

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting
Monday, January 27, 2010****I. Announcements**

1. UCSC Division Chair Lori Kletzer has been named the Dean of Faculty of Colby College
2. UCORP's Seminar Network Paper has been published in PLoS Biology
3. UCEP's paper on undergraduate research will be distributed to the divisions

II. Consent Calendar

1. Approve the December 16, 2009 Council minutes.
2. Approve topics for February 26, 2010 Assembly teleconference
3. Approve draft letters on: (a) the report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force; (b) technical revisions to the APM.

ACTION: The draft letter on the report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force was moved to New Business; the rest of the consent calendar was approved.

III. Approval of the Agenda.

ACTION: The agenda was unanimously approved with the addition of the report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force under New Business and two new items: (1) BOARS' memo on diversity impacts of the eligibility policy; and (2) BOARS memo on defunding of StatFinder.

IV. Update on UC Commission on the Future

ISSUE: Committees that had visits from Commission Working Groups, Council members who sit on the Working Groups, and Chair Powell provided updates on the progress of the Working Groups.

DISCUSSION: Chair Powell reported that the Commission held a public meeting on December 8 at which Vice Chair Simmons gave very effective testimony. The next meeting will be on March 23, at which recommendations of the Working Groups will be presented. The Working Groups have been instructed to focus on recommendations that focus on budgetary savings and demonstrate that UC is making effective use of public funds. The recommendations will be brought to the May Regents' meeting for possible action in July. Senate review will be 60 days and a special teleconference on the subject may be called in May. The recommendations will be suggestions; they will be implemented only at the campuses' discretion. The Working Groups will continue to meet and will develop further recommendations, which will be issued in June and reviewed by the Senate in the fall. However, it is crucial that the Senate continue to be involved and be ready to respond to Commission requests during the summer. Vice Chair Simmons proposed that Council appoint four or five members to stay abreast of Commission issues during the summer and report to Council when needed. Keith Williams, Co-Chair of the Education and Curriculum Work Group, stated that it has formed five subgroups. He noted that both UCEP and CCGA will review early drafts of the recommendations. Chris Kutz, Chair of the Berkeley

Division, reported that the UCB Senate Executive Council was briefed by the Access and Affordability Work Group and by Commission member and student Regent-designate Jesse Cheng. UCORP's chair reported that Mary Croughan, Co-chair of the Research Strategies Work Group, attends all of UCORP's meetings. Among the issues under discussion are limiting overhead waivers and renegotiating overhead rates on a systemwide basis to better reflect real research costs. Peter Krapp, who serves on the Funding Strategies Work Group, stated that it has added a member from Riverside. It also has divided into five subgroups—student fees (including differential fees by major and campus), state funding (modeling different scenarios), federal funding (strategies to convince the federal government to support Pell Grants, research and capital projects at Research I universities), efficiencies (e.g., in purchasing), and alternative funding (such as indirect cost recovery, medical faculty compensation plan, taxes on non-state funded units to cover central functions, intellectual property and royalty revenues, and streamlining development efforts). He also noted that the Size and Shape Work Group will meet with Funding Strategies. CCGA's chair stated that his committee met with the Education and Curriculum and Research Strategies Work Groups. Sylvia Hurtado, a member of the Access and Affordability Work Group, stated that the Group has developed a set of principles on access. One proposal is to institute a cohort-based model of fee increases to make college costs more predictable. She noted her concern about the potential impact on student diversity of many of the proposals, such as differential fees by major.

V. ACSCOLI Briefing

ISSUE: Vice Chair Simmons, who also chairs ACSCOLI, gave a brief overview of how the activities of the laboratories have changed in the recent past.

DISCUSSION: Vice Chair Simmons stated that the laboratories have moved from solely weapons research and development to a more diverse portfolio of research activities including biological science, laser science, advanced computation, and environmental and climate science. It also has increased collaboration between academic researchers and private industry.

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

Eligibility. President Yudof stated that the new eligibility policy is being challenged by activist groups threatening to sue the University, but he strongly believes that ultimately, the policy will promote diversity and is fairer than the prior policy.

Advocacy. President Yudof stated that he believes that legislators on the whole understand that the University has reduced its budget as much as possible and that further cuts will cause deep injury. He is guardedly optimistic that UC will receive the \$370 million that the governor recommended in his budget. However, no members are willing to introduce the governor's proposed constitutional amendment that would create a floor for funding higher education. Yet the governor's message was useful as a starting point for public discussion about the need to set priorities in California, and that one of those priorities must be public higher education. The University will support proposals that provide a stable and adequate source of funding for higher education. The University is discussing with CSU potential ballot measures to provide such funding for the November 2010 or June 2011 elections. UCOP encourages the campuses to increase their efforts in creating advocate lists. They are organizing meetings of core advocates across the state with Assembly members in their district offices. President Yudof noted that he continues to meet with legislators, and just met with John Perez, the speaker-designate.

UCRP. UCOP is investigating whether the federal government would issue pension obligation bonds to enable the University to borrow funds for the retirement plan. The interest rate on such bonds is only 4% over a long period of time. This approach would reduce the risk to the retirement system.

VII. Update on Post-Employment Benefits Task Force

ISSUE: Council received an update on the progress of the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force from Randy Scott, Executive Director of Human Resources, and was asked to participate in a preference survey.

DISCUSSION: Executive Director Scott noted that the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force was created in March of last year. Information on the Task Force can be found at:

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/ucrpfuture/>. The Task Force consists of a Steering Committee and three Work Teams on retiree health, pension and finance. Last fall, the Task Force conducted 32 forums on the campuses to provide an overview of the issues that the University is facing. Over 6,500 people attended. Answers to some questions asked at the forums have been posted on the website. In November, two evaluations were provided to the Regents regarding the cost and sustainability of benefits. He noted that no change has been made to retiree health age limits in 20 years. In April, the Task Force will conduct another series of campus forums to outline a range of options for changing benefits that will be considered. In addition, a preference survey has been released. Executive Director Scott encourages employees to participate in the survey and forums. UCFW's chair thanked him for working closely with UCFW through the process and for taking many of its suggestions. He expressed concern that changes could cause young faculty to leave or prompt lump sum cashouts. In addition, he expressed doubt about the value of the preference survey, given that employees' preferences may change based on concrete options.

VIII. General Discussion

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

IX. Update on Advocacy Efforts and ICAS

ISSUE: Council discussed (A) BOARS' memo on the diversity impacts of the new eligibility policy; and (B) advocacy efforts in Sacramento.

DISCUSSION: (A) As part of its discussion on advocacy, Council addressed a memo written by BOARS on the diversity impacts of the new eligibility policy. BOARS wrote the memo to answer critics of the eligibility policy and to counter misinformation. In addition, Senate members will hold a special briefing for legislative leaders and their staff on this issue. BOARS' chair stated that in the past, it was easier to predict which students would be admitted to specific campuses with the eligibility index. Now it is less predictable because campuses are using a comprehensive review process, and each campus values different qualities. She noted that it is important to remember that the policy changes eligibility standards, i.e., who can apply to UC, not who is admitted. It simply expands the pool of applicants, and allows campuses greater flexibility in determining whom to admit. It expands the pool partially by eliminating the requirement of subject tests. The social costs of retaining the subject tests were high; only among Asian Americans is test taking high. BOARS has been studying the predictive value of testing on academic success for several years, and will continue to monitor it.

ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed BOARS' memo.

(B) Advocacy Efforts. Chair Powell stated that he and Vice Chair Simmons spent a day with the leaders of the faculty Senate meeting with legislators in Sacramento. In addition, next week's ICAS meeting will focus on advocacy and will include consultations with all three segments' governmental relations staff and student leaders. A slide show, developed by Professor Conrad Rudolph of UC Riverside, was shown, highlighting the impact of the accomplishments of UC faculty on everyday life. Lynn Tierney, Associate Vice President of Communications, attended this portion of the meeting. She stated that her unit is working with campus communications units on local advocacy efforts. They are surveying the campuses about their experiences with media buys. They also are making use of web advertising and new media outlets, which are less expensive than traditional media. Additionally, they are meeting with CSU to coordinate a joint message about the value of higher education to the citizens of the state. Council members exchanged ideas for advocacy with AVP Tierney. CGA's chair noted that his committee is finishing a white paper on the contributions of graduate students, which could be useful in advocacy efforts. Council members suggested highlighting the achievements of Nobel Prize winners, as well as students who contribute to California by becoming teachers, nurses, etc. A member suggested that presentations like the slide show should be distributed via email to alumni.

X. Draft Compendium revision

ISSUE: A draft of proposed revisions to the Compendium was presented.

DISCUSSION: Tony Norman, chair of the Compendium Committee, stated that the revision of the Compendium is essential at a time when the University is going through so many changes. It serves as a road map for academic programs. Council members made specific suggestions for changes to the draft. A member noted that multi-campus undergraduate programs are likely to be proposed as budget cuts are made to programs on individual campuses. However, such programs are not addressed in the Compendium. Vice Chair Simmons suggested that UCEP draft a proposal outlining appropriate review processes, to be authorized in Senate Regulations. A member noted that the issue of MRUs remains to be addressed and suggested that UCORP or a special task force examine it and make a recommendation. Members expressed concern that programs would be closed or consolidated in a *de facto* manner, without review, as a result of budget cuts. A member suggested addressing this issue explicitly at the Academic Council's joint meeting with the Chancellors in April. Members also expressed concern that some ideas for multi-campus instructional endeavors, such as the Institute for Global Health or the notion of a cybercampus, have bypassed Senate advice and review entirely.

XI. Response to LAO Report

ISSUE: Recently, a report from the state Legislative Analyst's Office recommended greater legislative oversight of program establishment, which is in the purview of the Academic Senate. CCGA provided a list of concerns regarding the report.

DISCUSSION: The LAO report recommended centralized coordination of the establishment of graduate programs. They proposed that a survey be undertaken to identify the specific disciplines in which additional programs are advised to fulfill state workforce needs. The universities would then submit proposals to establish these programs. CPEC would review the proposals first. This idea contravenes the principle of faculty purview over academic programs. UCPB's chair noted

that his committee also will address the LAO report at its next meeting. Members discussed whether it would be useful to produce a public response to the report.

XII. Differential Fees and Non-Resident Tuition

ISSUE: UCPB submitted a position paper on differential fees and non-resident tuition.

DISCUSSION: UCPB's chair stated that the position paper is a summary of Senate positions against tiering. The paper begins with the notion that UC is one university and extends this logic from differential fees by major to differential fees by campus and non-resident tuition. It is meant to begin a conversation about these issues since proposals on these topics likely will emerge from the Working Groups of the UC Commission on the Future. It also is intended to provide a framework for placing otherwise incremental proposals to increase revenues in context, and to connect such proposals to the Senate's stated budget priorities—competitive faculty salaries and restoring the retirement system. UCPB's underlying concern is that decisions made on individual campuses could affect the other campuses. For example, allowing non-residents additional slots on one campus could shift the costs of educating residents to other campuses. A second motivating principle in the memo is that any increases in revenue should support the systemwide Senate's budget priorities: funding the faculty salary plan and restoring the retirement system. UCPB argues that new revenues (beyond course fees used to mitigate higher, clearly documented costs of delivering instruction) should be pooled to support these priorities, instead of being used for local purposes. Therefore, they ask the Senate to examine whether the administration's recent policy of allowing campuses to retain NRT revenues should stand.

Members debated the appropriateness of extending the proposal on differential fees by major to the idea of differential fees by campus, when no proposal to do so has been made, and two members objected to the language of "stratification" used in the document as divisive. A member noted that all campuses have their own strategies for garnering revenue, including summer sessions, agricultural extension, and University Extension programs, and asked whether such sources of revenue also should be shared among the campuses. A member followed that campuses do not have a clear understanding of how revenue streams are allocated and argued that this information is needed before any decisions about new funding streams are made. There is a group at UCOP examining this issue and UCFW and UCPB have had preliminary presentations of its findings. Vice Chair Simmons suggested inviting the administrators responsible for this report to the next Council meeting. A member suggested that UCPB should meet and outline the principles that ideally should guide allocations. Another member emphasized that historical inequities in allocations of funding should not be perpetuated. A member requested that a cover letter summarizing the Council's discussion be appended to the document, as well as background memos explaining the NRT policy from former Provost Rory Hume and former EVP Katie Lapp, and Principles for Non-Resident Undergraduate Enrollment authored by BOARS and endorsed by Council in August, 2009.

ACTION: Council voted unanimously to send the document for systemwide comment and review, with the enclosures mentioned above.

XIII. Review of the Report of the Senate Special Committee on Online and Remote Instruction and Residency

ISSUE: Council discussed responses to the systemwide review of the report of the Senate Special Committee on Online and Remote Instruction and Residency.

DISCUSSION: The systemwide responses to the report ranged from rejection of its premise to endorsement of the report, with the majority urging a cautious approach to the implementation of online courses. Members expressed concern that the report seems to deemphasize lower division teaching and devalue face-to-face instruction. Additionally, implicit in the report is the problematic idea of establishing a core undergraduate curriculum. Other issues include the significant cost of online instruction, the need to maintain quality and Senate oversight, and the notion that the mode of course instruction should be driven by pedagogy, not budget. Several members noted that what differentiates UC from other state institutions is that it offers undergraduate education in a research environment. This point should be emphasized. A member suggested endorsing the idea that using online instruction in a hybrid manner could enhance instruction, and noted that such blended courses seemed to be acceptable to many of the divisions. Several online graduate programs already exist, and there are many courses that employ online methods. A member noted that BOARS has established rigorous criteria for online providers of a-g courses. However, he noted that there is no cost savings associated with the quality providers of these courses. A member stated that in order to maintain quality in such courses, we must first define it. Members also argued that further discussion about the definition of residency is needed, and perhaps UCR&J should be consulted. Council members agreed to discuss this subject in more depth after the recommendations of the Commission on the Future are issued, as they likely will include some recommendation on online and remote instruction.

ACTION: Council approved sending the draft letter (with revisions) responding to the report to the Chair of the Special Committee on Online and Remote Instruction and Residency.

XIV. Review of Report on Education Abroad Program (EAP)

ISSUE: Council discussed responses to the systemwide review of the report of the Joint Senate-Administration Task Force on EAP.

DISCUSSION: A Council member noted that one of the themes that emerged from the review of the report was that the Senate should have a stronger voice on the Governing Board. To this end, a member suggested requesting that the Governing Board be co-chaired by the chair or vice chair of the Academic Council or UCIE, which would affirm EAP's status as an academic program. In addition, Senate staff will draft a letter summarizing the responses to the joint report and will circulate it to Council for approval.

ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed sending a request to Interim Provost Pitts to appoint the chair or vice chair of the Academic Council as co-chair of the EAP Governing Board.

XV. COR Funding

ISSUE: UCORP drafted a letter expressing concern about the fact that the furlough program disproportionately affects faculty in disciplines without access to external funding and requested that budget cuts to COR funds, which support faculty research in these disciplines, be restored.

DISCUSSION: UCORP's representative stated that the importance of research at UC is being undermined by budget cuts. Council members agreed that this critical message should be conveyed

to the administration, but did not endorse UCORP's request for restoration of COR funds. Members argued that since many campus programs are experiencing budgets cuts, they would not want this program, however meritorious, to be privileged over others. The divisional chairs, in particular, emphasized that budgetary choices are complex, local matters and preferred to maintain flexibility to make such decisions at the campus level. A Council member suggested forwarding the letter from UCORP to UCPB for consideration in its statements on budget priorities.

ACTION: Council approved (13 in favor, 2 abstentions) a motion to send UCORP's letter to UCPB for consideration in its statements about budget priorities.

XVI. New Business

ISSUE: BOARS drafted a memo objecting to the defunding of StatFinder.

ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed sending to President Yudof BOARS' memo on StatFinder.

ISSUE: The report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force was removed from the consent calendar.

ACTION: Council unanimously approved the draft letter on the UEETF report with some revisions to the first paragraph.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest: Henry Powell, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst