

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, March 25, 2009

I. Announcements**▪ Mary Croughan, Academic Council Chair**

1. Agenda items for next Council meeting are due by 4/17/09.
2. Report on March Regents meeting:
 - (a) The UCD School of Nursing was approved. Senate concerns were addressed in the final documents between UCD and UCOP.
 - (b) The Regents voted to support Proposition 1A, which will be on the May statewide ballot.
 - (c) The Regents approved a Senior Management Group salary freeze (the incentive group in the Treasurer's Office is exempt) and cost-cutting measures for their own meetings.
 - (d) Chair Croughan and Interim Provost Pitts made a well-received presentation on faculty accountability.
3. President Yudof has decided not to outsource UCRP benefits administration. Thank you to UCFW Chair Henry and TFIR for their hard work on this. The Senate's strong opposition to the proposed outsourcing was a major factor in the President's decision.
4. ICAS update: Legislative Day, an intersegmental (UC, CSU, and CCC) education advocacy day in Sacramento, is on April 13th. Meetings with legislators and their staffs will be held to stress the importance of higher education for the state and the state's economy.
5. ACSCOLI update. There is a proposal to potentially move the National Security Administration (NSA) from DOE to DOD. There is great concern among some parties about the implications of this.
6. Effort Reporting System update: Improvements in the software interface are being made.
7. UC Riverside responded satisfactorily to Council's comments on the Anderson Graduate School of Management. This item will be moved to the consent calendar for a vote of approval.
8. TFIR's statement on lump sum cash outs has been posted on the At Your Service website.
9. Task Force on Recognizing Students Interned in 1942 this task force plans to request that special honorary degrees be awarded to this group. Their proposal will come to Council next month.

▪ Harry Powell, Academic Council Vice Chair

1. The Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC) recently met and heard about an early assessment program that could increase the number of students advancing to CSU. The E-Portfolio program helps students build their CVs and self-assess readiness.
2. Textbook affordability. There are currently four bills on textbook affordability pending in the legislature, including one that would require faculty to submit a written justification whenever they assign a new edition of a text if they assigned an older edition in the

previous three years. This would place a significant burden on faculty, and is addressed by a draft letter on the consent calendar. Much of such legislation is generated by students. Chair Croughan and Vice Chair Powell are encouraging the student Regents and student groups to work directly with faculty to make changes, instead. A list of best practices for faculty to use in addressing textbook affordability will be developed and distributed to all UC faculty.

II. Consent Calendar

- 1. Approval of the February 25, 2009 Minutes**
- 2. Approve draft Assembly meeting topics for April 22, 2009.**
- 3. Approve letter endorsing ACA 7.**
- 4. Approve letter opposing SB 386 on textbook affordability.**
- 5. Comment on proposed legislative ruling on SR 764.**
- 6. Approve proposed Amendment to the UC Diversity Statement.**

ACTION: The consent calendar was approved, with the following changes: Item 7 of the Announcements was added, Item 2 of the consent calendar will be addressed under New Business, and a technical correction to language in the letter regarding ACA 7 (Item 3) was requested.

III. Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was approved with the addition of Item 2 on the Consent Calendar under New Business.

IV. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

V. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Senior Managers

- **Mark Yudof, President**
- **Larry Pitts, Interim Provost (via telephone)**
- **Katherine Lapp, Executive Vice President, Business Operations**

President Yudof

- President Yudof reported that a plan for UC to create a separate 501(c)3 non-profit organization in partnership with Los Angeles County to reopen and run MLK Hospital is moving forward. The plan was presented to the Regents, who were receptive but wanted assurances that UC will not shoulder any financial liability. The University would provide physician services and medical oversight.
- He also reported that Peter Taylor has been hired as Chief Financial Officer. He has been active in the UCLA alumni association and previously served as an Alumni Regent.
- President Yudof reported that the Regents endorsed ballot Proposition 1A, which would temporarily increase revenues, establish a "rainy day" reserve fund to help guard against

fluctuations in the amount of money available for general fund expenditures each year, and regulate annual levels of spending. s

EVP Lapp

- EVP Lapp summarized the ballot propositions. She noted that, from the University's perspective, Proposition 1A is the most important one. It would change the way the state creates its budgets by creating a stabilization fund and restricting the ability of the governor or the legislature to divert the money. Any funds above a certain threshold must go into the stabilization fund, and if Proposition 1B passes, the first \$1.5 billion deposited each year would be earmarked for education until the level mandated by Proposition 98 had been reached. This will address the \$9.3 billion gap in funding promised to education, but not received. More importantly, Proposition 1A extends the 1% increase in state sales tax for one year, and extends the increases in the vehicle license fee, sales tax and the 0.25% increase in personal income tax for two additional years. This would provide \$16 billion in additional revenue. It first must be used to pay off K-12 and community college obligations (maintenance factor). The California State University system has endorsed all of the propositions.

Q&A

Q: How much autonomy will campuses have in implementing budget cuts?

A: President Yudof stated that there will be systemwide norms and a range of tools for achieving budget cuts, but that specific decisions will be made by the campuses. Campuses must craft a strategic plan appropriate for the circumstances they face, and they will be held accountable for these choices by the Office of the President.

Q: One of the advantages of furloughs is that they do not affect one's pension, while salary cuts tend to be permanent, but seem more transparent. How much of an effect would furloughs have on the budget?

A: A one-day furlough would save the University approximately \$31 million, but that figure does not include administrative costs.

Q: Why does the University continue to launch new enterprises such as the UC Davis School of Nursing or the proposed School of Global Health when it has been chronically under-funded?

A: President Yudof stated that he agrees with these concerns and thinks that the University should be reticent to begin large new programs in these economic times. The Office of the President will make sure that any new programs are sufficiently funded and have budgetary contingency plans so that they do not become burdens for their campuses or the University as a whole.

Q: How will you ensure that there is faculty consultation in the budget process, particularly in any discussion of furloughs or salary cuts?

A: President Yudof responded that he is developing a policy framework which will address a decision making process for potential furloughs or salary cuts. There will be language in the policy that requires campus administrations to consult with the Academic Senate, and it will be up to the divisional Senates to bring any abrogation to his attention.

Q: Your comments on the budget are informative and helpful. Can you encourage the Chancellors and EVCs to more actively communicate with faculty and staff? Perhaps you could provide the Chancellors talking points about the budget and request that they share information with faculty.

A: President Yudof stated that he will discuss the importance of open communication at the Council of Chancellors meeting. He also stated that he needs to know when faculty at particular campuses are not being adequately informed or consulted so that he can address the situation.

Q: Would you consider alleviating the burden of fee increases for graduate students? Such fee increases in effect are a tax on faculty grants.

A: President Yudof noted that graduate student fees have not risen at the same rate as undergraduate fees. He stated that he will consider this idea, but has to balance competing priorities.

Comment: I'd like to express my appreciation for the care and thoughtfulness of your approach to the decision to reject the outsourcing of UCRP benefits administration.

VII. General Discussion

VIII. [APM 240](#)

ISSUE: This proposed policy establishes that academic deans, with a very few exceptions, are governed by the APM rather than Senior Management Group (SMG) policies. The policy was sent for systemwide review.

DISCUSSION: A wide range of opinions were expressed in the systemwide responses; Council decided not to try to come to a consensus. Rather, it opted to forward the letters to Academic Personnel and have them address the issues raised.

ACTION: Council unanimously voted to forward a letter outlining the concerns of all respondents; it did not arrive at a consensus position.

IX. MRU/MRPI RFP Update

ISSUE: Chair Croughan and UCORP met separately with Vice President Beckwith to discuss concerns regarding the [MRPI \(Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives\) RFP process](#). The Senate has long [called for a competitive process](#) for allocating MRU funds. However, concerns include the potential disestablishment of existing MRUs that are not funded, and how new MRPIs will be incorporated into the [Compendium](#) process.

