

## ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Teleconference Meeting  
December 17, 2014****I. Consent Calendar**

1. Approve today's agenda items and their priority
2. Approve draft Council minutes of November 24, 2014
3. Approve UCSD proposed simple name change from the School of International Relations and Pacific Studies to School of Global Policy and Strategy

**Action: Council approved the consent calendar.**

**II. Announcements**

- o Mary Gilly, Academic Senate
- o Dan Hare, Vice Chair Academic Senate

**ICAS Meeting:** The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) met on December 15. ICAS discussed a proposed state constitutional amendment that would remove some of UC's historical autonomy. CSU faculty shared examples of what UC may lose under such an arrangement, noting, for example, that the legislatively-mandated "SB 1440" Transfer AA degrees that guarantee degree-holders CSU admission and a bachelor's degree upon completion of 60 units, are incompatible with engineering and other majors that normally require more than 60 upper division units for graduation. ICAS also discussed a new pilot program signed by Governor Brown that will allow up to 15 California Community Colleges to offer bachelor's degree programs in certain vocational fields not currently offered at a UC or CSU campus. ICAS has been asked to advise CCC faculty about the appropriate general education requirements for the degrees. Chair Gilly has offered UCEP's assistance.

ICAS oversees the California Open Education Resources Council (COERC), an intersegmental committee that is working to increase faculty adoption of low-cost or free open educational resources. Two of UC's representatives are leaving the Council. Faculty interested in one of the positions should contact Chair Gilly.

**III. Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual****1. Proposed revisions to APM 080 and APM 330**

Council reviewed comments from Senate divisions and committees about a set of [proposed revisions](#) to APM 080, clarifying procedures for the separation of faculty members who are unable to perform their duties due to a disability or medical condition, and APM 330, clarifying the duties and responsibilities of individuals appointed to the Specialist title series.

***APM 080***

Reviewers expressed general support for the revisions to APM 080. Council members noted several areas of the policy that need clarification:

- The intended definition of “reasonable accommodations” in the context of the justification required to make a decision to initiate separation procedures. It was suggested that the policy include a standard definition of “reasonable accommodation” as a link or footnote – for example, the one in the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- Procedures for addressing cases involving a Senate member with tenure or security of employment (APM 080-20-a) and cases involving an untenured Senate member (APM 080-20-b). The procedure for requesting a hearing or waiving the right to do so through inaction should be consistent for all Senate members regardless of their employment security status.
- The period in section 080-10-d for the chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure to respond to the chancellor from 15 business days to 30 calendar days. The period should be consistent with the time period allowed for other steps in the process.
- The individual with authority to initiate a medical separation review. One division notes that a faculty member’s immediate supervisor should generally be responsible for initiating a review, and that a dean should not initiate a review when the chair is the immediate supervisor.
- How the revisions will impact faculty in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP) who are not covered by other APM provisions that allow for long-term medical leave. One division suggests that APM 670 be modified to align with the policy revisions.

Council agreed to ask the Department of Academic Personnel to incorporate the suggestions into the final draft and issue the APMs for a final review.

**Action:** A motion was made and seconded to endorse the proposed modifications and provide feedback on the items mentioned. A draft letter will be circulated to Council for review and approval.

### ***APM 330***

Senate reviewers expressed general support for the revisions to APM 330. Council agreed that the new language is a substantial improvement, particularly the provision making University and public service for individuals in the Specialist series optional based on the requirements of the funding source. Two divisions noted that the revised policy continues to be ambiguous regarding the role of service in the criteria for evaluation in the series and that the policy should clearly state that service is optional for eligibility and advancement. One division suggested a revision to 330-10 to address cases in which a funding source may forbid service. Council agreed with one division’s recommendation to add language allowing for flexibility in setting salaries in response to the market.

**Action:** A motion was made and seconded to endorse the proposed modifications and provide feedback on the items mentioned. A draft letter will be circulated to Council for review and approval.

## **2. Proposed Revisions to APM 133-17, APM 210-1-c&-d, APM 220-18; and APM 760**

Council reviewed comments from Senate divisions and committees regarding proposed revisions to policies for “Stopping the Tenure Clock” in APM 133, 210, 220, and 760, and proposed

revisions to APM 210-1-d, addressing the role of diversity in the Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Appraisal.

### ***Stopping the Tenure Clock***

It was noted that UCFW originally proposed the amendments to 133-17 expanding the permissible reasons to stop the eight-year service limitation “tenure clock” to personal circumstances beyond childrearing, such as a serious health condition or family bereavement, or other significant circumstances that may impede the faculty member’s duties or timely research progress. Council expressed strong support for the revisions and agreed that they improve existing language and policy. It was noted that the policy should clarify that it applies to a “blended” family.

**Action:** A motion was made and seconded to endorse the revisions and to ask the Office of Academic Personnel to review the technical clarifications suggested by Senate reviewers.

### ***APM 210-1 d s***

In April 2013, Council [proposed](#) a review of UCAP and UCAAD’s revision to APM 210-d-1. The revision is intended to address confusion from campus CAPs about how to interpret the APM’s provision regarding the role of contributions to diversity and equal opportunity in the academic personnel process.

In general, Senate reviewers agreed that the revisions are intended to clarify that faculty contributions to diversity and equal opportunity should be evaluated and credited in the academic personnel process on the same basis as other contributions, but those contributions should not constitute a “fourth leg” of evaluation in addition to teaching, research and service. Several campuses noted that one of the new sentences is vague and should be revised, as it could suggest that diversity contributions do constitute a fourth leg of evaluation and are necessary to a strong file.

Some reviewers were concerned that the revision intrudes on academic freedom by seeming to elevate one type of research, teaching, and service activity over others and granting it preferred status in the academic personnel process. They noted that the subject matter of a faculty member’s contributions should not determine its value, faculty should not receive special commendation for their contributions to equal opportunity and diversity, and a personnel case should not be weakened by the absence of such contributions. Others noted that the language is not intended to prefer any form of scholarship over another but to clarify the importance of valuing and crediting meritorious contributions that work to reconcile inequalities – contributions that have been historically undervalued and marginalized. Faculty should, in fact, be encouraged to participate in these activities and should receive additional recognition and perhaps remuneration for them.

Council agreed that it would be better to maintain the existing language until faculty can agree on improved wording that clarifies at least some of these issues. Council will ask the relevant Senate committees to consider Senate reviewer comments and recommend additional revisions for the review of Academic Council and the Office of Academic Personnel.

**Action:** A motion was made and seconded to express appreciation for the intent of the revision to APM 210-1-d but to reject the revised language due to problems identified by campuses and

committees, particularly their view that the proposed language does not meet the intent. The motion passed with three members abstaining.

#### **IV. Faculty Salary/Total Remuneration Update**

Senate division chairs reported on local meetings of campus administrators and campus committee chairs to discuss options for allocating a 3% faculty salary increase in the 2015-16 UC budget and for addressing the 10% gap in UC faculty total remuneration.

The meetings revealed a range of opinion about the extent to which a 3% increase should be applied to all faculty on an across-the-board basis. Many administrators and some faculty believe campuses should have the flexibility to use at least a portion of the increase to fund targeted retention and equity actions. Some would support applying the full 3% increase on an across-the-board basis in the first year and then (assuming a multi-year plan) using a greater proportion of future increases to target specific disparities. Campuses also noted that their support for the increase is contingent on its being funded with new money.

There is also a diversity of opinion about the extent to which salary increases should apply to the off-scale portion of the salary in addition to the regular salary. Some support raising the scales in order to have a greater effect on total remuneration; while some faculty with a significant off-scale believe it is fairer to apply the increase to the entire salary in order to maintain their off-scale differential. It was noted that an across-the-board salary increase would apply to both the x and x prime portion of salaries of faculty on the Health Sciences Compensation Plan.

Several systemwide committees are also discussing options. UCPB estimates that a total of \$180 million is needed to close the salary gap with the Comparison 8. UCPB suggests addressing the gap with annual salary increments of 5.6% over five years, using 3% as an across-the-board range adjustment applied to both on and off-scales portions of the salary, and the remaining 2.6%, drawn from the “quality improvements” portion of the budget, to close the 12% total remuneration gap. UCFW supports allocating the full 3% on an across-the board basis in the first year, and thereafter, in consultation with the Senate, using money to address local equity issues. UCAP and UCAAD are also discussing recommendations.

#### **V. Consultation with UCOP**

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

#### **Provost Dorr**

*Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)*: In January, the Provost will announce the systemwide online course proposals that have been selected to receive RFP 3 ILTI funding. The Provost is considering a UC Irvine proposal to provide the campus a direct block grant to manage 25 ILTI courses, including 12 new courses. She has invited other campuses to submit similar proposals. UCOP is considering new approaches to more effectively advertise the availability of ILTI courses.

**Engagement Plan:** UCOP is asking campus Senate divisional chairs to inform their committees about UC's Long-Term Stability Plan for Tuition and Financial Aid, and to encourage faculty to take an active role in talking publicly about the excellence of the university and how their teaching, research, and public service contributes to that excellence.

### **President Napolitano**

The Governor has requested a series of focused conversations with President Napolitano about specific ideas for adjusting UC's cost drivers. The meetings will be supported by internal and external experts and staff-prepared white papers, and the university will bring its own issues to the conversation, including the role of UC research, how research contributes to a well-educated citizenry and a strong economy, and graduate student training. The new plan will be an information item at the January Regents meeting.

The Long-Term Stability Plan for Tuition and Financial Aid has helped place public higher education funding front and center in Sacramento. The release of the Governor's preliminary 2015-16 budget in early January will start a months-long process of negotiation. The President is working to engage various university constituencies, including unions and student leaders, in advocacy for the university. UCOP will need the faculty's help to inform the public and to address misperceptions about UC's work. UC is also tracking the progress of State Senate Bill 15, which would provide additional money to UC, and a funding plan proposed by Assembly Speaker Atkins.

The President has announced the first five recipients of her Research Catalyst Awards, which will fund multi-campus, multi-disciplinary research projects in areas that could benefit California and the world. The largest award will fund a project to use UC's natural reserve system to model the impact of climate change on California ecosystems. Another will examine solutions to health care challenges in the state's prison population; and a third will tap big data to inform questions involving health, poverty and social justice. UCOP is preparing final recommendations from the President's Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault, and has released preliminary undergraduate application data for fall 2015, which indicate that demand for a UC education continues to increase. UC received a record number of applications for the 11<sup>th</sup> consecutive year, and Chicano/Latinos are now the largest group of CA resident freshman applicants.

### **Q&A:**

*What can faculty do to help convince the California public about the importance of funding higher education?*

UCOP has a detailed communications and legislative lobbying plan that will include faculty in specific conversations and is working with campuses to sponsor visits from local legislators to help them learn more about the university and what is happening on campuses; faculty will also need to inform these conversations. UCOP is looking for stories about interesting faculty work in scholarship, teaching, and public service.

*What do you envision as the outcome of the Committee of Two with the Governor?*

I expect that proposals will emerge from the process, but some will need to come back to the faculty and/or the Regents for review.

*Please comment on Senator Lara's bill that would remove UC's constitutional autonomy.*

We are tracking the bill and concerned about it, but I also note that every tuition increase brings a similar proposal; we want to work with state leaders more closely on how to fix the state's divestment in higher education. We also note that by any measure, UC outperforms CSU, which is subject to control from the legislature.

## **VI. Other Business**

Chair Gilly noted that there is some confusion about the role of divisional representatives on systemwide committees. Divisional representatives should be encouraged to bring local perspectives to systemwide meetings, but are also expected to forge a systemwide perspective that takes into account what is best for UC as a whole, and should not feel obliged to represent their committee or campus viewpoint on an issue.

In addition, Regent Ruiz has asked Chair Gilly to speak at the January Regents meeting about how technology has changed both teaching and research for faculty. Council members are requested to provide specific examples to Chair Gilly about the positive impacts of technology on both teaching and research from different disciplines and campuses.

-----  
Meeting adjourned at 12:15 pm

Attest: Mary Gilly, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst