

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Approved Minutes of Meeting
OPDCC 2, Oakland, CA
December 20, 2006

I. Chair's and Vice Chair's Announcements

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

Council Chair Oakley introduced the alternates in attendance at today's meeting, and then reported on the following topics:

- Tobacco Funding: At their January meeting, The Regents will reconsider whether the University should accept funding from the tobacco industry, an issue first introduced by Regent Bustamante in September 2006. Chair Oakley reviewed the resolutions passed by the Assembly in October 2006, and stated his intention not to reopen this issue in the Senate because the Assembly has already spoken. Council members expressed approval with this plan.
- Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI)/Ludwig Proposal: Chair Oakley announced that this issue, acted on by the Council at its November 2006 meeting, will most likely not be discussed at the January 2007 Regents' meeting. Council members affirmed their disapproval of the HHMI/Ludwig proposal as presented in November, yet agreed that they would review a revised proposal should one be presented later this year.
- 2007-2008 Academic Council Vice Chair Nominations: The deadline for Senate members to submit nominations is January 4, 2007. Chair Oakley announced that a list of past Council members since 2002-03 will be distributed to current Council members for their information.
- UCR Chancellorial Review: The Council Chair is responsible for facilitating Chancellorial reviews. Council Chair Oakley will be distributing an official request to the Senate divisions soon for faculty nominations to the review committee.

Council Vice Chair Brown provided a brief update on his participation on the Regents' Study Group on University Diversity, and his chairmanship of a subgroup of the Study Group focused on Undergraduate Student Eligibility, Admissions, Enrollment, and Persistence. He also reported on the December 6, 2006, meeting of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). This year, ICAS plans to address the role of faculty in setting policy for WASC accreditation visits; convene a CSU-UC-CCC group to align general education transfer requirements among the segments; and will hold a Legislative Day later in the spring.

II. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The Academic Council acted to amend the order of the agenda as follows: the UCPB report will be discussed at 10:45a.m., in place of the BOARS report; the BOARS report will be heard at the end of the meeting; and the Senior Management consultation period will take place from 12:00 – 1:00p.m.

III. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the November 29, 2006 minutes
- ‘In Association With’ Degrees Proposal
- Cancellation of the January 31, 2007, Meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate

ACTION: The Academic Council approved the consent calendar as noticed, with amendments to the November 29, 2006, minutes.

IV. Draft October 25, 2006 Minutes

ISSUE: The October meeting minutes were pulled from the November 29, 2006, Consent Calendar due to a protocol issue regarding how to record a vote that is unanimous, but with abstentions.

ACTION: The Academic Council acted to amend the October 25, 2006, minutes to reflect the actual vote in the recorded actions for items I and X.

V. Joint Academic Council and Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Meeting

- John Oakley, Academic Council Chair

ISSUE: The EVCs have requested that the joint Council-EVC meeting of February 27, 2007, focus on two agenda topics. The Council is to decide which two topics they wish to discuss.

DISCUSSION: Chair Oakley proposed that the Council discuss the issues of faculty salaries and graduate student support within a broad discussion item focused on the University budget. The UCFW and UCAP Chairs requested that a discussion of campus childcare facilities be added to the budget item as well. One Council member requested that the EVCs discuss how they can better support the missions of the divisional Senates, to which Chair Oakley suggested that the topic not be discussed at the systemwide level. Finally, Council members agreed that they should coordinate necessary campus documents and reports on the agenda topics in preparation for the joint meeting.

ACTION: The Academic Council acted to confirm the February 27, 2007 meeting date, and agreed to the following two agenda topics: (1) stratification; and (2) budget priorities (including faculty salary scales, graduate student support, campus childcare centers, and divisional Senate support).

VI. University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB): Futures Report and Budget Priorities

- Chris Newfield, UCPB Chair

Academic Council’s Resolution on Improving the Fiscal Future of the University

ISSUE: UCPB Chair Newfield reviewed with Council members the events leading up to his drafting of the *Resolution on Improving the Fiscal Future of the University*, along with Council Vice Chair Brown. This resolution was based on the analyses of the UCPB Futures Report, adds recommendations to the Report, and requests a plan for the University to fill in the budgetary gaps identified by the Report.

DISCUSSION: Chair Oakley noted his hesitation to act on this document, given it was just introduced today. Council members then heavily debated the draft resolution, noting the important budgetary realities it addresses, and commending its purpose as a planning document

for the University. UCAP Chair Croughan reported that UCAP's absolute budget priority this year is faculty salaries, and recommends that UCOP produce evidence of harm to students, to faculty, and to the California economy should the University's budget not improve. UCPB Chair Newfield clarified that although the resolution may not mention all budget priorities, it is not intended to exclude any specific priorities. One Council member suggested that she would need more information on specific campus budget practices before she could advise on structuring the budget. Some Council members pointed out that Council should also act to endorse the UCPB Futures Report because it would lend weight to the resolution, and further enhance the widely-held belief that the Compact is not working as well as it was intended. Members agreed that the resolution should stress the importance of maintaining the University's mission and preserve its basic structure, not to dissociate and privatize. One Council member suggested that Council should produce a compelling report with longitudinal data showing how the University contributes to the state. Further, one member suggested that a subcommittee be appointed to revise the resolution, taking into account all issues discussed today.

ACTION: In a vote of 11 in favor, 5 against, the Academic Council acted to remove the "whereas" statements of the Resolution.

ACTION: By consensus, the Academic Council agreed to appoint a subcommittee to finalize the Resolution and circulate it via email to Council members, within a workable timeframe, but no later than December 29, 2006. The subcommittee members appointed are: Chris Newfield, Joel Michaelsen, Mary Croughan, Susan French, John Oakley, and Michael Brown.

ACTION: In a vote of 16 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention, the Academic Council endorsed the UCPB Futures Report for communication to the President, and transmittal to The Regents and the University community.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President – Senior Managers

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

REPORT – Provost Hume

WASC: WASC teams are currently conducting accreditation visits at the campuses. UCOP is also involved, as WASC has requested information from UCOP concerning UC governance, how it impacts the campuses, and how the system functions, including relations with The Regents. Provost Hume noted that the faculty will be included in the WASC consultations with UCOP.

CalIT2 Review: Provost Hume has received what appears to be a positive report from the CalIT2 review team. The campus Chancellors are in the process responding to the report, which will then be submitted to the Senate divisions in early 2007. Following, he will receive all comments, which will be submitted to the systemwide Senate for a full review. Provost Hume is particularly interested in learning how the Cal ISIs are contributing to UC. Lastly, he will ask the Senate for input on the Cal ISI review process once the Cal IT2 review is completed.

Faculty Salaries: The problems associated with faculty off-scale salaries have been accelerating. President Dynes is concerned that we do not have an accountable salary scale system, and has appointed a joint workgroup to evaluate the issue, which involves Senate members. The

workgroup looks forward to receiving principles from the Senate as soon as possible, so that it can develop a plan of action as requested by President Dynes.

Salary Slotting and Stratification: Provost Hume has discussed this issue with the campus Provosts recently, who share similar concerns with the Senate. This is a topic that UCOP and the Senate will be following closely this year, along with The Regents.

UCOP Reorganization: The UCOP Health Sciences department will be unified by having one Vice President to consider all quality of care issues, hospitals, and academic and financial matters. This Vice President will report to Provost Hume. The research support elements at UCOP have undergone a review as well, and the draft recommendations support a more unified structure. Finally, the Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) division at UCOP is undergoing evaluation, including a close look at the nature of the ANR Vice President position. It is likely that the Vice President position will continue, and ANR will be administered from UCOP, but with as much administrative responsibility transferred to the campuses as possible. Provost Hume intends to recommend that the new ANR Vice President reach out to the CSU system more than has been done in the past.

REPORT – Vice President Hershman:

UC Budget: The Governor is currently in the decision-making process for the state budget, which will be released the second week of January 2007. Vice President Hershman and President Dynes have recently met with representatives from the Department of Finance and members of the Governor's staff. They are advocating for the state to fulfill its obligations under the Compact, and not make any cuts to the UC budget despite the state's \$5.5 billion structural problem. UC must still wait for an agreement from the state on student fees, and whether the state will allocate additional funds for UC to resume contributions to UCRP, fund a new major UC research initiative, and give extra money to the Cal ISIs. UC's capital program appears strong, with unknown issues involving extra state funding for telemedicine programs, lease-revenue bonds for the Helios Project at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, and matching funds for proposals that Berkeley and San Diego have made for a major research initiative sponsored by British Petroleum.

January Regents Meeting: Vice President Hershman is working on a presentation to The Regents, which, in addition to the annual "benchmark" presentation, will indicate some success for UC under the Compact despite the budget challenges currently faced by UC.

