the Senate to expedite its processes. CCGA notes that it has been responsive and efficient in its reviews, often approving proposals in sixty or fewer days. Moreover, CCGA and UCPB have agreed that they will not participate in the three-year review of SSGPDPs unless the campus representatives to the two committees express dissatisfaction with the budgetary information their corresponding committees receive.

IV. Consultation with Senior Managers

- **Janet Napolitano, President**
- **Aimée Dorr, Provost & Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs**
- **Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer**

Enrollment Funding: The 2017-18 state budget bill requires the University to enroll 1,500 more undergraduates in 2018-19 with \$15 million in funding redirected from systemwide programs and UCOP operations. To identify the \$15 million, UCOP will analyze budgets for all centrally-funded programs and services, including more than 140 systemwide research programs and initiatives. The effort will also draw on information gathered in the most recent strategic organizational review of UCOP.

The budget bill also includes a \$5 million augmentation to support the enrollment of 500 additional graduate students. The University welcomes additional investments in the graduate education mission, but it is also concerned about language in the bill asking UC to prioritize the enrollment of California residents. The state has agreed to work with UC on clarifications to this language through a technical clean-up bill. UC also wants to work with the state on a plan for multi-year enrollment funding and a plan to fund capital facilities projects to support the new enrollments.

- A Council member noted that UCOP's portfolio review should include programs housed in the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources and the Agricultural Experiment Station.

Transitions: President Napolitano thanked Chair Chalfant for his service to the University and his partnership with the President on several important issues as Academic Senate vice chair and chair. Provost Dorr will depart the University in September, and the Regents have confirmed her replacement: Michael T. Brown, UC Santa Barbara professor of counseling, clinical and school psychology and dean of UCSB Extension. The Regents also confirmed the appointment of Alex Bustamante as the new senior vice president and chief compliance and audit officer.

Augmented Review: President Napolitano noted that she is pleased with the new Undergraduate Admissions Augmented Review policy. She expects the Senate to monitor the policy's implementation and its effects, including applicant responses to campus requests for supplemental information and the effects of letters of recommendation.

SVSH: At the end of June, UCOP announced a new systemwide framework and procedures for the investigation and adjudication of sexual violence and sexual harassment (SVSH) cases involving faculty and staff. Campuses are expected to implement local procedures that align with the framework by September 1. The framework requires Senate agencies to take up charges no later than 40 business days after the receipt of the Title IX report. It does not mandate a similar timeframe for the Privilege and Tenure hearing process, but the President wants the Senate to consider scheduling P&T hearings year round to increase efficiency.

Retiree Health: CFO Brostrom noted that the Regents have postponed to November their discussion of a UCOP proposal to remove the 70 percent floor for the University's aggregate annual contribution to the retiree health benefit program. The [Senate](#) and other groups had expressed strong concerns about the proposal and asked UCOP to pull the item from the agenda. The delay will give UCOP time to consult more thoroughly with constituencies about potential changes and what is sustainable going forward. The CFO noted that retiree health costs are projected to grow faster than any other UC benefit. Retiree health is not a vested benefit, and changes are needed to sustain the program. The CFO is concerned that UC faces increasing debt obligations in the form of the retiree health liability that could harm UC's credit rating and limit future borrowing. He added that there are a variety of actions, in addition to removing the 70% floor, the Regents could take to mitigate cost growth, including adjustments to the plan's design.

- A Council member noted that in the 2010 Post-Employment Benefits process employee groups felt they had made concessions in exchange for assurances that the 70 percent contribution would be an absolute floor. Further lowering the floor or otherwise weakening the benefit will widen the faculty total remuneration gap and hurt UC's ability to recruit and retain excellent academic personnel. Council members also noted that the Senate should focus on preserving the overall value of the benefit, rather than a specific arbitrary number.

Student Housing: UC is investing in new student housing across the system. In July, the Regents approved internal and external financing plans to support approximately \$800 million in housing projects at UCSD. UCLA is expected to propose projects of a similar scope in November. UC also plans to release a limited project revenue bond this fall.

Negotiated Salary Pilot Program: Provost Dorr noted that UC has released for systemwide review a [report](#) on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) from the Fourth Year NSTP Taskforce. The five-year NSTP has been in effect since 2013 on the Irvine, Los Angeles and San Diego campuses. The program is intended to add flexible options for generating funding for faculty salaries by allowing eligible general campus faculty to supplement their income with certain non-state resources. In its report the Task Force recommends continuing the program for another four years and expanding it on other campuses where there is consensus support for doing so.

ILTI: The Innovative Learning Technology Initiative funds the development and enhancement of new and existing online/hybrid undergraduate courses. The Initiative enables a UC student

enrolled at one UC campus to enroll in an ILTI course offered at another UC campus. Enrollment in ILTI courses has been growing. UCOP is encouraging campuses to facilitate more cross-campus enrollments into ILTI courses and to allow ILTI courses to count for both major credit and unit credit. The systemwide Senate chair and vice chair sit on the ILTI Steering Committee.

- Chair Chalfant expressed appreciation for Provost Dorr's career of service to the University. The Academic Council recognized Provost Dorr with a round of applause.

V. Update on the National Laboratories

- Kimberly Budil, Vice President, Office of the National Laboratories

UC is a member of Los Alamos National Security (LANS), an LLC that holds the contract for management of the Los Alamos National Laboratory. LANS' current contract ends in September 2018, and the Department of Energy has decided to open the contract for re-competition. A draft management RFP indicates that the DOE will base its evaluation of proposals on three criteria: Past Contractor Performance; Organization and Key Personnel; and Small Business Strategy. UC has asked the DOE to clarify several aspects of the draft RFP, but it is pleased that the scoring system will weigh the first two criteria equally and incorporate interviews with LANL personnel into the process. The DOE is expected to release the final RFP in September and to request proposals by mid-November. The University won the last management competition largely due to the quality and performance of key lab personnel, and their ability to work together effectively. UC emphasizes that it is important to build a supportive operational culture focused on enabling the execution of the scientific mission.

VI. Senate Officer's Announcements

- Jim Chalfant, Academic Senate Chair

ACSCOLI Updates: Vice Chair White is preparing a revised charter for the Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI), as well as a proposal for two new ACSCOLI members and a 2017-18 chair.

July Regents Meeting: In addition to the topics described above, the Regents discussed the results of the Activity-based Costing (ABC) pilot studies undertaken at UCR, UCD, and UCM as part of the Budget Framework Agreement between the Governor and the President. Provost Dorr told the Regents that the University has fulfilled the terms of the ABC agreement.

Faculty Discipline Follow-up Work Group: The Senate office is assembling all additional comments that arose during the systemwide reviews of revisions to APMs 015/016 and Bylaw 336 that were not directly related to the goals of those reviews. Chair Chalfant has invited UCFW, UCAADE, and UCAP to appoint representatives to a working group that will meet in the fall to review the comments and discuss next steps.

- Council members noted that UCOP's systemwide Investigation and Adjudication Framework is not fully consistent with all existing campus Privilege & Tenure Committee policies and procedures. It was suggested that Senate division chairs discuss lingering issues over email or in a conference call.

VII. University Committee on Academic Freedom statements

The Academic Council reviewed a request from the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) to endorse two UCAF statements.

1. On the Free Exchange of Information

“On the Free Exchange of Information” affirms that free speech is one of the key principles on which the University is founded. It notes that it is vital to the UC mission to allow all viewpoints and opinions to be expressed and considered, including speakers that some students may consider offensive and even abhorrent.

2. In Support of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 21

The second UCAF statement expresses support for the CA Legislature’s [Assembly Concurrent Resolution 21](#) (Public postsecondary education: free speech policy). The resolution calls on all California universities to adopt statements consistent with the principles articulated by the UC Irvine Chancellor and the University of Chicago, which reaffirm existing commitments to free speech and academic freedom and the development of a culture among students and faculty in which ideas can be expressed freely, including ideas that are regarded as offensive by some.

ACTION: It was agreed that the statements should circulate to Council for an email vote to ensure that the members not present at today’s meeting have a chance to opine.

VIII. Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Presidential Electronic Information Security Policy

Council reviewed responses from systemwide committees and divisions to the [proposed revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security](#). The goal of the revised policy is to bring UC into compliance with new federal requirements related to faculty research contracts and to replace inconsistent campus policies with a single systemwide framework for responding to the risk of security breaches. Senate reviewers expressed significant concerns about the policy’s clarity, length, accessibility to a general readership of faculty end-users, and its potential compliance implications for faculty. They agreed that the policy requires a thorough revision. It was noted that the policy is helpful only to the extent that it allows campuses to develop and implement their own policies.

ACTION: A letter summarizing the commentary and conveying concerns about the draft policy will be send to Vice Provost Carlson.

IX. Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to APMs 285, 210-3, 133 and 740

Council reviewed a draft letter summarizing Senate reviewer responses to the [proposed revisions to APMs 285, 210-3, 133 and 740](#), and reporting the motions Council approved in June concerning the revisions. Council also discussed a proposal to appoint a working group to advise the administration on additional modifications that address the concerns and questions raised by Senate reviewers.

In June, Council endorsed the concept of a new title series to replace the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) faculty series that includes rank and step, sabbatical privileges, a research requirement that emphasizes pedagogy but allows research in the underlying discipline, and precludes new hires in the LSOE series. However, Council rejected the title proposed for the new series – “Teaching Professor.” Following the June meeting, Council discussed alternative titles over email, including Professor of Pedagogy, Principal Lecturer, and Senior Lecturer, but members reached no consensus about an alternative to LSOE or Teaching Professor.

Council members noted that other universities, including some UC campuses, use the “Teaching Professor” title. There was concern that allowing individuals to remain grandfathered under the old LSOE criteria but also keeping the LSOE title for faculty hired under the new criteria could create confusion. It was suggested that the University solicit input from external constituencies about the title change to get a sense about how it would be perceived. Chair Chalfant noted that he will contact potential faculty members for the joint working group that will begin meeting in the fall to discuss specific guidance about the next round of proposed revisions.

X. Council Priorities for 2017-18

Council members identified several anticipated new and continuing issues for the 2017-18 Council:

1. Meeting the 2:1 freshman-to-transfer enrollment ratio
2. Faculty total remuneration
3. Nonresident enrollment
4. The rise of SSPs and their policy implications for campuses

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst
Attest: Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Chair