Notes From the Academic Senate Chair
Gayle Binion (gayle.binion@ucop.edu)

The Academic Senate has seventeen standing committees working on a very wide variety of issues, policies, and problems of interest to the Senate and the larger University community. Whether it is BOARS, considering changes in undergraduate admissions’ criteria, or UCFW, debating a phased retirement program for the faculty, our committees are actively engaged in internal discussions as well as in dialogs with colleagues on the UC campuses concerning our shared interests.

From time to time, the systemwide Academic Senate empanels a task force to address a question that either does not in the main neatly fit within the bailiwick of a single committee and/or involves intensive work beyond the workload constraints of a standing Senate committee. This year we are utilizing an especially great number of such task forces. Below is a brief description of each with the name/email of the appropriate faculty contact, who welcomes your input.

Bylaws: George Blumenthal, UCSC, george@ucolick.org

The By-laws task force has been working on clarifying the composition, service term and procedures governing the work of Academic Senate Committees. The major goal of this group is to present to the Academic Council a document that understands the work of each committee within a broadly contemporary context rather than the unique circumstances that may have existed at the time of the committee’s formation. The revised by-laws, when approved by Academic Council will be reviewed by Rules and Jurisdiction and then placed on the agenda of the Academic Assembly in late May.

Bylaws: George Blumenthal, UCSC, george@ucolick.org

Course Descriptions: Carole Goldberg, UCLA, goldberg@law.ucla.edu

At the request of President Atkinson, and in response to concerns raised about a course taught at UC Berkeley in Fall Semester 2002, the Academic Senate is looking at the processes of reviewing course descriptions on the campuses. The task force has three charges: to review the experience of the Berkeley English R 1A (“The Politics and Poetics of Palestinian Resistance”); to review how (non-standard) course descriptions on the campuses. The task force has three charges: to review the experience of the Berkeley English R 1A (“The Politics and Poetics of Palestinian Resistance”); to review how (non-standard)

Making Shared Governance Work

 Tight budgets, enrollment growth, and faculty recruitment are just a few of the many complex issues facing the University of California today. As members of the Academic Senate, faculty wield the power to shape programs and policies that will help bring UC through these challenging times. With over 300 Academic Senate committees active in the UC system, there are wide opportunities both on campuses and systemwide to become involved in Senate work.

Many faculty welcome this opportunity, but others may not consider serving because of lack of time, or may think the effort outweighs the rewards. In preparation of this article, The Senate Source took an informal poll of active Senate members to hear their thoughts on the rewards of working in the UC Senate and on present challenges to maintaining its vitality.

Why Serve in the Senate?

Because it’s engaging and gratifying. According to Professor Chris Newfield, a member of UCPB, “...most Senate work is intellectually interesting, since it intersects with a variety of public policies, educational theories, organizational strategies, financial issues, and more. I’d also say that the contemplative and analytical nature of academic work benefits from concrete experience and the wielding of a little power.” And UCSC Divisional Chair George Blumenthal made the point that “...hard-working and committed faculty will participate in Senate activities if they believe that their efforts will make a difference. If faculty can see a real path to progress on issues they care about, they will happily volunteer to participate.” Others are rewarded by interaction with colleagues outside of their own disciplines, and find, as Professor Katja Lindenberg (UCSD) does, that their encounters “provide an intellectual stimulation and breadth that reminds [one] again and again why this is such a wonderful and ever renewable environment.” Senate involvement allows faculty to meet head on real challenges that face the University in a collaborative way that offsets the discipline-centered environment in which most faculty work.

What Challenges Face the Senate?

Of primary concern to some veteran Senate members is how to encourage a regular influx of younger faculty members. Junior faculty seem less inclined than in the past to take on Senate service, or simply less able to in the face of the demands of their research. Another piece of this problem lies with what Joel Dimsdale, UCSC Divisional Chair, characterized as the “atomistic” academic division.

(Continued on page 2)
sources, such as “umbrella,” “single-offer,” or “varying subject” are reviewed for content; and finally to review the appropriate norms for faculty with respect to how they describe their courses. The review of the Berkeley experience is now completed and submitted to President Atkinson (http://www.ucop.edu/senate/english1ra.pdf), and it is expected that the two additional reviews will be completed shortly.

Honors/AP: Gayle Binion, Academic Senate gayle.binion@ucop.edu

An issue that has been before the Academic Senate for five years, and is still unresolved, is the appropriate role of Honors/AP/IB and community college courses with respect to admissions to UC. In the case of AP courses, there are also questions with respect to the principles governing the credit given at UC campuses. Because of the dual but interrelated nature of these questions, a task force including the Academic Senate Chair, the Chairs and Vice Chairs of BOARS and UCEP, as well as an additional specialist in the area, will review the wealth of data that UC has amassed on the subject(s). The group will also review the various perspectives on these matters in an attempt to formulate recommendations to the Senate and the Regents on policy in this arena.

Graduate/Professional Entrance Examinations: Lawrence Pitts, Academic Senate lawrence.pitts@ucop.edu

During 2001-02, the Academic Senate adopted “properties and purposes” for the use of entrance exams for undergraduate admissions, (http://www.ucop.edu/news/sat/summary.pdf). The Senate, via this task force, will now address the question of whether a set of principles could be developed for the proper use of entrance exams in the admissions processes in UC’s graduate and professional programs. This review is of a very different nature given that there are more than 600 such programs at UC, each with a significant degree of autonomy in its decision making with respect to admissions. But the task force will consider whether it is possible to frame a set of criteria for the various departments, schools and programs to consider in determining proper reliance on GRE, MCAT, LSAT or GMAT. This task force, which is just beginning its work, includes members from a wide variety of academic disciplines, CCGA, law, medicine, veterinary medicine, and business.

Professorial Steps: Richard Watts, UCSB, watts@chem.ucsb.edu

Concerns have been raised over recent years about the rationale behind the step system at the Professor level. Two specific issues have had preliminary review in the recent past but without resolution. These are: whether triennial merit review involves a too-frequent application of the “quality-control” system for full professors, and whether the Step VI “barrier” is an appropriate form of review. With respect to the latter, the task force will be considering whether a step with uniquely high standards should be maintained, and, if so, whether Step VI is the right point in a professorial career to place a review of that nature.

All of our colleagues are welcome, indeed encouraged, to share your thoughts with the chairs of these task forces. Later in the year I will report the outcomes of these deliberations.

Shared Governance, cont.

culture in which faculty are more likely to feel a part of a department or a program rather than a campus or the University as a whole. Course relief or other structural changes that would compensate for Senate service are unlikely to be instituted, but would ease the way for all Senate volunteers. Nonetheless, as UCSB Divisional Chair Walter Yuen emphasized, “Senate service needs to be recognized as an integral part of academic life.”

For more than eight decades the UC Academic Senate has enjoyed a degree of authority in university government unparalleled in any other institution of its stature. Most would judge the Academic Senate to be as vital an institution as ever, whether that vitality is gauged by its role in making historic changes in admissions practices, offering direction in response to the budget crisis, molding the academic foundation of a new campus (UC Merced), or providing key input on the further development of an existing campus (UCSF’s Mission Bay). At the same time, preserving effective shared governance at UC is an ongoing and critical effort in the face of challenges both familiar and new. UC faculty have, in the words of longtime Senate member Fred Spiess (UCSD), “more power and responsibility than in any other major institution of higher education [...] but this privilege only survives because faculty members take part.”

Under Senate Review

► OUT FOR GENERAL REVIEW: Proposed Policy on Faculty-Student Relations. The Academic Council has proposed an amendment to APM 015, the Faculty Code of Conduct, addressing sexual liaisons between faculty and students. The Academic Council Chair requests comments by March 1. Send to: gayle.binion@ucop.edu; or respond to your divisional Council representative.

Review the proposal here: http://www.ucop.edu/senate/facrel.pdf

► Proposal to Allow Part-Time Enrollment for Students Transferring to UC from a CCC

► Subject A — The Senate will look at ways of evaluating which of the various approaches to accomplishing Subject A are the most (and least) effective, and make recommendations on how campuses might assess student writing beyond Subject A.

► Proposal for Use of Supplemental Subject Matter Tests in the UC Admissions Process (http://www.ucop.edu/senate/supptests.pdf)

► Racial Privacy Initiative (RPI) and its potential effects on admissions, instruction, employment, and research. To see the Initiative go to: http://www.ucop.edu/senate/current.html