DISCUSSION: Chair Croughan noted that the Senate originally requested a competition be held to reallocate MRU funds. These funds are intended as seed money to stimulate new programs and create collaborations among campuses. Each MRU should be reviewed every 5 years and there is an expectation that central funding will end after 15 years, unless an exception is made. In reality, only one MRU has ever been disestablished; in the recent past, two programs were recommended for disestablishment but the president funded them. In 2006 a joint Senate/Administration work group examined the MRU funding issues. Its recommendations were reviewed systemwide, and the Senate endorsed instituting a competitive process with a

multi-year phase-in and further defining a taxonomy of multicampus research entities. A subsequent MRU Advisory Board recommended that multiple competitions take place over a period of up to three years in order to accomplish the recirculation of MRU funds. Vice President Beckwith believes that the MRPI RFP is responsive to the Senate's wishes. However, divisions and committees have expressed concern that Senate processes have not been followed. The most serious issue is how it relates to Senate processes for establishment and disestablishment of MRUs.

Council members expressed support for the notion that MRU funds should be used as seed money, and that MRUs should not be funded in perpetuity, opening up opportunities for other research projects to compete for central funding. However, several members vigorously objected to the lack of divisional review of the RFP process requiring all existing MRUs to compete for funds. A divisional chair stated that while the Senate wishes to reallocate funds through a competitive process, it is not appropriate to administratively disestablish existing MRUs, and suggested delaying the RFP process until all existing MRUs can be reviewed. Others urged their colleagues not to pass up the opportunity to open central funding to other projects, as the Senate has requested for years, and noted that MRU reviews seldom recommend disestablishment. Some members argued that not receiving central funding is not equivalent to disestablishment. Chair Croughan stated that Vice President Beckwith has agreed that no funds will be awarded to any new MRPI until the Senate approves its establishment; establishment and disestablishment will take place only through the Compendium review process.

Chair Croughan affirmed that Vice President Beckwith is willing to make changes to the RFP process suggested by the Senate. Council members discussed possible modifications that could include: (1) providing 12 months of bridge funding for any existing MRU that fails to retain its UCOP funding; (2) providing a weighting criterion favoring programs in the Humanities that could not easily find other funding sources; (3) providing a weighting criterion favoring existing MRUs; (4) not releasing funds for new MRUs unless and until the Senate approves establishment; (5) stressing teaching and service, as well as research, in the review criteria; and (6) requiring letters of support from Graduate Councils and Committees on Research to ensure input from divisions. Council discussed the merits and disadvantages of these options. Some felt that existing MRUs have a built-in advantage and should not receive extra consideration.

A Council member asked what percent of the total budget of each MRU represents core funding, and what percent supports administrative staff. Chair Croughan responded that the only programs that are completely reliant on MRU funding are the humanities fellowship programs. She also noted that while some tenured faculty members appear to receive salary support from MRU funds, this appears to be against policy.

A member objected that the RFP process provides the Senate no real discretion over those projects that are not chosen for funding. Another member stated that Senate representatives will serve on the peer review panels and they will therefore have a role in selecting the funded programs.

A member suggested halting the process until the issues can be worked out. Chair Croughan stated that the Senate does not have the authority to do so; the funds belong to the Office of the President, and they can distribute them as they wish.

A member requested information on the amount and end dates of funding for existing MRUs. Chair Croughan clarified that she will need permission to distribute this information, but noted that most MRUs receive less than \$20,000 per year, and only five receive more than \$200,000 per year (this does not include the three entities that were exempted from the competition—the UC Observatories, UCMEXUS and White Mountain Research Station).

ACTION: Council unanimously approved sending a letter to Vice President Beckwith outlining specific requests regarding the MRPI selection process, including (but not limited to): giving the humanities extra weighting because they have less access to outside funding; giving more weight to currently funded projects; ensuring that disestablishment and establishment will only take place through the regular Compendium review process; ensuring that no funds will be allocated to new MRUs until the Senate approves their establishment; providing up to one year of bridge funding for any MRU that fails in the competition; and providing 24 months of transition time for those MRUs that have already received letters notifying them that they have funding until a specific future date. Chair Croughan will circulate a draft letter and information on currently funded MRUs to Council for comment prior to transmittal.

ACTION: Council unanimously voted that Chair Croughan will send a letter to division chairs for distribution to the Graduate Councils describing the role of divisional Senates in the review and establishment of new MRUs and outlining the requests that Council has made to Vice President Beckwith.

X. UC Seminar Network

ISSUE: UCORP has proposed the establishment of the UC Seminar Network, which would broadcast via the web and archive all of the seminars held on UC campuses.

DISCUSSION: UCORP Chair Carey stated that his department has been testing the concept by webcasting seminars from his campus and that it has been inexpensive, without hidden costs, and not technologically complex to set up. He is investigating funding, and the California Digital Library may cover archiving costs. Chair Croughan noted that President Yudof suggested that publicizing the project to the alumni could be excellent for public relations for the University. A member asked about projected costs. Chair Carey stated that it costs only \$500 for the equipment and \$150 in licensing fees for Adobe Connect at the departmental level. Another member inquired how seminars would be chosen for webcasting, and noted that archiving them all could be very costly. Chair Carey responded that there could be three levels of access: live video streaming, on-demand video with an expiration date, and archived video. So it would be possible to choose to archive a seminar for only a short period of time. Several members stated that it is a wonderful idea and noted that UC could take a lead in this area. Some divisional chairs requested that the concept be reviewed systemwide, and that the OGC first issue an opinion on liability and copyright issues, particularly whether consent forms would be required for seminar participants who ask questions and therefore become part of the broadcast. A member noted that other universities have similar programs and may have wrestled with many of these issues.

ACTION: Council unanimously supported sending UCORP's UC Seminar Network concept paper for systemwide review.

XI. Graduate Students *In Absentia* Registration Policy

ISSUE: The Council of Graduate Deans has proposed a policy effective in fall 2009 that would require graduate students in absentia who are pursuing approved coursework and/or research outside of California to pay reduced fees. The goal of the policy is to promote continuous enrollment of graduate students by reducing the fees required to remain registered. UCOP will conduct a follow-up evaluation of usage and revenue impacts two years after the policy is implemented. CCGA unanimously recommended the revised policy.

ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed the revised *in absentia* registration policy.

XII. Amendments of Senate Regulations Governing Eligibility for Admission

ISSUE: In response to the Regents' approval of the Academic Assembly's Eligibility Reform Proposal, BOARS, in consultation with the Office of Student Affairs, has developed amendments of the Senate regulations governing eligibility for admission.

DISCUSSION: A member noted that because there are changes beyond the scope of the eligibility proposal (including admission by exception), the amendments should be sent for systemwide review. Another member suggested that it could be reviewed simultaneously systemwide and by UCR&J, and that it could have a shorter than normal response time.

ACTION: Council unanimously approved simultaneously sending the proposed amendment to UCR&J and for systemwide review, with responses due by May 15th.

XIII. BOARS Survey of Departments Offering Introductory Courses in Science and Engineering

ISSUE: BOARS requests approval to distribute a brief survey that reviews faculty expectations of high school student preparation for UC mathematics and science courses. The survey will be distributed to departments offering introductory courses in mathematics, science, and engineering, and will be administered by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA.

DISCUSSION: A member requested confirmation that BOARS has consulted the EESS advocates and asked if the raw data will be made available. BOARS chair responded affirmatively, noting that the data will have to be anonymous. A divisional chair requested that BOARS provide links to high school prerequisites and volunteered to urge department chairs to respond.

ACTION: Council approved the distribution of the BOARS survey (18 in favor, 2 abstentions).

XIV. Agenda for Joint Meeting with the EVCs

DISCUSSION: Chair Croughan noted that it is the Chair's prerogative to choose the topics for the joint meetings with the EVCs and Chancellors. She prefers not to address graduate student support since it was discussed with the Chancellors last year. She stated that the EVCs prefer the

topic of budget planning and priorities and suggested a discussion of academic labor contracts. They also recommended addressing only two topics. Some members objected to the idea of highlighting specific campuses as having best practices, and noted that the proposed presenters come from unique campuses. Chair Croughan responded that the presenters also will review best practices from other campuses. A member stated that the biggest issue facing the Senate is consultation with UCOP, particularly around budget issues. Chair Croughan responded that the EVCs felt that this is a more appropriate topic to discuss with the Chancellors. Chair Croughan stated that she will communicate with the presenters, taking Council's feedback into account. The presentations will be brief, and will be used as a springboard to discuss strategies that could help the University deal with the coming challenges.

XV. Shared Research Computing Project

ISSUE: UCCC opposes a proposed centrally-funded shared research computing project due to current budget constraints and competing campus IT priorities. The pilot program would include twenty-four projects and would incur \$5M in one-time costs and \$1.5M annually for one to three years.

DISCUSSION: Joining the meeting by phone, UCCC Chair Naugle outlined the committee's concerns with the project, including: the project is expensive and is a misuse of resources in a time of budget crisis; the project benefits too few people; it was undertaken without input from the divisions or systemwide review; the proposal process was not transparent; and it is unclear whether it will save money. The committee recommends cancelling the project and redirecting the funds to the campuses. Furthermore, if it is reinstated in the future, it should include projects from the humanities and social sciences, conduct an open call for proposals, document cost savings, and have divisions choose representatives to serve on the oversight committee.

Chair Croughan noted that she met with President Yudof and CIO David Ernst. She stated that the president intends to implement the project, but will take Council's input into consideration. Since the Senate does not have authority to stop the project, the most effective way it can engage in improving the situation is to outline the parameters that are important to the faculty. She stated that while CIO Ernst believes that the utility savings would be significant, he does not have any data to support this claim, and needs to conduct the pilot to prove it. He asserted that there was no open, competitive RFP because he needed to identify high cost, highly intensive computer usage projects for the pilot, and therefore asked the VCRs for assistance. Chair Croughan stated that she will ensure that faculty serve as representatives on the oversight committee, and will make the case that the committee should be composed of equal numbers of faculty and administrators. She also noted that if the project fails, the hardware will be used for a centralized data warehouse for HR functions. A member expressed concern that the process will create divisions within campuses because some PIs will benefit significantly by being chosen for participation by a VCR. Several members noted the irony that the president was just discussing severe budget constraints but has found funds to support this project. This undermines the credibility of his claim that his priority is to invest in the campuses. Chair Croughan noted that the president sees this project as a way to enable campuses to save money. A member objected to the lack of prior consultation, even though the Senate is only advisory on such matters. Chair Croughan asked UCCC Chair Naugle to revise her committee's letter to include its specific recommendations. She will then circulate the revised letter and her cover letter to Council for review.

ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed sending UCCC's revised letter with recommendations to the President.

XVI. UCFW/TFIR Informational Statement on Evaluating UCRP Investment Returns

DISCUSSION: A member, who is also an economist, stated that the section on hedge funds draws conclusions that are not warranted. Another member felt that the statement reflected the authors' opinions, and made value judgments. Chair Croughan asked how it could be edited to be acceptable. Several suggestions were made.

ACTION: Council approved the statement, contingent on certain changes being made to the document (10 in favor, 2 abstentions). If UCFW agrees to the changes, the statement will be distributed to all divisions and posted on the Senate website.

XVII. Total Remuneration Study

ISSUE: UCFW Chair Henry will summarize the preliminary findings and methodology employed in the cash compensation portion of the 2009 Total Remuneration Study, which includes only general campus faculty.

Council did not have sufficient time to discuss this item.

XVIII. New Business

1. Approve draft Assembly meeting topics for April 22, 2009.

Council did not have sufficient time to discuss this item.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Attest: Mary S. Croughan, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst