

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting

July 26, 2023

I. Consent Calendar

1. Today's agenda items and their priority
2. Draft Council Minutes of June 28, 2023
3. Master of Biotechnology SSGPDP at UC Berkeley

ACTION: Council approved the consent calendar.

II. Senate Officers' Announcements

- Susan Cochran, Academic Council Chair
- James Steintrager, Academic Council Vice Chair

July Regents Meeting: The meeting included a discussion of potential increases to the UC Retirement Plan (UCRP) employer and employee contribution rates. This discussion came in response to a UCRP experience study conducted by the Regents' actuary, which recommended changes to valuation assumptions that will increase the Plan's actuarial accrued liability.

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee (ASAC) discussed UC's use of state funding to support Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnerships (SAPEP) programs. These programs aim to raise student achievement levels and close achievement gaps among targeted student groups across California public schools, from pre-kindergarten to postgraduate levels. ASAC also discussed the UC Reengagement Consortium's efforts to leverage UC Extension operations into a systemwide bachelor's degree completion program targeting stop-outs.

UC State Governmental Relations (SGR) provided updates on the status of several bills, including Assembly Bill 1749 (McCarty), which would require UC to give priority undergraduate admission to Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) completers with a 3.0 GPA. Both the University and Academic Senate oppose the bill, and Vice Chair Steintrager testified against it in Sacramento in June. The Senate is working with SGR to communicate the major challenges and concerns to the bill's author with the hope of reaching a resolution.

Online Degrees: Administrators and regents are exerting pressure on Senate leadership to delegate to campuses the ability to offer fully online undergraduate degrees. However, the Senate is emphasizing that such a decision should not be made lightly and has called for the formation of a presidential task force to thoroughly study the matter.

Labor Issues: Regents and administrators are discussing how certain union demands would impact University finances. A particular concern is how to delineate graduate students' work toward achieving academic goals from their work as represented employees. To address this and other issues, Provost Newman has announced plans for a systemwide Academic Congress on Innovations in Graduate Education, scheduled for October 9 at UCLA. The Senate is currently compiling a list of campus faculty invitees for the event.

III. Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to APM 710, Leaves of Absence/Sick Leave/Medical Leave

Council reviewed comments from Senate divisions and committees to a set of proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 710. The revisions aim to align APM 710 with California Assembly Bill 1041 (Wicks), which allows eligible employees of covered employers to take paid leave under the California Family Rights Act to care for a “designated person” with a serious health condition, to whom they are related by blood or share a family-like relationship. Under AB 1041, an employee may use paid sick days to care for one designated person within a 12-month period. Under the revised APM 710, UC academic appointees will be able to use their accrued sick leave for medical appointments, illness, or bereavement related to a designated person.

Senate reviewers expressed strong support for the amendments, as they enable faculty to care for all family members, including those fictive kin who do not fit the conventional definition of family. In making APM 710 more flexible, inclusive, and supportive of UC employees, the amendments will boost employee morale and promote diversity and equity. Reviewers also made suggestions for improving the policy, the most significant of which was to consider expanding the policy to allow faculty to care for multiple “designated persons” over a 12-month period. Reviewers also recommended several clarifications. These include defining the term “designated person” at the beginning of the policy, incorporating language from APM 715 to inform readers about the timing of identifying a designated person, and including a reference to the regulation addressing graduate student leave.

ACTION: Council endorsed the policy and will forward division and committee comments and a summary letter to Vice Provost Haynes.

IV. Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to APM 210, Review and Appraisal Committees (Mentorship)

Council reviewed comments from Senate divisions and committees to proposed revisions to APM 210, which add language concerning the consideration of mentoring in the criteria for appointment, promotion, and appraisal for several academic employment series.

In August 2021, the Academic Council asked the office of Academic Personnel and Programs (APP) to consider adding new language proposed by UCAP and CCGA to APM 210, focusing on faculty mentoring activities. The proposed revisions were released for systemwide review in spring 2023 and included detailed functions of mentoring and guidance on providing evidence of and evaluating mentoring effectiveness. The revision also covered evaluation and evidence of teaching effectiveness and contributions to diversity, equity, inclusion (DEI) for policy-covered librarians. The revision stated that mentoring should be reported under service if it is not primarily focused on teaching or scholarly activity.

Senate reviewers generally supported the goal of including mentoring in the teaching and service categories of APM 210. However, they had concerns with some of the proposed revisions. One was that certain phrases in the policy might unintentionally imply that mentorship is a mandatory

professional requirement for faculty advancement rather than an optional opportunity within teaching-related activities. The proposed changes also suggested to some the possibility that faculty could advance without formal teaching responsibilities and meet the minimum expectations for teaching and mentorship without engaging in classroom teaching. The policy should clarify that mentoring is not an additional requirement on par with teaching, research, and service, nor should it fully replace classroom teaching.

In addition, some reviewers felt the expanded list of criteria for judging teaching and mentoring effectiveness was excessively prescriptive and the policy should make clear that none of the items are mandatory. Another concern was that the revisions did not adequately connect DEI efforts with research and teaching in reviews and appraisals. There were also reservations about using student and mentee feedback for demonstrating teaching proficiency in merit and promotion reviews, as such feedback may be biased, and about how making faculty solely accountable for teaching outcomes could be challenging to control and document. Lastly, reviewers pointed out that the proposed revisions might increase the time required to assemble materials for a merit review or promotion, potentially exacerbating workload inequities.

During the discussion:

- Council members agreed that assessing the quality and effectiveness of teaching and mentoring can be challenging and may vary from discipline to discipline. However, campus Committees on Academic Personnel are skilled in making such assessments, and many already consider mentoring, meaning the changes may not significantly influence current practices or evaluations or enhance fairness.
- Members noted that mentoring has been undervalued and it is especially important to recognize the significant mentoring work performed by women and/or racial/ethnic minority faculty.
- It was suggested that the policy adopt a more flexible approach to evaluating mentoring, de-emphasize the division between scholarly and non-scholarly mentoring, and allow faculty to describe their mentoring work in their own terms.
- It was noted that the Senate had originally requested a simple renaming of the APM 210 section on teaching to include mentoring. Subsequently, the Senate responded to APP's suggestion to define mentoring more precisely with a more elaborate revision to APM 210, which was further expanded by APP. To align with the original purpose, consideration should be given to removing overly prescriptive aspects of the guidance, maintaining the policy at a higher level to ensure flexibility for the diversity of mentoring contributions.

ACTION: Council will forward the divisional and committee comments and a summary letter to Vice Provost Haynes.

V. Interim CCGA Guidance on Directed Studies Courses

o Erith Jaffe-Berg, CCGA Chair

Council reviewed a draft set of interim systemwide guidelines for directed studies courses, commonly referred to as 299 or 599 courses. Such courses are classified as research or independent study and offer students the opportunity to conduct research under the guidance of a

professor. Typically, they are required for completing a thesis or dissertation, or used to signify continuing enrollment during graduate studies.

CCGA incorporated suggestions made at the June Council meeting for clarifying advice about how to distinguish between the activities graduate students undertake for 299/599 course credit and their employment responsibilities. The guidelines note that academic coursework and employment have distinct goals that faculty members should map out for their graduate students at the beginning of each academic term. They also note that it is up to the faculty member to distinguish between the activities that graduate students perform for 299 credit and those for their University employment. CCGA considers the guidance to be interim, recognizing that the definitions continue to evolve.

- During the discussion Council members noted that the revisions improve the clarity of the document. However, some faculty do not see academic coursework and employment as distinct activities. It was suggested that this guideline be modified to say that faculty members at the beginning of each term should map out for their graduate students the distinct objectives of their academic coursework and their employment.

ACTION: Council endorsed the document subject to these revisions and a final review by UC Legal.

VI. UCEP Recommendations for Protecting Academic Integrity & Intellectual Property

- **Melanie Cocco, UCEP Chair**

Council reviewed a letter from UCEP with recommendations to faculty about combatting academic dishonesty and the online posting of copyrighted course materials. The “annual reminder” letter has been updated this year to include guidance on defining the use of generative artificial intelligence tools.

ACTION: Council endorsed forwarding the document to divisions this September.

VII. UCOPE Recommendation on the Digital SAT

Beginning in January 2024, SAT test administrations will switch to a digital format and introduce a Digital SAT Reading and Writing test as a replacement for the Evidenced-Based Reading and Writing (EBRW) test currently approved by UCOPE to satisfy the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). UCOPE recommends a full analysis of new test scores before approving the assessment as one mechanism to demonstrate satisfaction of the ELWR. UCOPE has asked Council to advise UC Undergraduate Admissions about the recommendation.

ACTION: Council endorsed the recommendation and will forward it to UC Undergraduate Admissions.

VIII. Consultation with Senior Managers

- **Michael Drake, President**
- **Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and CFO**

President Drake joined the meeting from Washington, DC, where he was participating in a National Summit on Equal Opportunity in Higher Education convened by the Department of Education to discuss strategies and resources for expanding access to higher education in light of the Supreme Court ruling on affirmative action.

During the meeting, President Drake expressed gratitude to the Senate for their collaboration with the administration on specific budget and policy issues, particularly in facilitating better transfer pathways. He also took the opportunity to thank Chair Cochran for her service to the University as Senate chair and for the valuable support and advice she provided over the past two years.

Budget: CFO Brostrom provided a breakdown of the state budget allocation for UC. The state has granted UC \$325 million in new ongoing funding. This includes \$215 million for a 5% base budget adjustment to fund new resident undergraduate enrollment and sustain core operations across campuses. In addition, \$30 million has been allocated to replace 900 nonresident students with California residents at UCB, UCLA, and UCSD. There is also \$30 million to support debt service for a student housing grant program, and \$33 million allocated for debt service related to the UCM and UCR expansion projects and the UCB Clean Energy Campus project. The budget also provides \$129 million in one-time funding for specific campus projects, including the California Institute for Immunology and Immunotherapy at UCLA. UC will collaborate with the state to explore various funding options for capital projects, including lease revenue bonds and clean energy financing opportunities through the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. The final state revenues for the last fiscal year will not be known until October.

During the discussion:

- Council members expressed concerns about emerging campus budget deficits and the lack of funding for new graduate student contracts. They noted that as employment of graduate students become more expensive, there might be a reduction in educational opportunities for students, impacting diversity. They suggested that UCOP should advocate for graduate education funding with a focus on the diversity pipeline. Additionally, they asked President Drake to elaborate on how UC should respond or adjust to the Supreme Court ruling on affirmative action and inquired about the status of state funding for electrification of campuses.
- In response, CFO Brostrom outlined various strategies that UC is exploring to address budget deficits, such as increasing philanthropy and optimizing long-term investment returns by leveraging unspent endowment payouts, as well as funds in the Short Term Investment Pool and the Blue and Gold fund. He acknowledged that the student-faculty ratio had been negatively affected due to the lack of revenue for faculty renewal.
- President Drake emphasized that he expects pressure and scrutiny on UC from those who do not support inclusive outcomes at universities nationally. He stressed that UC's system of holistic review ensures fair and inclusive admissions outcomes and does not use any factor as a proxy for affirmative action. He asserted the importance of remaining true to the holistic review process and not allowing desired outcomes to influence it. He agreed that increasing graduate student diversity is of utmost importance and invited the Senate to collaborate with

the administration in crafting advocacy messages and addressing any other concerns brought forward by the state Legislature.

IX. Executive Session: Senate Committees and Shared Governance

ACTION: After the meeting, Council approved sending a statement to BOARS.

X. Health Care Task Force

- **Michael Ong, HCTF Chair**

Council invited UCFW-Health Care Task Force (HCTF) Chair Ong to summarize the activities of the task force during academic year 2022-23. He did so in the context of the HCTF's three charges:

1. Review and analyze UC health plans: The HCTF is collaborating with the administration to investigate and address complaints related to UC health benefits. These include disruptions to pharmacy benefits during the transition to Navitus, issues with dental coverage, and premium increases. HCTF is also working on options to enhance behavioral healthcare access and expand fertility benefits.
2. Advise on faculty welfare in UC Health Sciences settings: HCTF is evaluating concerns about low morale, burnout, and high turnover among non-Senate clinical faculty, and the extent to which these issues are connected to Senate membership and/or appointments in the wrong employment series. As part of this effort, HCTF is developing options for a potential survey of faculty experiences with the Health Sciences Compensation Plan.
3. Advise on management of UC Health and UC Health Systems: HCTF is reviewing UC's affiliations with institutions that restrict comprehensive access to care, discussing UCSF's recent decision to acquire two community hospitals, and the transition of self-funded health plans from UC Health to UC Human Resources.

During the discussion:

- Council members expressed their support for ongoing attention to behavioral health access, the need for more local campus healthcare advising staff, and a desire to learn more about the financial relationship between the campus health systems and the general campus. Chair Ong mentioned plans to expand the number of campus healthcare facilitators and UC Retirement Administration Service Center (RASC) retirement advisors to address these issues.

XI. New Landscape for Managing Student Employees

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

Academic labor loomed large this academic year. UC experienced a historic strike that involved over 40,000 academic appointees and created new UAW bargaining units. The strike and subsequent salary agreements have consequences for the UC academic culture and also its finances. In addition to increasing costs that will also affect the size of the incoming graduate student cohorts, the expansion of academic labor will affect the roles and responsibilities of faculty.

The terms and conditions of the contracts raise questions that faculty and administrators are working through. These include how faculty will reconcile the new identities of students as represented employees while also carrying out their responsibilities as academic advisors. CCGA's guidance on directed studies course syllabi will help to sort out the issue of employment versus academic progress. Another related challenge is the expansion of time and attendance record-keeping that instructors of record will be expected to maintain and use to certify that the negotiated entitlements of student workers are honored consistently and accurately. An additional challenge will be for the University to manage grievance activity and unfair labor practice allegations under the new relationship. APP is preparing guidance documents and is hosting a systemwide Academic Personnel Academy in February to discuss academic labor issues.

There are several potential grievance issues that could impact the academic mission. These include an issue about whether first year GSR rotation programs should be considered paid labor. UC's position is that rotations benefit the student and reducing or eliminating such programs could harm student progress. Another issue is whether everyone covered by a contract should have a 50% appointment. UCOP is distributing guidance about how to document percentage appointments.

During the discussion:

- Council members noted that many campuses are unable to afford to offer graduate students 50% appointments consistently, because funding for appointments depends on available grant monies. However, many graduate students assert that this is what they were fighting for. Moving to a common standard for appointments would help clarify matters for students but will likely result in fewer positions being offered overall; extensive consultation is warranted.
- Campuses are addressing how to distinguish academic training from paid labor. It is a huge shift for faculty to think of themselves as "managers" of student employees. A faculty consultation team is crucial to ensure decisions support the academic mission.
- APP leaders asked Council members to communicate specific questions through their local academic personnel offices.

XII. Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues

○ Jim Chalfant, ACSCOTI Chair

Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI) Chair Chalfant began with an overview of UC transfer, and then summarized the 2022-23 activities of ACSCOTI. He noted that six UC campuses (UCD, UCI, UCM, UCR, UCSD, and UCSB) offer guaranteed transfer admission through Transfer Admission Guarantees (TAGs). The steps to earn a TAG are clearly stated, and not difficult to achieve. TAGs help campuses encourage transfer applications; at three campuses, TAGS are not needed. However, roughly half of students with TAGs ultimately end up at UCB, UCLA, or UCSD. Furthermore, TAGs cover a broader range of majors than either the UC Transfer Pathways or Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs). ACSCOTI agrees that ADTs may not be the most effective option for UC transfers due to the inclusion of unnecessary electives for certain UC majors and the exclusion of key courses required for others.

He noted that ACSCOTI does not support the view that all UC majors should have identical course requirements, or that UC and CSU should mandate identical lower-division preparation because the two systems have different goals. Emphasizing diversity and flexibility in academic pathways, the committee believes in tailoring academic requirements to the specific needs of each major. He also noted two common misperceptions about ADTs: First, ADTs do not necessarily provide a direct and clear 2-year + 2-year degree pathway, as many community college students take more than three years to complete an ADT. Secondly, it should be recognized that UC does acknowledge ADTs in determining eligibility for transfer, with ADT earners constituting a significant percentage (between 45% to 60%) of UC transfers at most campuses. UCOP is currently conducting a study to examine the outcomes of ADT earners at UC compared to other transfer students.

ACSCOTI is actively exploring alternative solutions to those proposed in pending legislation (i.e., McCarty's AB 1749) that better prioritize the interests of students. The committee advocates for a transfer guarantee that does not displace applicants with better academic preparation. It also aims to ensure that the Senate retains authority over defining appropriate academic preparation for a given major.

XIII. Reports from Senate Division Chairs

- Individual campuses are actively engaged in discussions surrounding various aspects of the new graduate student labor contracts. These discussions encompass new financial models and strategies aimed at ensuring the success and well-being of our students. Notably, the UCLA Senate Legislative Assembly has endorsed a statement urging the administration to fund the new contracts through targeted cuts to administrative budgets and non-academic programs, rather than affecting academic budgets.
- The UCI division is organizing a town hall event with the purpose of informing faculty members about the accomplishments of the Senate and emphasizing the value of shared governance.
- UCSD has experienced recent student protests that have led to disciplinary actions against students for harassment and arrests for vandalism.
- Several divisions are actively advocating for the extension of the 4.6% faculty salary increase to encompass the total salary, not just the on-scale salary. Additionally, other divisions are currently involved in discussions pertaining to crucial topics, including decarbonization and sustainability efforts, strategic planning initiatives, course modality considerations, and academic personnel matters.
- The UCR administration responded to the Senate's request to address staff shortages by proposing that solutions involve increased class sizes and the approval of more online courses, and other revenue-generating solutions.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director
Attest: Susan Cochran, Academic Council Chair