

## ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting  
Wednesday, June 30, 2010****I. Announcements**

1. **CUCEA Report on Emeriti Activities.** We received CUCEA's (Council of University of California Emeriti Associations) biannual report on emeriti activities for 2007-09. It is an impressive example of the many ways that emeriti contribute to the intellectual and institutional life of the University.
2. **BOARS' Statement on Career Technical Ed.** BOARS has done a service to UC and to K-12 education in laying out a clear statement of the challenges and opportunities California schools and students face in mapping new paths to higher education that do not sacrifice the rigorous academic preparation needed to succeed at UC.
3. **Update on the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force.** In September, the Regents will decide only on the rate of contribution for FY 2011-2012 and amortizing unfunded liability over 30 years rather than 15 years. We received a letter from President Yudof extending the consultation schedule for recommendations from the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force, so that the Regents will not take action on changing benefit plans until a special meeting in December. The Task Force report and recommendations will be released in August and the review will begin in September. This extension represents an important acknowledgement of the role of shared governance. The Senate will continue to advocate for faculty interests at all stages of the process.
4. **BOARS' Letter to the President on Holistic Review.** Last spring, in response to racist incidents at some campuses, the President asked BOARS to develop a plan for implementing holistic review of applications for admission to UC. BOARS was completing its own in-depth analysis of UC's implementation of Comprehensive Review over the past seven years at that time and offered a detailed response and concrete recommendations that grew out of the Comprehensive Review study.
5. **Update on the Academic Planning Council.** The Academic Planning Council met in June. They are likely to be tasked with implementing proposals emerging from the Commission if adopted by the Regents. The agenda included papers prepared by Academic Affairs staff on self-supporting degree programs and the definition of "quality" for purposes of tracking the effect of curricular changes.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**ACTION: The consent calendar was unanimously approved.**

**III. Approval of the Agenda.**

**ACTION: The agenda was unanimously approved as noticed.**

**IV. Funding for Senate Divisional Offices**

**ISSUE:** Divisional Senate offices have suffered budget cuts at a time when staffing is especially needed. Senate offices are funded differently, and not centrally, by UCOP. Council discussed possible solutions to budget instability in order to ensure Senate effectiveness.

**DISCUSSION:** In 2003 and 2004, the Senate directors developed a white paper on the requirements for Senate offices. In September 2004 President Dynes transmitted it to the Chancellors in the context of establishing a new division at Merced. While Senate offices have not suffered disproportionate cuts compared to other units, we should be reaffirm to the president that Senate offices are central to the business of UC. Also, COR grants, which are administered through many Senate offices, are being cut, which harms the University's research productivity. A member suggested advising the president regarding an ideal ratio of Senate staff per number of faculty, but others countered that what matters is the volume of transactions that flow through the Senate office, including program reviews, course approvals, MRU/ORU reviews, involvement in WASC reviews, merit reviews, systemwide policy reviews, and administering COR grants. A Senate Director in attendance noted that approximately 50 to 60% of the critical decisions made on campus are routed through the Senate offices. A member also noted that there are great disparities among how campus Senate offices are funded and structured, but that they all should be funded commensurate with instructional and research support, rather than like business units. A member suggested asking the provost to write a letter to the EVCs to emphasize the importance of the Senate to vital functions at the University, including, at some campuses, graduate program and WASC reviews and merit reviews. Members discussed strategies for demonstrating the importance of Senate offices, and resolved to ask the Senate Executive Directors to revisit the 2004 white paper and devise specific suggestions to include in a draft letter to Provost Pitts at their meeting in early August.

## **V. Systemwide review of Compendium revisions**

**ISSUE:** At its February meeting, Council requested that the proposed revisions to the Compendium and the final report of the Compendium Task Force be distributed for systemwide review. Comments were distributed, along with a summary highlighting the comments and areas of disagreement. In addition, some newly developed flow charts were circulated.

**DISCUSSION:** The chair of the Compendium Task Force summarized the responses and outstanding issues. He noted that the flow charts, which were developed by Academic Affairs staff, still need to be reviewed by the Senate; feedback was requested by July 16. Regarding whether graduate/undergraduate hybrid program proposals should be encompassed in the Compendium, three divisions opined that they should not, while UCEP argued that they should be included. The MRPI competition held last year created a disconnect between funding and institutional existence; MRPIs should be governed by Compendium processes. The Task Force chair proposed that UCORP vet the policy issues surrounding MRPIs and MRUs, tapping into its expertise on research policy, and make recommendations on how MRPIs should be established, disestablished and reviewed. UCORP's chair agreed to evaluate the issues, but stated that UCORP proposed a solution in its response, namely, to apply the existing guidelines governing MRUs to any multi-campus research endeavor. A member requested that UCORP also examine the Regents' 1993 policy on ORUs as part of this effort. A divisional chair objected to the codification of divisional Senate processes into the Compendium, suggesting that the document should be less prescriptive. The division's Executive Director will circulate specific examples of this practice. Members resolved differences in interpretation regarding the timeline for new graduate degree program proposals and the five-year perspectives. Senate staff will incorporate changes suggested

via the systemwide review and in Council discussion and Council will consider endorsement of the revised Compendium at its July meeting.

**ACTION: Council unanimously agreed to hold in abeyance the section on MRUs in the Compendium and refer it to UCORP for consideration.**

## **VI. Consultation with Office of the President Senior Managers**

Provost Pitts. The annual admissions report with data on the number of students who intend to register has been completed. Its results were surprising. The University had set an enrollment target of 1500 fewer students in order to reduce the number of unfunded students, but yields were far higher than expected, and we reduced the number of freshman admits by only 200. The University aimed to increase the number of transfer students by 250, but 2000 have been admitted and intend to enroll. Provost Pitts noted that faculty should play a larger role in the process, in cooperation with the admission directors. Non-resident enrollment increased by 5 to 6% across the system, but at Berkeley, it rose substantially, doubling to 27% of admits. In general, non-residents are less diverse than residents. It is encouraging that a slightly greater percentage of African Americans were admitted to UCSD, despite the events of last spring.

Provost Pitts noted that to evaluate diversity in admissions, OP reviewed disparate impact data for all campuses. This shows the ratio of admitted applicants belonging to a particular racial or ethnic group compared to the racial or ethnic group that comprises the highest percentage on a particular campus. For example, the ratio of African Americans is 55 to 60% of the highest group across all campuses. The ratio of African Americans at UCSD and UCI was substantially below that. It is unclear why these campuses do not have higher yields of African American students, but both are making efforts to evaluate and ameliorate the situation. Currently, neither uses holistic review in admissions, but UCI is moving toward this system and is consulting with UCLA regarding their very successful increase in admitted under-represented minorities. UCSD is going to conduct a study and are open to trying a variety of approaches to increase their yield. An advantage of holistic review is that a student who is outstanding in one characteristic but not others, has a chance to be considered. The University already uses holistic review for 70% of applicants, and aims to extend this to all applicants.

Provost Pitts noted that with the increasing use of holistic review scores, efficiencies for admissions across the campuses may be achieved. For instance, a portion of the applications are of either extremely high or low quality and are easy to accept or reject without additional work. This will make the effort to review only the middle band more manageable and less expensive.

**Comment:** UCM does not receive funding for applications that arrive through the referral pool, yet the quality of review is inconsistent, so the campus reviews them again. BOARS' chair noted that even if the University uses a common scoring system, that will not preclude campuses from doing their own quality reviews. She suggested that the distribution of application fees could take into consideration the referral pool.

**Comment:** UCFW is concerned about how placing amendments to the incentive plan for the medical center and treasurer's office personnel on the Regents' agenda will be perceived by the public.

**A:** President Yudof stated that the plan has been in place since the 1990s, but no audits of it have been conducted, and there is no orderly process for amending it. The Regents' item is a process plan aimed at providing meaningful oversight; it does not make any substantive changes to the plan. He stated that he recognizes that addressing it could cause a public perception problem, but that is unavoidable in these economic times. He stated that it is important to bring in auditors to oversee how it is administered and to review whether the current targets the right ones, and which employees should be part of an incentive program. It will provide greater accountability.

**Comment:** The Senate would like to enlist the support of the Provost in helping the EVCs understand the critical role that the Senate plays in the educational mission, and to protect the budget of the Senate offices. It is more similar to other academic administrative offices than to the accounting department. For example, included in the Senate budgets are the graduate program reviews that occur every 5-7 years.

**A:** Provost Pitts responded that he will support this request, but the Senate office should make clear what they are doing to be as efficient as possible. He agreed that there is a minimum size necessary for the functioning of the Senate. President Yudof voiced his support for ensuring adequate funding for the divisional Senate offices to help facilitate their role in university governance.

**Q:** What is the timetable for implementing the funding allocation plan? Who will be involved in consultation?

**A:** Provost Pitts responded that in the fall, he will convene a group of administrators and Senate faculty to "re-benchmark" the allocation of general funds among the campuses. He anticipates that it will be a six to nine month process. We will evaluate the methods used by other University systems to determine if they are appropriate for UC.

**Comment:** This is an important process. It will force the University to focus on what it values most, and will justify and explain funding decisions. While everyone will not agree on everything, it is important that all campuses are represented and engaged.

**Q:** What is the worst case scenario if the legislature does not provide the funding requested?

**A:** President Yudof stated that the campuses are planning for varying cuts, with a 5% cut at the worst. From a systemwide perspective, there is not a lot we can do to reduce the budget if we rule out furloughs and fee increases. Cuts will have to occur in personnel.

## **VII. CCGA Letter on Part-time Self-supporting Programs**

**ISSUE:** CCGA submitted a recommendation that a Senate-Administration Task Force be formed and charged with rewriting the 1996 policy on the establishment of self-supporting programs, taking into consideration CCGA's suggestions.

**DISCUSSION:** Historically, most self-supporting programs were created as "private" versions of already approved state funded degrees, without formal systemwide review. Since CCGA wrote their letter, staff in Academic Affairs redrafted the 1996 policy. CCGA sent comments to Academic Affairs, which will incorporate them and then circulate the policy for formal review. If a graduate program is not state-funded and simply wants to change the funding source, they

negotiate with UCOP. But if the program makes significant academic changes, it must be reviewed by CCGA. CCGA will write a letter explaining this distinction.

#### **VIII. Revised report of Special Committee on Remote and Online Instruction and Residency**

**ISSUE:** The report of the Special Committee was reviewed by divisions and systemwide committees. The Special Committee revised the report and issued a letter responding to points raised during the Senate review, and summarizing the changes in the report.

**DISCUSSION:** The Special Committee's chair reviewed the revisions made to the document, and noted that it asks that UCR&J examine the definition of residency in Senate Regulation 610. He noted that the committee's primary concern was access for UC students, not for those outside of UC. He also stated that the committee strongly believes that any programs of study should be subject to particularly intensive Senate oversight. Currently, two online master's degrees exist within UC. A member stated that the report reflects the caution but willingness to proceed expressed by the Senate in its approval of the online pilot project. UCPB's representative noted correction to statistics in the report, which will be incorporated into the final document.

**ACTION:** Council unanimously endorsed the report of the Special Committee.

#### **IX. Systemwide review of proposal to expand Area 'd'**

**ISSUE:** In January, the Academic Council voted to distribute for systemwide review a proposal to expand the Area 'd' laboratory science admission requirement to include Earth, Environmental and Space Sciences. Responses were received, along with commentary by the proposal's proponents on BOARS' letter accompanying the packet of information that was distributed.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Powell noted that the dominant systemwide response to the proposal was negative, but that some divisions and UCEP offered ideas that would make it easier for schools to understand what is necessary to create EESS courses that satisfy the "d" requirement. For instance, UCEP proposed adding a statement that one of the courses can be an approved interdisciplinary science course, and UCM suggested that requiring three years of laboratory science would enable UC to be more inconclusive of other courses. BOARS' chair responded that BOARS has discussed this option in the past and that an intersegmental committee just clarified the language in 'd' a year ago. BOARS does not want to introduce changes until after 2012 when the results of the new eligibility policy will be evaluated. In addition, currently there is no money to develop new courses and CSU has expressed concern that requiring a third year of science would not be appropriate for them. However, BOARS currently is working through UCOP with teachers to ensure that more of those courses meet the preparation requirements for UC. Several members spoke in favor of developing courses that promote science literacy, and are not aimed at students who plan to major in the sciences or engineering. A member suggested including an additional sentence that would recognize the value of integrative sciences courses that meet the standards. A member countered that a student who has not taken chemistry in high school has no chance of passing a college level chemistry class. BOARS' chair stated that its first priority is to be clear to the high schools.

**ACTION:** Council unanimously voted to decline to expand the Area 'd' language to include EESS along with the fundamental sciences of biology, chemistry, and physics in the Academic Senate regulations.

**ACTION:** Council voted to direct BOARS to examine an expansion of the language in the Senate Regulations to consider a description of alternative approaches in meeting the laboratory science requirement (13 in favor, 4 against).

#### **X. Systemwide review of the Choices Report**

**ISSUE:** UCPB submitted the “Choices” Report in March. Due to time constraints, on April 7, the Academic Council voted to disseminate it widely as a draft for discussion without endorsing it. At its meeting on April 28, Council decided to send it out for systemwide review. The reviews were received and distributed for Council discussion.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Powell stated that the process used to circulate the Choices report caused confusion, because of the early solicitation of informal comment followed by formal review. In addition, the UCLA division raised a legitimate question about the incorporation into one document of multiple issues that have been addressed in the past. Several members thanked UCPB for bringing these issues up for discussion. A member noted that a substantial majority of respondents were in favor of most of the document, but given that it addresses multiple topics, some of which foster disagreement, it would be problematic for Council to endorse it. UCPB’s Vice Chair suggested that Council could endorse it as history and context that should guide the administration in its budgetary decisions. A member noted that the Cuts and Futures reports have not constrained the Council from opining on issues; the Choices report simply serves as a framework for discussion. A member countered that because it was sent for review, Council can not endorse it without changes being made in response to the review. A member suggested that Council could outline a hierarchy of priorities rather than sending it back to UCPB for revision. Another member noted that ideally, Council would review the document recommendation by recommendation, and UCPB would respond to the comments. Since there is no time to do this, the report and the comments could be used instead to frame the ongoing discussion throughout the University about priorities. Alternately, we could summarize the issues raised in the review and release the summary with the report. A member noted that the report already has served the purpose of stimulating discussion. UCPB’s Vice Chair stated that he would prefer to have Council send a cover letter to UCPB summarizing the points of agreement, asking the committee to incorporate the comments, and specifying the areas that require more data. This would strengthen UCPB’s requests to UCOP for such data. The report and the systemwide comments could then be posted on the Senate website.

**ACTION:** Council voted to draft a letter that will synthesize the feedback from the systemwide review, find points of agreement, disagreement, and identify where more data is needed in order to direct future discussion regarding budget priorities (11 in favor, 4 against).

**ACTION:** Council voted to endorse the Choices report as a document that provides history, context and analysis supporting future discussion of next steps in the budget process (13 in favor, 2 opposed).

#### **XI. Debriefing on Commission on the Future meeting and next steps**

**ISSUE:** Council discussed strategies for reviewing the next round of recommendations to the Commission on the Future.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Powell stated that the Assembly decided to send both the Council and UCLA recommendations out for systemwide review in the fall. He reported that the next meeting of the Commission has been set for August 31, and the Working Groups have been told by the president that their work is complete. He noted that the reviews that you completed enabled the Senate to have a strong presence and voice at the last Commission meeting. Vice Chair Simmons has developed a plan to maintain that momentum and to capture the energy of the Senate participants in the Commission Working Groups by convening them as an ad-hoc advisory group to respond to the new recommendations unveiled at and just after the last meeting of the Commission. We will include this group's comments along with the divisional and systemwide committee comments. This will help us to take advantage of the deep knowledge of the Working Group members.

## **XII. UCFW Letter on Bonus and Incentive Plans**

**ISSUE:** UCFW wrote a letter advising the administration to delay presenting to the Regents proposed revisions to the bonus and incentive plans for the following groups: SMG, CIO, UC Medical Centers SMG.

**DISCUSSION:** UCFW's chair withdrew his letter because he directly expressed the concerns to the president during the consultation period with Senior Management.

## **XIII. UCORP Letter on Use of Laboratory Fees**

**ISSUE:** UCORP wrote a letter to Vice President Steve Beckwith requesting that the Senate be consulted regarding the uses of the supplemental fees collected from the national laboratories.

**DISCUSSION:** A member suggested that appropriate uses would directly benefit UC faculty or graduate students, such as funding the graduate student health insurance program. UCORP's chair explained that last year, an additional \$5M was collected beyond what was anticipated and previously committed. Vice President Beckwith proposes to use these funds for salary support for laboratory researchers spending their sabbaticals at UC campuses. UCORP does not think this is an appropriate use of the funds. Rather, they should directly support UC faculty and graduate students conducting research. Additionally, in the spirit of shared governance, any such decisions should be made in consultation with the Senate. A member noted that one proposed use for the monies is to fund the graduate student health insurance program (GSHIP). A member stated that ACSCOLI has been searching for ways to integrate the laboratory scientists into the University. A member countered that the Vice President's proposal only benefits the campuses indirectly. Other member concurred and suggested that funding a research competition or GSHIPS are examples of appropriate use of the funds.

**ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed UCORP's letter on the appropriate uses of fees from the national laboratories, noting that the funds should directly benefit research programs or UC faculty or graduate students.**

## **XIV. New Business**

*Council did not have any new business.*

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Attest: Henry Powell, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst