

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2015****I. Consent Calendar**

1. Today's agenda items and their priority
2. Draft Council minutes of September 30, 2015

ACTION: Council approved the consent calendar.

II. Senate Officer's Announcements

- **Dan Hare, Academic Senate Chair**
- **Jim Chalfant, Academic Senate Vice Chair**
- **Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director**

Transfer Streamlining Meetings: In October, the Senate and Provost hosted three meetings of campus faculty delegates from 11 majors to discuss potential systemwide transfer pathways. Delegates are currently seeking local approval of agreements reached at the meetings.

Regents Work Group on Principles of Intolerance: The Regents hosted a forum at UCLA on October 26 to gather public input about a new Statement of Principles Against Intolerance. The Statement is being written by a joint working group that includes Senate Chair Hare. It hopes to finish its work by January 31, in time for discussion at the March Regents meeting.

Assembly Meeting Scheduled for December 9: Currently there is not enough business that would justify a full day, in-person meeting of the Assembly on December 9. If the meeting is held, it will take the form of a shorter teleconference.

UC Health Governance: Many of the [concerns](#) recently expressed by the Senate about proposed changes to the governance structure of UC Health agree with those of the Regents, and are expected to be incorporated into a revised draft for consideration in November. It is expected that the revised proposal will add a Senate representative to the reconstituted Regents Committee on Health. The Senate will be asked to appoint an experienced faculty member with clinical experience to the Committee.

New Joint Committee: Following a well-publicized case involving a UC professor with a history of sexual misconduct who was allowed to remain in his position without sanction, President Napolitano has decided to form a Joint Committee to examine systemwide and individual campus policies and practices for addressing incidents of sexual misconduct involving faculty and academic personnel. Chair Hare will co-lead the Joint Committee with Sheryl Vacca, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer.

Discussion: It was noted that the disciplinary procedures outlined in the APM and Senate Bylaws offers tools, including informal resolution, that were not used by the administration at the campus where the well-publicized incident occurred. However, some administrators maintain that they do not have authority to discipline faculty or institute interim measures when an

allegation is made. As these issues are clarified and addressed by the Joint Committee, the Senate should ensure that the opportunity for a hearing is not eliminated due to administrative failings on one campus.

III. Course Identification Numbering System

- **David Morse, President, ASCCC; Julie Bruno, Vice President, ASCCC;**
- **Michelle Pilati, C-ID Coordinator; Erik Shearer, C-ID Curriculum Coordinator;**
- **Krystinne Mica, C-ID Program Manager; Julie Adams, Executive Director, ASCCC;**
- **Robert Cassidy, Curriculum Director, School of Engineering, UC Irvine**

Guests from the California Community Colleges and UC Irvine joined Council to discuss the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) and its implementation at CCC and CSU. The goal of C-ID is to establish uniform identification numbers for comparable lower division major preparation courses across the three higher education segments. The numbers help CCC students identify clear transfer paths into courses and majors that have been approved by CSU campuses as meeting articulation standards. UC does not currently participate in the project, but has been asked by the state to consider using C-ID as an additional number for UC campus courses.

ASCCC President Morse noted that C-ID has helped eliminate confusion among transfer students attempting to navigate the transfer path to the universities, increased degree completion, and facilitated dialogue among faculty about instructional integrity and rigor.

Professors Pilati and Shearer noted that C-ID numbers are assigned based on course descriptors developed and approved by Senate-appointed intersegmental work groups. The C-ID number identifies comparable CCC courses that match a given descriptor and that CSU and UC can recognize as comparable to their own courses. The descriptors identify the essential, common components of a course based on the course outline of record. Draft descriptors are developed and vetted by faculty review groups, posted [online](#) for statewide vetting, and re-evaluated every five years. C-ID has descriptors for individual courses and also for course sequences. C-ID is faculty driven and student-serving. It enables the CCCs to work like a system while maintaining local control of curriculum. A C-ID number ensures course portability for comparable courses across the CCCs. It also has the potential to instantly articulate a CSU course with up to 113 CCCs, greatly simplifying transfer. C-ID also offers quality control and a model for required courses in the transfer model curricula (TMCs) used to develop Associate Degrees for Transfer.

It was noted that CCC welcomes and desires more UC participation at all levels of the process, particularly during the development and review of descriptors and in the evaluation of descriptors against corresponding CCC course outlines. Individual UC campuses and departments can decide to articulate courses aligned to a specific C-ID designation, relying on the C-ID review process to ensure that the course is appropriate.

Robert Cassidy noted that the UCI School of Engineering has been participating in C-ID for several years. Following a comprehensive faculty review of C-ID descriptors, the School secured approval for all course articulations reflected in C-ID descriptions. It is now instructing campus articulation officers to automatically articulate courses with a C-ID designation to UCI Engineering courses. He noted that UCI (along with most UC campuses) draws transfers from a broad set of CCCs across the state. C-ID helps UCI identify comparable courses across many

colleges and is also shoring up demand for less commonly offered courses by giving the CCCs a broader and more stable demand for low enrollment courses. However, more CCC students are planning their lower division study around courses with C-IDs to ensure they can be admitted to a CSU. If UC does not participate in C-ID, transfers may be less likely to prepare for UC, and UC campuses could miss out on many good students.

Discussion: Council members noted that C-ID can help UC enroll more and better-prepared transfers by establishing stronger connections with a viable transfer pool; however, courses designated “comparable” through C-ID should truly be comparable. One way to determine whether this is true is to track the UC performance of transfers who have taken C-ID-aligned courses to see if they arrive prepared for upper division work. It was also noted that UC transfers already perform as well as students admitted as freshmen, and that C-ID descriptors offer even more detail for the articulation decision. It was noted that UC needs faculty to participate in the development of course descriptors to ensure they are consistently and appropriately detailed. It was suggested that UC begin by adopting C-ID numbers for large enrollment courses and/or pilot the use of C-ID tags for courses included in approved transfer pathways. It was noted that C-ID does not identify whether a particular CCC course is taught online or in-person.

IV. Consultation with UC Senior Managers

○ Janet Napolitano, President

Joint Committee: The President is appointing a Joint Committee to examine policies and processes for sexual harassment allegations lodged against UC faculty. Recent events involving a tenured UCB faculty member (who has now resigned) have highlighted the extent to which there are misunderstandings on campuses about existing policies. The University has an opportunity to revisit and clarify the policies, if needed, and strengthen education and training, to ensure it is setting and enforcing the right standards. The President will ask the Task Force to provide recommendations by the end of February.

November Regents Meeting: UCOP will ask the Regents to approve a proposed delivery framework for the Merced 2020 project under which the winning bidder will both build and operate new and expanded facilities at UC Merced. UCOP will also ask the Regents to approve proposed changes to the governance structure of UC Health intended to provide better and more transparent oversight of the University’s health enterprise. The proposal has been revised to include a UC clinical faculty member on the new Regents Health Governance Committee. Finally, the Regents will review a preliminary 2016-17 budget, which reflects the agreement with the state for increased state funding, no increase to resident tuition, and an 8% increase to nonresident tuition. The budget will also propose a substantial increase to investments in academic quality, and address the legislature’s request to enroll 5,000 new California residents.

Presidential Initiatives: The UC Global Food Initiative seeks to leverage UC’s leadership on a wide range of issues intended to help put the world on a sustainable food path. Recent events included a Food Day at UCLA focused on issues of food waste, and a carbon neutrality summit at UCSD, which included the presentation of a UC-generated climate change study that will also be part of an upcoming United Nations Conference in Paris. Governor Brown’s remarks at the Summit included praise for UC’s sustainability efforts.

○ *Aimée Dorr, Provost and Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs*

Budget Framework Initiatives: The “Major Requirements” project asks campuses to review course requirements and reduce the number of upper division units required for a major to roughly the equivalent of one full year (3 quarters or 2 semesters) of academic work, when possible, for the top 75% of majors. Although the initiative is modeled on UCLA’s “Challenge 45,” the goal is not to meet a specific unit number, but to trim excess units, strengthen the curriculum, and improve the experience for students. UCOP will ask departments to provide a rationale for outcomes that maintain existing unit requirements exceeding a full year. UCOP is also planning to convene campus engineering representatives to discuss different strategies campuses are using to satisfy the special curricular requirements set by engineering accreditors.

In addition, Riverside will pilot “activity-based costing” for the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences to help understand instructional costs. Three similar departments at Merced and Davis will participate in an activity-based costing scoping study and implementation depending on the outcome of scoping study. Davis will also pilot a study on “adaptive learning technologies” intended to help students master challenging coursework and increase the number of students who persist to completion.

Discussion: A Council member noted that campuses implementing the Major Requirements project would benefit from access to information about upper division requirements for similar majors across UC campuses.

○ *Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer*

Financial Statements: At the November Regents meeting, UCOP will present financial statements indicating a generally stable financial outlook for the University and improving fundamentals, despite a \$100 million decrease in overall net position due to increased pension liability and retiree health costs. UCRP’s unfunded liability is currently \$10.8 billion. Its funded ratio decreased from 87% to 84% last year (market basis) as the result of updated assumptions from an experience study and the Plan’s failure to achieve the assumed return rate of 7.25%. (On an actuarial basis, the funded ratio increased from 80% to 82%.) UC will need to consider new options for addressing retiree health costs, including pre-funding.

UCRP Borrowing Plan: UCOP will ask the Regents to approve a plan to borrow from internal sources, including excess liquid assets from the Short Term Investment Pool (STIP) for investment in UCRP, continuing a path pursued in three times since 2011. The new proposal would increase the total \$2.7 billion invested so far by about 50% over three years. UC estimates that these additional funds, combined with \$436 million in new state funding for UCRP over three years, will enable the University to cover the Actuarially Required Contribution (ARC) in each of the next three years.

V. UCRP Borrowing Plan

Council reviewed letters from UCFW and its Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) in support of UCOP’s proposed UCRP borrowing plan. UCFW Chair Moore noted that UCRP has an unfunded liability; meaning that its future estimated payment obligations exceeds the present value of available assets. Regents’ policy requires UC to meet the Actuarially Required Contribution for UCRP, which includes funding the Normal Cost of the plan (the present value

of future pension benefits), plus interest on the unfunded liability, plus an annual amortized payment on the unfunded liability. To do this, UC funds the Plan with 22% of covered compensation from employer (14%) and employee (8%) contributions, using 4% to pay the interest on the unfunded liability and a portion of the principal. UC has periodically borrowed from STIP, at less than 2%, for investment in UCRP, where it will hopefully earn the assumed 7.25% UCRP interest. The borrowed money is paid back through campus assessments on payroll. The Senate has long supported and encouraged this fiscally responsible strategy. UCFW and TFIR ask the Council to support the CFO's multi-year proposal to borrow to meet the ARC for the next three years.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to endorse the borrowing proposal. The motion passed unanimously. A letter indicating Council's support will be sent to CFO Brostrom.

VI. Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment

Council reviewed feedback from Senate divisions and systemwide committees in response to the [proposed revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment](#). The policy was revised based on feedback from University constituencies, including the [Senate](#), during the February 2015 systemwide review.

In general, Senate reviewers agreed that the revised draft improves upon the earlier version by providing clearer definitions and guidance; however, reviewers still found many elements of the policy difficult to understand. They noted significant points of confusion and concern about provisions related to mandatory reporting responsibilities for faculty, graduate students, and others, in different circumstances; protections for graduate students; privacy and confidentiality provisions; disciplinary procedures; and the relationship of the policy to law enforcement and Senate Privilege and Tenure processes.

Discussion: Council members noted that the policy is unclear about the potential sanctions facing a faculty member who chooses not to report an incident. They also pointed to concerns about privacy and confidentiality, including the need for victims to consult confidentially, the need for the policy to include clearer safeguards for respondents' due process rights, and concerns about the potential for hearsay to influence proceedings. In addition, the policy should be clearer about how it interacts with the established disciplinary process for faculty involving Senate Privilege and Tenure committees—particularly the extent to which some elements of the Title IX process are intended to replace or supplement established P&T procedures. There was concern that the process outlined in the policy could weaken and/or unduly influence the P&T process. It was noted that the policy may be overly broad and complex and will be difficult to implement. In the long run, it may be better to have separate policies covering sexual violence and sexual harassment, or covering students and employees.

Action: A draft letter summarizing the feedback will be circulated for Council's review and approval.

VII. Executive Session

VIII. Update on Progress of Budget Framework Initiatives

Council reviewed a list of the UCOP and campus point people assigned to each of the 14 budget framework initiatives. Campus point people include both administrators and faculty. Several Senate chairs reported that they meet regularly with point people or are otherwise engaged in communication with them regarding progress and the role of the Senate in the initiatives. Some campuses are in the process of designating an additional co-point person from the Senate for some of the initiatives.

IX. Update on the Retirement Benefits Advisory Task Force

- **Rachael Nava, Chief Operating Officer**
- **Gary Schlimgen, Executive Director, HR Retirement Programs and Services**

COO Nava noted that the Task Force is making significant progress in responding to the state mandate to develop new retirement options for employees hired after July 1, 2016 – options that include a new cap on pensionable earnings based on the requirements of the California Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act (PEPRA) and that support two guiding principles: 1) to ensure UC retirement benefits remain competitive and 2) UCRP remains financially sustainable. The Task Force is analyzing the financial impacts of different models, including a supplemental Defined Contribution plan that would work in tandem with a capped Defined Benefit plan, as well as a stand-alone DC plan.

Executive Director Schlimgen noted that the Task Force is reviewing design elements that will yield the strongest benefit for retirees, and solidifying around a set of options that will save up to \$38 million as a 15-year average. One supplemental benefit design under consideration would involve a 10% employer contribution and a 7% member contribution. The Task Force prefers that any supplemental benefit apply to all groups of employees with individuals over the PEPRA limit, not just a particular employee group.

Discussion: It was noted that state officials have introduced an additional goal of immediate cost savings, but it is important to take a long-term perspective with regard to savings. Reducing UCRP’s Normal Cost and unfunded liability over time is a very real form of savings that also does less harm to competitiveness. If UC pays less generous benefits, it will need to spend more on salary if it wishes to remain competitive, perhaps negating some of any savings gained from the redesign. The DB plan is worth more to employees than a DC plan, and provides the employer with “bang for the buck” in terms of competitiveness. It was noted that the Task Force is using data from the recent faculty Total Remuneration study conducted by Mercer, and from Mercer’s 26 comparator universities to help it define competitiveness.

Chair Hare noted that the Senate will be permitted a full review of the final proposal between approximately January 15, 2016, when the final report is released, and February 15.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst
Attest: Dan Hare, Academic Council Chair