



Notes from the Academic Senate Chair



Mary Gilly
mary.gilly@ucop.edu

Dear Colleagues,

It has been quite a year, with the University of California under the microscope in Sacramento and in news outlets here and around the country. The budget process started in November when the Regents approved a budget that would have increased tuition by up to 5% in each of the next five years. It ended with a budget that, while better than the 4% increase the Governor had originally offered (without a tuition increase), micromanages UC in unprecedented ways. Without continued Academic Senate vigilance, UC is in danger of diluting its excellence in the name of efficiency as envisioned by State political leaders.

The Budget Framework asks UC to implement a number of new programs, many of which are in the Senate's academic purview. For example, the Senate must be the one to review major requirements with the goal of reducing upper-division units in the major to 45 where possible, complete systemwide transfer preparation pathways for 20 top majors, propose and evaluate online options for gateway courses, examine policies on Advanced Placement and College-Level Examination Program tests, and consider adopting the Course Identification Numbering (C-ID) system. And while several other programmatic commitments are not under direct Senate authority, they have implications for faculty. We are happy to re-evaluate some of our procedures and programs and consider changes that may improve access and efficiency, but we will not endorse changes that diminish the quality of a UC education.

The Framework also depends on UC's commitment to changing the UC Retirement Plan for future employees; however, we must avoid changes that affect the behavior of future UC hires in ways that damage quality. UC's Defined Benefit plan has helped UC attract and retain young, innovative faculty members, and its assured retirement income has encouraged their retirement at an appropriate time. By contrast, a more portable Defined Contribution plan could encourage young faculty to leave as they become more prominent and begin to receive competing offers, and it provides no financial incentive to employees to move from active service to retirement. As UC considers the parameters of the new UCRP options, it needs to assess not only cost factors but also the effect on faculty employment patterns that may harm the University. Fortunately, the Retirement Options Task Force has four Senate members who have extensive experience with pension and faculty welfare issues. Their goal will be to make any changes as attractive as possible to faculty.

Throughout the past year, I have spoken at Regents meetings about our shared value of excellence, how much of California's excellence is rooted in the University of California, and how faculty are the key to the excellence of the University. UC faculty members have received 62 Nobel prizes and 61 National Med-

Continued on page 4

Ten UC Transfer Pathways Take Effect

Thanks to the efforts of the faculty and staff, the first phase of a project to adopt common systemwide transfer pathways for 21 majors is complete.

On July 1, following campus-based reviews of agreements reached by faculty at three April workshops, UCOP unveiled a [website](#) detailing systemwide transfer preparation pathways for Anthropology, Biochemistry, Biology, Cell Biology, Chemistry, Economics, Mathematics, Molecular Biology, Physics, and Sociology. President Napolitano introduced the pathways at a joint press conference with UC Academic Senate and intersegmental higher education leaders on July 7.

The effort follows a recommendation in the 2014 [Transfer Action Team](#) report to streamline the transfer admission pathways from the California Community Colleges (CCC) to UC by aligning the preparation requirements for specific majors across UC campuses. That report revealed that CCC students often have difficulty preparing simultaneously for transfer into a similar major at multiple UC campuses.

President Napolitano asked the Senate to facilitate the completion of agreements for 10 majors by the end of the 2014-2015 academic year, and 11 more the following year. In April 2015, Senate Chair Gilly and Vice Chair Hare led three workshops for faculty from ten popular majors to identify a single set of major-specific lower division coursework for CCC students to follow as preparation for transfer admission in each major at all campuses.

Senate leaders say the pathways will make it possible for transfers to prepare simultaneously for the same major at multiple UC campuses, and will help ensure that transfers arrive prepared to compete with native juniors and graduate in two years. The pathways also will help UC meet its agreement with the Governor to improve the transfer path and increase the number of transfer students.

"When faculty understood the challenges transfer students face in preparing for multiple campuses, they were very supportive of this effort," said Senate Chair Gilly. "They saw it as an opportunity to communicate to transfer students what courses to take if they want to apply to multiple UC campuses (on average, transfers apply to four), and have them arrive better prepared to graduate in two years."

The Senate office has scheduled three October meetings for campus faculty and academic administrators who are responsible for evaluating and/or deciding transfer preparation requirements from 11 additional majors: English Literature, Film Studies, History, Philosophy, Business Administration, Communications, Political Science, Psychology, Computer Sciences, Electrical Engineering, and Mechanical Engineering.



Senate Vice Chair Dan Hare & Chair Mary Gilly with President Napolitano at a July 7 press event announcing the UC transfer pathways

Continued on page 2

als of Science. As of June, 2013, UC faculty included 61 MacArthur “Genius” Grant recipients, 286 members of the National Academy of Sciences, and 410 members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. What attracts that caliber of faculty to UC?

UC serves as an incubator of intellectual excellence for its undergraduate and graduate academic and professional students. The *Sacramento Bee* calls the University of California “an academic treasure, a font of skilled workers, a research engine, a mission, a bargain, a shot at social mobility,” and in 2009, the *New York Times* called UC “a crown jewel of education.” Californians take justifiable pride in their University.

But what makes UC faculty among the very best? It is useful to look at the UC Academic Personnel Manual description of what UC expects from its professors: “*Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions. Insistence upon this standard for holders of the professorship is necessary for maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.*” Meeting these high expectations is challenging, but they are known to anyone applying for a UC position, or being considered for promotion and tenure here.

These standards are a magnet for people who want to change the way we understand the world – whether in deep space, in microbes, or in the Central Valley. They mean that UC faculty will be supported to do their best possible work in research and in the classroom, that they will work with colleagues who are the best in their fields, and that they will teach students who are excited by new knowledge.

You can think of the University of California as a brand. UC Berkeley Professor Emeritus Dave Aaker is a guru of branding, marketing, and business—my fields. Professor Aaker says that the essence of a brand is the values and priorities it represents—what the organization considers important. Research indicates that people want to associate with organizations they respect and admire. For scholars who want to be the very best in creating and transmitting knowledge, UC represents the highest commitment to their values of intellectual achievement.

In November, the *Los Angeles Times* described the debate over UC funding as a “battle for UC’s soul.” They wrote, “At issue is whether the 10-campus system will continue to rank among the nation’s premier research universities, drawing top students and the best professors from throughout the world, or whether it will slowly shrink its ambitions, becoming a more utilitarian institution that concentrates narrowly on moving students to their bachelor’s degrees into the workforce quickly and efficiently.” I doubt that the Senate faculty could agree more.

But some people are now questioning UC’s emphasis on excellence. They say faculty only care about prestige, selectivity, and rankings. I would argue that faculty care about the attributes of UC that lead to prestige, selectivity, and rankings. We take pride in the quality of the research led by UC faculty and conducted with graduate and undergraduate students. We are pleased when our alumni and peers evaluate UC’s quality of education highly. The increasing selectivity of UC’s undergraduate admissions is a function of an increase in applications at a time when the state has not wanted to support increased enrollment. The faculty would prefer to accommodate more California residents, and we worry about the increasing faculty-student ratio not because it lowers our rankings but because it reduces the ability of faculty to connect with students as individuals.

The Budget Framework suggests that State officials believe UC should focus on processing undergraduate California residents as quickly as possible. While we do offer an excellent undergraduate education, it is only a part of UC’s excellence. I am concerned that an emphasis on speed and efficiency in the production of undergraduate degrees will change the UC brand. Faculty and students, who

Continued on page 4

Chair Gilly says the pathways are not intended to be a set of requirements, but rather UC’s best collective advice to transfers about the preparation that will ensure they are competitive for admission to a major at all nine UC undergraduate campuses and prepared to graduate two years after matriculation.

“Campuses should not expect students to take more than the pathway to be competitive,” she said.

The systemwide website refers students to individual campus websites for a complete list of expected major preparation coursework and information about minimum GPA requirements for the campus and specific courses.

UC Senate and administrative leaders also met with CSU and CCC colleagues at a June meeting in Oakland to introduce the UC pathways and discuss their relationship to the Associate Degrees for Transfer and Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) used by CSU and the CCCs. Senate Bill 1440 requires the CCC to develop 60-unit Associate Degrees for Transfer (AD-T) that guarantee admission into a CSU bachelor’s degree program and a degree following an additional 60 units of CSU coursework. CSU and CCC have developed TMCs identifying the coursework needed for an AD-T, for 33 majors. As UC develops its pathways, it is also noting the differences and similarities with the CSU TMC for a given major.

Over the coming months, BOARS and campus admissions directors will be considering next steps for implementing the UC pathways, which include improving the articulation of individual CCC courses across UC campuses, communicating information to CCC students about courses available at their local college that will satisfy a pathway, and establishing a process for vetting a campus’s proposed change to major preparation that affects a systemwide pathway. ■

Senate to Tackle Programmatic Elements of Budget Agreement

The Senate is finalizing a plan to ensure faculty involvement in the development and implementation of 14 programmatic initiatives included in the budget agreement between UC and Governor Brown that are intended to improve efficiency, access, and student outcomes.

Senate leaders have been identifying specific initiatives in which the systemwide Senate and Senate divisions should be involved or consulted, and are asking Senate division chairs to identify appropriate review bodies and experts on each campus. Many initiatives relate to efforts already underway at several campuses, while other represent new activities and in one case a pilot program and scoping study involving only three campuses. Much of the work will occur at the campus level, although BOARS and UCEP will lead efforts requiring systemwide Senate involvement and will facilitate campus reporting as well as sharing of best practices.

One initiative requiring the significant engagement of campus Senates is a review of local curricular requirements for 75% of majors, in an effort to reduce, when possible, the number of upper division courses required for a major to no more than 45 quarter units. The UCLA College of Letters and Science undertook a similar initiative known as “Challenge 45” between 2010 and 2011.

In addition, campuses will be asked to develop three-year degree specifications for 10 of their top 15 majors and to incentivize summer enrollment. The aim is to increase the proportion of students who graduate in three years from 2.6% to 5%.

The agreement asks UC to improve the transfer path to meet the Master Plan’s 2:1 freshman-to-transfer ratio for undergraduate enrollments and to adopt systemwide transfer pathways for 20 majors.

[Story continues in link](#)

Faculty Salaries to Increase Slightly; Total Remuneration Gap Widens

According to Senate leaders, the modest salary increase that took effect on July 1 will not reverse the declining total remuneration position of UC faculty relative to their peers at comparison universities. “Total remuneration” refers to the combined value of cash compensation, health and welfare benefits, and retirement benefits.

All UC faculty will see an increase of at least 1.5%, and potentially more depending on how their campus decides to distribute the remainder of the 3% pool of money set aside for that purpose.

However, because 2015-16 will be the first year in five that the UCRP employee contribution rate (now at 8 percent of pay) will not go up, Senate leaders say the raises may help UC faculty from losing further ground. They will do nothing to close the total remuneration gap.

A 2014 [study](#) of general campus faculty total remuneration conducted by Mercer Consulting indicated that UC faculty lost ground over the previous five years relative to faculty at the “Comparison 8” group of institutions, and UC benefits no longer make up for a long-standing gap in cash compensation.

The previous study (2009) found that while the salaries of UC faculty collectively lagged those of Comparison 8 faculty by 10%, the gap in total remuneration was only 2% when factoring in the value of UC’s health/welfare and retirement benefits. The recent study showed that by fall 2013, the salary lag had grown to 12% and the relative value of UC faculty’s health/welfare and retirement benefits had declined to nearly the average level of the Comparison 8, leaving a total remuneration gap of 10%. Principal factors contributing to the decline are the resumption of employee contributions to UCRS in 2009 and the creation of the “2013 tier” of retirement benefits for employees hired after July 1, 2013.

An analysis by the Department of Academic Personnel determined that closing the total remuneration gap will require annual salary increases of at least 5.6% for five years.

The Regents set aside time at their July 2015 meeting to discuss the study, but discussion was brief and the Board took no action.

“Faculty were not surprised at the results of the 2014 total remuneration study,” says Senate Chair Mary Gilly. “We understand that it is common for employees to contribute to retirement, but the increase in faculty salary over the last five years has just equaled the increase in contribution to UCRP. In the 12 Regents meetings I have attended, I have heard on at least two occasions statements that UC faculty salaries are below market but our great benefits make up for it. This can no longer be said. The total value of UC’s benefits, including the sum of the health and welfare benefits and all retirement benefits do not compensate at all for UC’s below market salaries.”

While this year’s salary increase is modest, its exact nature was discussed and debated in great detail throughout the spring by a joint work group of Senate faculty and administrators.

The work group included the chairs of UCPB, UCFW, UCAAD, and UCAP, the Berkeley vice provost for academic personnel, the Santa Cruz vice provost for academic affairs, and the San Diego associate vice chancellor for academic personnel. It had been asked to recommend options to the President for distributing a 3% increase in the faculty salary pool included in the 2015-16 UC budget, as well as long-term solutions to the larger faculty salary lags noted in the Mercer study.

The joint work group sent the President two options for the 3% salary adjustment: 1) apply the increase to

[Story continues in link](#)

Retirement Options Task Force Begins Work

Four Academic Senate representatives are serving on a Task Force charged by President Napolitano to design and develop retirement plan options for UC employees hired after July 1, 2016.

UC agreed to implement new pension options for future employees as part of a multi-year budget agreement with Governor Brown that provides UC with \$436 million in one-time pension funding over three years and increases UC’s base budget by 4% in each of the next four years.

Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Rachael Nava chairs the twelve-person Retirement Options Task Force. That group is expected to make initial recommendations to the President by the end of the calendar year. Senate representatives are all members of the 2015-16 Academic Council: Chair Dan Hare (UCR), Vice Chair James Chalfant (UCD), UCPB Chair Shane White (UCLA), and UCFW Vice Chair Lori Lubin (UCD).

Per the budget agreement, the group will explore options for modifying UC’s Defined Benefit (DB) Plan to limit pensionable salary for new employees to the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: US City Average ([\\$117,020 in 2015](#)) established by the California [Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act of 2013 \(PEPRA\)](#).

Some faculty worry that the new options will hurt UC’s competitiveness. To the extent that the Defined Benefit plan helped attract top faculty to UC, retain them during their academic careers, and encourage their retirement at an appropriate age, a change may adversely affect faculty behavior.

The Academic Council has sent President Napolitano a [statement](#) expressing its concern about the decision to impose a cap and urging the task force to consider options that preserve the current value of benefits in the UC retirement system.

Professor Hare says he expects the Task Force to focus on ways to protect pension competitiveness for all employee groups, particularly faculty, including the possibility of giving certain employee groups access to a hybrid plan that combines a DB plan containing the PEPRA cap with a supplemental Defined Contribution (DC) Plan that would include an employer match.

“Our primary goals will be to ensure that neither the welfare nor total remuneration of employees is reduced by the 2016 retirement options,” Hare says. “We need to achieve both goals to maintain our competitiveness and ability to recruit and retain high quality faculty members. The Regents and the administration [now understand](#) that the value of UC’s benefits do not compensate for UC’s below-market salaries for faculty. Accordingly, we will be closely examining the proposed employer and employee contributions and the investment vehicles offered to employees under any new options. We also expect to examine the impact of the potential choice of DC or hybrid plans on the funding status of UCRP.”

Collectively, the Senate members on the Task Force have many years of experience with pension issues, including prior service on President Yudof’s Task Force on Post-Employment

[Story continues in link](#)

Under Senate Review

Click [here](#) for a comprehensive list of current and past review items and check the [Tracking Log](#) for the progress of all issues.