DISCUSSION: Council members discussed the following topics with Provost Hume and Vice President Hershman:

Proposed Academic Council Resolution on the Improving the Fiscal Future of the University: Vice President Hershman commented that he believes an extra \$500 million permanent augment to the UC base budget would at least regain ground for the basic instructional budget. This extra \$500 million was not included in the budget presentation to The Regents, but exists as a list of priorities for The Regents to request from the state when feasible. Regarding funding of The Regents' seven budget priorities, more work needs to be done on an exact estimate. Provost Hume suggested that any resolution from the Council should not allow for the possibility of

stratification, and warned that overstating funding needs could lead some to give up and direct the University toward stratification. Vice President Hershman then requested that Council stick with a \$500 million budget augmentation request, focusing on UC's base budget; and not rely on UC's 2001 budget figures, which he says are inflated because of special research and public service funding that was granted in 2001.

Faculty Salaries: Provost Hume mentioned some of the recommendations currently under discussion by the President's task force to fix faculty off-scale salaries: (1) offer salaries within ranges, not points or scales; (2) allocate a significant amount of money towards recapturing off-scale salaries; and (3) link economics faculty with management faculty. No decisions have been made yet, as the President's task force is waiting for Senate input. Vice President Hershman added that any extra money from the state will be requested when politically feasible. This year, President Dynes' decision was to request state funding of the Compact only. One Council member noted the need for flexibility to increase salary ranges, beyond COLA increases, so that such a system will not become out of date. Provost Hume stated that the campus CAPs will need to give advice on setting steps within the salary ranges. Many Council members agreed that faculty should be in control of setting salaries, no matter what structure is agreed upon. Lastly, members voiced their disappointment with UC's proposed budget because it does not provide enough money to raise faculty salaries to competitive levels.

VIII. General Discussion

[Council members continued discussion of Item VI – UCPB Futures Report and Budget Priorities. Final action is recorded under Item VI, above.]

IX. Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees

- **John Oakley, Academic Council Chair**

ISSUE: The proposed principles were sent out for systemwide Senate review at the beginning of the 2006-07 academic year. The Regents are expected to consider the proposed principles at their January 2007 meeting, and the Senate must submit its comments by December 22, 2006.

DISCUSSION: After providing additional background information on this issue, Chair Oakley reviewed the proposed letter to Provost Hume contained in the agenda. UCPB Chair Newfield suggested the addition of language from the UCPB comment letter concerning the idea of UC as "One University." UCSF Divisional Chair Greenspan requested the incorporation of the UCSF comments as well. Lastly, Council members expressed widespread praise for the draft letter, and encouraged its forwarding to Provost Hume.

ACTION: **The Academic Council acted via consensus to endorse Enclosure 5, with amendments, as its final response for transmittal to Provost Hume.**

X. Mercer Report to The Regents on Total Remuneration

- **Susan French, UCFW Chair**

ISSUE: This is an informational item from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) regarding the committee's *Memorandum of Recommendations for Changes and Additions to Mercer's Total Remuneration Report*, in preparation for Mercer's update to The Regents planned for January 2007.

REPORT: UCFW Chair French introduced the UCFW Memorandum contained in the agenda, and reviewed its contents with Council members. Council Chair Oakley then reviewed the unusual nature of this informational item, since UCFW communicated its Memorandum directly to its UCOP committee consultants in December, and not through the Academic Council. Lastly, Council members expressed their gratitude to UCFW Chair French and UCFW for the Memorandum and their work this year on the Mercer Report.

XI. Academic Council Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL)

- **John Oakley, ACSCONL Chair**

REPORT: The Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) Advisory Board meeting took place on December 18 and 19, 2006, to which Council Chair Oakley serves as a member until 2008. Council Chair Oakley reported that LBNL is healthy, and the Senate is very involved in the decision-making process. Further, he reported that ACSCONL's recent visit to the Los Alamos National Laboratory was productive and successful.

XII. Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)

- **Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair**

REPORT: BOARS Chair Rashid provided Council members with background information on BOARS' examination of the UC Freshman Eligibility Policy. He then reviewed BOARS' early findings concerning eligibility, including that the testing requirements used to determine UC eligibility are not all educationally justified. BOARS is working on a draft recommendation. BOARS Chair Rashid wished to prepare Council members for such a change to UC eligibility policy, would be a large shift for UC should it pass.

DISCUSSION: BOARS Chair Rashid suggested to Council members that the best way to provide input at this time is to talk to himself, or their campus BOARS representative. On the other hand, members can wait to comment through the regular systemwide Senate review process once the BOARS draft policy is completed and submitted to Council. Finally, BOARS Chair Rashid noted that BOARS is still continuing its evaluation of UC's use of the SAT-I.

XIII. Multicampus Research Unit (MRU) – Recommendations of the Senate-Administration Joint MRU Workgroup

- **John Oakley, Academic Council Chair**

ISSUE: The MRU Recommendations were sent out for systemwide Senate review at the beginning of the 2006-07 academic year. The Academic Council is to determine its final response on this issue to Vice Provost Coleman.

DISCUSSION: Chair Oakley introduced the draft letter to Vice Provost Coleman contained in the agenda packet. Many Council members praised the contents of the draft letter. One member noted that the vitality of the MRU program demands some sort of recycling of funds to allow for new ideas, and commended the draft letter.

ACTION: The Academic Council acted via consensus to endorse the draft letter, with amendments, as its final response for transmittal to Vice Provost Coleman.

XIV. Draft UCOP Proposal on the Relationships Between (Pharmaceutical) Vendors and Clinicians

- **John Oakley, Academic Council Chair**

ISSUE: The Academic Council has been asked to review a draft UCOP policy on the relationship between vendors and clinicians, drafted by the UCOP Office of Clinical Services. Three items originally in the proposal have been removed for now in order to expedite the Senate review process, and will added to the policy later for a more thorough review by the Senate.

DISCUSSION: Council Chair Oakley provided Council members with a brief introduction to the issues which prompted UCOP to draft the proposed policy, and subsequently remove three of the proposals with the goal of receiving rapid approval from the Senate. Chair Oakley suggested that with the three controversial proposals removed from the Senate's consideration for now, the Senate could initiate an expedited systemwide review process. A majority of Council members agreed to this plan, and then worked out an appropriate timeline for the review.

ACTION: The Academic Council approved via consensus the UCOP proposal to be sent out for systemwide Senate review. Senate divisions and systemwide committees will be requested to respond to the amended UCOP proposal (without the three additional proposed policies) by March 10, 2007. Systemwide committees will be requested to respond to the full UCOP proposal in April 2007, and Senate divisions in May 2007.

XV. Systemwide Standards for Institutional Review Boards (IRB), UCORP Report
[deferred]

XVI. The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction, UCEP-CCGA Report
[deferred]

XVII. Proposed Policy on Stewardship of Electronic Information
[deferred]

XVIII. New Business
[none]

Meeting adjourned at 4:30p.m.

Attest: John Oakley, Academic Council Chair

Prepared by: Michelle Ruskofsky, Academic Council Analyst

Attachment: Academic Council 2006-07 Attendance

ACADEMIC COUNCIL: 2006- 2007 Attendance											
Key: X=In attendance, \=Absent, Alt=Alternate											
	9/27	10/25	11/29	12/20	1/24	2/28	3/28	4/25	5/23	6/27	7/25
Officers											
John Oakley, Chair	X	X	X	X							
Michael Brown, Vice Chair	X	X	X	X							
Divisional Chairs											
William Drummond	UCB	X	X	X	Alt						
Linda Bisson	UCD	X	X	X	X						
Martha Mecartney	UCI	X	X	X	X						
Vivek Shetty	UCLA	X	X	X	Alt						
Shawn Kantor	UCM	X	X	X	X						
Thomas Cogswell	UCR	X	X	X	X						
Henry Powell	UCSD	X	X	X	Alt						
Deborah Greenspan	UCSF	X	X	X	X						
Joel Michaelsen	UCSB	X	X	X	X						
Faye Crosby	UCSC	X	X	X	X						
Committee Chairs											
Mark Rashid	BOARS	X	X	X	X						
Reen Wu	CCGA	X	X	X	\						
Mary Croughan	UCAP	X	Alt	X	X						
Richard Weiss	UCEP	X	X	X	X						
Susan French	UCFW	X	X	X	X						
Wendy Max	UCORP	X	X	X	X						
Chris Newfield	UCPB	X	X	X	X						
Alternates											
Pauline Yahr	UCAAD		X								
Jim Hunt	UCAP		X								
Dan Melia	UCB				X						
Elizabeth Bork	UCLA				X						
James Poscani	UCSD				X						
Guests											
Maria Ledesma, Student Regent			X								
Ann Shaw, Act. Sec. of Regents			X								
Gibor Basri	UCAAD	X	Alt	X							
Ben Crow	UCOL	X									
President & Senior Management											
Robert Dynes, President		X	X	X							
Rory Hume, Provost		X	X		X						
Bruce Darling, Exec. VP-UR		X	X	X							
Lawrence Hershman, VP-Budget			X	X	X						
Council Staff											
Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Director		X	X	X							
Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst		X		X							
Michelle Ruskofsky, Policy Analyst			X		X						
EVCs											