

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Wednesday, April 18, 2007
10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Teleconference

I. Chair's and Vice Chair's Announcements

- **John Oakley, Academic Council Chair**
- **Michael Brown, Academic Council Vice Chair**

Academic Council Chair Oakley

Reminder – Senate Bylaw 125: Chair Oakley reminded Council members that in the event that a member of Council cannot attend a meeting, according to SB 125, that member's vice chair shall automatically serve on the Council. If both the member and their vice chair cannot attend, then the appropriate Committee on Committees must appoint a replacement. Chair Oakley then clarified the procedures for appointing alternates to attend joint administrative work groups: the alternate must be a Senate member, and must be approved by the Council Chair in advance of the meeting.

Remembering Don Tuzin, UCSD: Chair Oakley announced the passing of Professor Don Tuzin, former UCSD division chair. UCSD Division Chair Henry Powell remembered Professor Tuzin as a passionate advocate on behalf of the Senate and shared governance. He was the first Senate chair working with UCSD Chancellor Fox, and set an excellent standard for shared governance at the campus. Professor Tuzin's passing is a tremendous loss to the San Diego campus and the Senate, and he will be sorely missed. Chair Oakley announced that a resolution in honor of Professor Tuzin will be presented for Council's approval at the April 25 Council meeting.

ACSCONL Update: ACSCONL met yesterday to discuss its remaining duties under the October 11, 2006, resolution of the Assembly, as well as fulfilling the objectives of the UCPB request for advanced access to the operating agreements of LANS LLC, and the prospective LINS LLC. Chair Oakley announced the following agreement that he has worked out with Vice President Foley: Chair Oakley, as Council Chair, will have access to the LANS LLC operating agreements, and will draft a review document with the assistance of general counsel for eventual posting on the ACSCONL website following the public disclosure of the operating agreements.

Academic Council Vice Chair Brown

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) Update: ICAS met on April 10, 2007, in Sacramento. A portion of the ICAS agenda included discussion of a resolution, proposed by Vice Chair Brown, concerning the proper use of the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE), and its role in determining high school graduation and the receipt of a high school diploma. The three California higher education institutions (UC, CSU and CCC), are now discussing the proposed resolution, which could be presented for action at the next ICAS meeting. Council will consider the proposed CAHSEE resolution at its April 25 meeting.

II. Approval of Agenda

ACTION: The Academic Council approved the agenda as noticed.

III. Consent Calendar

ACTION: The Academic Council approved the consent calendar as noticed.

RE-89 Announcement: Chair Oakley reminded Council members that committee and division responses to RE-89 are past due, and any remaining responses should be submitted to the systemwide Senate office as soon as possible.

IV. California Institute for Quantitative Biomedical Research (QB3)

- **John Oakley, Academic Council Chair**

ISSUE: Council is asked to: (1) propose names of participants for the QB3 review panel, (2) provide feedback on the draft charge to the QB3 review panel, and (3) provide suggested changes, if any, to the Cal ISI review process including formalizing a nomination process that includes the Academic Senate.

DISCUSSION: Council members suggested names of participants to the review panel, and were asked to provide additional names via email to Director Bertero-Barcelo following today's teleconference. Members then proposed changes to the draft charge of the review panel.

ACTION: Council members will submit names of participants to the QB3 review panel to the Senate office via email; and Council members Basri, Mecartney, Max and Croughan will work together via email on proposed changes to the draft charge, for eventual submission to Provost Hume.

V. Consultation with the Provost

- **Wyatt R. Hume, Provost and Executive Vice President, Academic and Health Affairs**

REPORT: Provost Hume provided Council members with a report on the following topics:

Systemwide Academic Planning: Provost Hume is preparing a presentation to The Regents for their May meeting on the progress of the academic planning initiative. Provost Hume is very encouraged by the progress made during the first year of the process, and is interested in receiving feedback from the Senate divisions. He is also encouraged by meetings with the Executive Vice Chancellors, and Senate division chairs, where campus academic planning reports were shared and discussed for the first time. Provost Hume's presentation to The Regents will focus on the planning process, and not necessarily the content of the reports so far. Provost Hume's goal is to involve some of the campus chancellors in the presentation as well, to provide a local perspective on the planning process. Lastly, Provost Hume encouraged Council's participation in providing feedback, and advising him on the process for next year. Council Chair Oakley announced that this issue will be discussed at the April 25 Council meeting.

Graduate Student Support: Provost Hume is also preparing a report to The Regents for their May meeting demonstrating the President's actions to increase graduate student support. The report will contain the President's goals, including program competitiveness, having the best graduate programs, being competitive in financial attractiveness, and getting rid of the barriers to enrolling international students. He will also provide a progress report for graduate student support in actual dollars. In sum, Provost Hume announced that UC has stopped the decline of

graduate student enrollment and increasing tuition costs for now. Lastly, the report will include an update on the President's action to direct the chancellors, at their request, to return all non-resident tuition funds to graduate student support at the campuses, without forcing return of the funds to the source of the grant. The President is also pledging \$10 million in new funds to match campus tuition fellowship funds, up to \$10 million. UC will need to assess further plans for graduate student support following the release of the governor's revised budget in May, including analysis of funding of the governor's research initiative. UCOP administrators are still debating the issue of continuing to advocate for changing state policy that requires UC's collection of non-resident tuition. Provost Hume noted that these announcements will be summarized and distributed to the Academic Council soon.

Discussion: Council Chair Oakley restated Council's standing request for the Senate to have time before The Regents to present its view of UC's budget. Provost Hume stated his view that this is a worthwhile effort, and that the presentation should likely occur at the May and July Regents' meetings. He suggested that a distilled version of the Futures Report be presented, accompanied by distribution of the full Report. Chair Oakley then announced that full discussion of the Senate presentation, and its congruence with Provost Hume's budget presentation, would occur at the April 25 Council meeting. Council Vice Chair Brown expressed his feelings of encouragement due to the progress of increased graduate student funding, and requested that the Council receive a copy of the letter from the President to the chancellors directing their use of non-resident tuition. Provost Hume said he would need to confirm if there was a letter, and then get back to Council on this matter.

Faculty Salary Scales Work Group Update: Provost Hume reported that the work group has been working for months at the request of President Dynes to reduce the number of off-scale salaries. Recently, however, President Dynes amended the work group's charge as follows:

- 1) Increase faculty salaries to a competitive position;
- 2) Reduce the proportion of faculty who are paid off scale;
- 3) Adjust the salary ranges and perform other procedural changes necessary to achieve these goals; and
- 4) Where necessary, to consider creating new scales to reflect disciplinary needs.

At its meeting last week, the work group developed the following recommendations:

- 1) Eliminate APM 620 language declaring off-scales are to be used only in exceptional circumstances, and only in the short term.
- 2) Amend APM 620 language to change the faculty salary scale from a point system, to a range system – so that “on-scale” will mean being on a defined level of a step as well as the next step available. This will place faculty at different points on a range, thereby reducing off scales by 20%, or more at some campuses.
- 3) Provide a COLA adjustment this year to all faculty, whether they are off- or on-scale. This COLA will be less than it would normally be for the coming year, however, in order to accomplish recommendation 4:
- 4) Propose a new scale, for the purposes of discussion and analysis, which would change the salary scales substantially upwards in order to capture many of the faculty that are off-scale. The proposed new scale would reflect a range adjustment that would:
 - i. Raise each step to our present averages for the rank and step (our averages are influenced enormously by the current degree of off-scaleness); and

- ii. Address the salary lag we have according to CPEC: either 10% (assuming the Comp 8 salaries are frozen), or 14.5% (assuming the Comp 8 salaries are going up as indicated).
- 5) Also apply the new scale/range adjustment to the professorial scales in Law, Veterinary Medicine, and Engineering. The Engineering scales will be split from Business and Management; and the Economics scales will be added to Business and Management.

Provost Hume noted that outstanding issues need to be analyzed, including how to pay for these actions; what the impacts would be on the campuses; how much of the funding would be campus-based and how much would be system-based; and how quickly can these changes be accomplished. Next steps include producing cost estimates, evaluating impacts on the campus budgets, assessing the impact of the new scales on campuses for the general ranks, assessing effects on the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, and major impacts on non-state funded Health Sciences faculty. President Dynes will need to determine the timeline, the tradeoffs necessary, and how to work with the governor's proposed budget. Provost Hume stressed that President Dynes is committed to increasing the competitiveness of UC faculty salaries earlier than 10-year plan announced by the Regents in RE-61.

Discussion: One Council member noted that the work group needs to clarify whether to use the average or the median in the off-scale salary analysis. Provost Hume agreed, and promised to follow-up on this suggestion. UCPB Chair Newfield reported on UCPB's concern with the apparent plan to send out for review suggested amendments to APM 620, when preferably, all of the work group's recommendations should be packaged together as a coherent proposal. UCPB believes that most reviewers would be more amenable to opening up the APM language knowing that salary scale increases would indeed follow. Chair Oakley suggested that holding up the APM review could result in delaying faculty salary increase in October, to which UCPB Chair Newfield responded that such a tradeoff is undesirable. He added that the committee does not want to lose leverage in ensuring that funding of the faculty salary scales occurs. Following, Council members applauded Provost Hume and the work group members on their quick and excellent work in accomplishing such a momentous task for the faculty. Some members stated that they look forward to receiving full details of the recommendations and how they will be implemented. Provost Hume reminded Council that the proposed new salary scale is for the purpose of discussion and analysis only at this time. Lastly, a Council member raised concerns about the APM 620 review process, and questioned the necessity of passing both language changes at the same time.

UCOP Reorganization – Regents' Hiring of External Consultant: Provost Hume announced The Regents' plans to hire an outside consultant to evaluate UCOP's role relative to The Regents and the campuses. He explained that this plan is an outgrowth of UC's compensation crisis last year, which is now requiring additional study of the nature of roles, structure and functions of UCOP. Over the past year, Provost Hume, Regents Parsky and Blum, President Dynes, and Council Chair Oakley have worked to develop a process to identify an external consultant to analyze and advise The Regents. The results of the RFP process should be announced soon.

Discussion: Chair Oakley restated the Academic Council's concern with spending funds on outside consultants, and noted that he registered these concerns as a member of the group

designing the consultants' RFP. He assured Council members that the consultants under consideration are extremely talented and that they should not assume the worst for this project. Vice Chair Brown noted his appreciation that the consultants would be charged with looking beyond the organization of UCOP, to UCOP's relationship with The Regents and the campuses, which will be extremely helpful. One Council member expressed strong objections to the plan, and great concern with spending \$8.5 million on a consultant at a time of great financial needs for UC. Other Council members concurred. Provost Hume thanked Council members for their comments, and stated his understanding of their concerns. He then reminded Council that this process is being driven by The Regents, and President Dynes has no choice in the matter. Council Chair Oakley announced that Council will discuss this issue further at the April 25 meeting.

VI. Faculty Salary Scales

- **John Oakley, Academic Council Chair**

ISSUE: Council is to discuss further the findings and recommendations of the Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales, including the proposed amendments to APM 620, and discuss a proposed resolution from the UCR division regarding a possible solution to the salary crisis.

DISCUSSION:

Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales: UCAP Chair Croughan began the discussion by providing an overview of the salary scale data the work group reviewed, including data concerning how to raise the salary scales in order to make UC faculty salaries competitive with the Competition 8 and the market. One Council member commented that UCOP will need to find sources of funding that will not create unfunded mandates for the campuses. Council members then discussed the merits of one of the recommendations, to change from a point system to a range system. Then members discussed future analyses that need to be completed, including potential impacts on UCRP. Lastly, a member reminded the Council that part of their request to Provost Hume in February was that the work group's report be distributed to the Council for systemwide review, in order to conduct a full analysis of the recommendations.

Proposed Amendments to APM 620: Chair Oakley announced his inclination to send out the proposed amendments for systemwide Senate review, but preserve Council's right after the review is completed to take the position that there is support for the language changing the scales from a point to a range system, but not support the language amending the "exception rule." Council members expressed their support for the plan, agreeing that the responses should be returned by the July Council meeting; and at that time, Council will have the option to act then, or in the fall. Once Council member further requested that an appropriate cover letter be included with the APM 620 amendments, explaining the work group's recommendations and how APM fits into the overall package of salary scale changes.

ACTION: The Academic Council agreed to send out for systemwide review the proposed amendments to APM 620, reserving the right to express partial support for the proposed changes, and reserving the right to act on this issue in July, or alternatively, in the fall.

UCR Divisional Advisory Committee's Proposal for a Possible Solution to the Salary Crisis: Council Chair Oakley stated his view that the proposed UCR resolution does not need to be

advanced due to the work group's recommendations announced today. UCR division Chair Cogswell agreed, and said no further consideration was necessary.

VII. Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles

- **John Oakley, Academic Council Chair**

ISSUE: Council is to determine next steps regarding UCAF's proposed Student Freedom of Scholarly Principles, which UCAF revised in response to the 2006 systemwide Senate review.

DISCUSSION: Council Chair Oakley stated that he has reviewed the Principles and noted that UCAF has made changes to the Principles based on comments received last year. He suggested that the revised Principles be sent out for another round of systemwide review. Council members did not register any objection to this plan.

ACTION: The Academic Council agreed to send out the Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles for systemwide Senate review.

VIII. Joint Work Group on Trends in Administrative FTE and Expenditures

- **John Oakley, Academic Council Chair**

ISSUE: Council is to determine whether to endorse UCPB's request to reactive the joint work group.

DISCUSSION: Chair Oakley announced that the proposed reactivation of this work group, also known as the "management bloat committee," is an ongoing discussion with both Provost Hume and President Dynes. Chair Oakley then reviewed the current membership of the work group, and suggested that UCPB Chair Newfield be added in place of former UCPB Chair Stan Glantz. UCPB Chair Newfield agreed to participate in the work group, and suggested that the work group discuss their charge in tandem with the outside consultants' future work, as mentioned in the earlier discussion with Provost Hume. Chair Oakley stated that this was the sense of President Dynes, that the work group oversee data, and assist the outside consultants in their project. Chair Oakley then announced that assuming he receives Council's endorsement to resuscitate the work group, he will work on confirming the membership.

ACTION: The Academic Council agreed to request reactivation of the Joint Work Group on Trends in Administrative FTE and Expenditures, with amendments to the group's membership and charge as reflected in the above discussion.

IX. New Business

Governor's Budget – CPEC Methodology Language: UCFW Chair French announced that UCFW will request that the Council endorse a proposal to add UC faculty representatives to discussions involving proposed changes to the CPEC methodology, included in the governor's budget proposal. Council Chair Oakley stated that the Senate has had ongoing consultations with the Provost, and all agree that UC representatives will need to be formally added to the table. UCFW Chair French noted that UCFW's proposal will be presented for action at the April 25 Council meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Attest: John Oakley, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by: Michelle Ruskofsky, Policy Analyst