▶ [Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulations 417 and 621](#) (Comments due 11-13-15)

▶ [Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 140](#) (Comments due 11-13-15)



2014-15 Academic Council members and alternates pose with UCOP senior administrators. From L: Bill Jacob (UCSB), Jim Chalfant (UCD), Gerry Boss (UCSD), Jeffrey Knapp (UCB), Aimee Dorr (UCOP), Joel Aberbach (UCLA), Gary Leal (UCSB), Farid Chehab (UCSF), Amani Nuru-Jeter (UCB), Tracy Larrabee (UCSC), Joel Dimsdale (UCSD), Bill Molzon (UCI), Ralph Aldredge (UCD), Lianne Brouillette (UCI), Jose Wudka (UCR), Jutta Heckhausen (UCI), Dan Hare (UCR), Nathan Brostrom (UCOP), Mary Gilly (UCI), Panos Papadopoulos (UCB), Don Brenneis (UCSC), Andre Knoesen (UCD), Jian-Qiao-Sun (UCM)

Chair's Notes, continued from page 2 have sought to associate with the UC brand, may find other institutions that share their values for excellence in teaching, research and service if they perceive these values eroding at UC. We still have a lot of work to do to protect the stellar UC brand with necessary long-term investment in our faculty, students, and infrastructure.

The Senate accomplished a lot this year, despite the distraction of visits by Governor's staff to Senate committee meetings. Committees reviewed new graduate programs, campus plans to address salary equity, a UC policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence, online courses, and draft guidelines for a pilot program to accept equity for access to University facilities or services.

The Transfer Pathways project was perhaps the Senate's biggest accomplishment. As President Napolitano likes to say, "They said it couldn't be done, but we did it!" Transfer was a systemwide problem that needed a campus-based solution. Many faculty were unaware of any problem because transfer students admitted to UC campuses perform as well as native freshmen. Once they became aware of the challenges transfers face in preparing for multiple UC campuses, discipline faculty got together to compare and adjust their already similar major preparation expectations to create common transfer preparation paths. I am grateful to the dedicated faculty and staff who participated in this process. We made some mistakes, but learned a lot, and I am optimistic that the process will progress more smoothly as Dan Hare and Jim Chalfant continue with the next 11 majors in October.



Senate Chair Gilly passes the chair's gavel to Vice Chair Hare at the July 29 Council dinner.

In my final address to the Regents, I urged them to resist pressure to change UC into an undergraduate degree factory and instead garner support for all aspects of the research, teaching, and service missions that faculty embrace and for which they are rewarded. The University of California is a treasure because of our commitment to discovery. As faculty, our highest priority should be keeping UC an excellent research university.

Fiat Lux, Mary

UC Issues Senate's Recommended Language for APM 210-1-d

New language developed by Senate faculty clarifies the intent of the Academic Personnel section governing faculty merit and promotion and strengthens the principle that diversity-related activities are a component of excellence at the University of California.

The modifications to APM 210-1-d [recommended by the Academic Council](#) took effect on July 1, following two rounds of systemwide Senate review.

Campus faculty had asked the Senate to consider modifications that would address confusion from campus CAPs about how to interpret its provision regarding the role of contributions to diversity and equal opportunity in the academic personnel process.

In December 2014, after the Academic Council [declined to endorse](#) revisions to APM 210-1-d originally proposed by UCAP and UCAAD in 2013, Senate Chair Mary Gilly charged a work group consisting of the chairs of BOARS, UCAAD, UCAP, UCEP, and the UCSD division, to discuss improvements to the wording based on the systemwide Senate responses to the review.

The work group focused its attention on broad agreement by reviewers that faculty efforts in promoting equal opportunity and diversity should be evaluated and credited on the same basis as other contributions, but should not be understood to constitute a "fourth leg" of evaluation, along with research, teaching, and service; and should not receive more credit than others simply on the basis of their subject matter.

The original modification to APM 210-1-d to include recognition of the University's commitment to diversity and equal opportunity occurred in 2005. Those revisions originated with the University Committee on Affirmative Ac- [Story continues in link](#)

THE SENATE SOURCE is published periodically during the academic year by the Systemwide Senate to inform UC faculty about the activities of the Senate. Your comments are welcome: senatenews@ucop.edu

Mary Gilly, 2014-2015 Academic Senate Chair
Michael LaBriola, Editor