

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Minutes of Meeting
Oakland, CA
October 25, 2006

I. Chair's and Vice Chair's Announcements

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

Academic Council Chair Oakley: Council Chair Oakley welcomed Council members and guests to the meeting, and provided an update on The Regents' recent visit to the Santa Cruz campus. He encouraged Council members to ask questions during the senior management consultation period concerning faculty salaries and the decrease in total remuneration, and to request a definitive plan for the elimination of non-resident tuition. Chair Oakley then reviewed Senate-related matters that are expected to be included on The Regents' November meeting agenda, including his report to The Regents on the Academic Assembly's resolutions on research funding sources, and the Assembly's unanimous approval of the Senate recommendations for faculty interaction with the Department of Energy (DOE) laboratories. He expects to report on the resolutions on research funding sources by presenting the facts of the Assembly proceedings and its outcome, and not interpret the resolutions themselves unless he is pressed by The Regents. Council members approved of Chair Oakley's proposed plan, and commended his handling of such a difficult and contentious issue.

Lastly, Chair Oakley updated Council members on the UCOP reorganization plan, including the use of the title "Chief Operating Officer" (COO) instead of the Senate's preferred, and agreed-upon title, "Executive Vice President for Business Operations" at UCOP. Recent conversations have suggested a possible retreat to the COO nomenclature in order to attract a wider pool of candidates to the position, and Chair Oakley requested the Council's support in opposing the COO title should the issue arise at The Regents' November meeting. Council members held a lengthy discussion of the issue, recalling the 2005-06 Council decision to support the Executive Vice President for Business Operations title because it represents the academic and educational missions of UC, and supports academic principles such as shared governance. Council members made clear that opposing the COO title is a top priority and they stand behind Chair Oakley and Vice Chair Brown in their efforts to support this view. Some members voiced their opinion that they do not outright oppose the corporate governance model. One member suggested that the Council should undertake a review of UC's bottom-up governance structure and evaluate whether it facilitates UC's academic mission, to which Chair Oakley suggested that a proposal be developed for further consideration of the Council.

ACTION: By a vote of 17 in favor, 0 against, the Academic Council passed the following motion:

"The Academic Council gives full support to Council Chair Oakley and Academic Council Vice Chair Brown to exercise their discretion to protect the academic integrity of the University of California, as opposed to supporting corporate hierarchical structures."

Academic Council Vice Chair Brown: Council Vice Chair Brown provided Council members with a brief update on the Task Force on the Structure of the Academic Senate, including its drafting of a proposed new bylaw on the procedures for removal of a Senate officer, which should be presented to Council in November. Also, he reported that a set of Academic Personnel Policies (APM) have been drafted to address the recommendations of the Task Force on UC Compensation, Accountability and Transparency, and will be sent out for informal review at the campuses. Lastly, Vice Chair Brown encouraged Council members to attend the Proposition 209 Diversity Conference at the Berkeley campus this Friday.

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Update: BOARS Chair Rashid reported that at its October 6, 2006, meeting, BOARS approved a new policy which provides for “Criteria for Approval of Online Providers to Satisfy UC’s Subject (‘a-g’) Requirements.” This new policy fills a void in UC policy, and addresses the requirements for online course providers concerning course content, testing procedures, etc. The online providers who meet this new policy can then provide a course list to UC, and as usual, individual courses will have to be approved by faculty. More information and a written policy will be provided to Council at the November meeting.

II. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The Academic Council approved the agenda as noticed, by unanimous consent.

III. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the September 27, 2006 Academic Council Minutes
- University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) Request for the Operating Budgets of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation
- Cancellation of the November 22, 2006, Meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate

ACTION: The Academic Council adopted the consent calendar as noticed, by consent, with amendments to the September Council minutes adopted without objection.

IV. Amendment to Senate Regulation 694 and Proposed New Senate Regulation 695

- **John Oakley, Academic Council Chair**
- **Reen Wu, CCGA Chair**

ISSUE: The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) is proposing an amendment to SR 694, and a new SR 695. Council is to decide whether to approve the proposed regulations to send out for systemwide Senate review. This is a carry-over item from the September 26, 2006, Council meeting.

DISCUSSION: CCGA Chair Reen Wu provided Council members with a brief overview of the proposed regulations. Some Council members raised questions about certain provisions of SR 694 and SR 695, to which CCGA Chair Wu said he would bring these concerns to the upcoming CCGA meeting. Council Chair Oakley requested that any additional questions be sent directly to CCGA Chair Wu following the meeting. Council members agreed that due to numerous

outstanding issues with the proposed regulations, and a lack of clarity regarding their intent and justification, Council should consider them at the November meeting.

ACTION: The Academic Council requests that CCGA submit a cover letter explaining the purpose behind its proposals for Senate Regulations 694 and 695, for consideration and action at the November Academic Council meeting.

V. Election Process for the 2007-08 Academic Senate/Academic Council Vice Chair

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

ISSUE: Council is to discuss the election process and time line for the nomination of the 2007-08 Academic Council Vice Chair.

DISCUSSION: Chair Oakley reviewed the election process used last year (see agenda enclosure 5), and noted that the same process will be used this year with the exception of the dates for submitting nominations, etc. He mentioned the importance of the transparent nature of the election process, which had not been the case in the past. Council Vice Chair Brown commented that he is very pleased that last year's election process resulted in a Chair/Vice Chair team that works together extremely well, and is committed to representing the Senate in a unified, dignified manner. Council members concurred, and held a brief discussion regarding the January deadline for submitting nominees. Some suggested possibly moving the selection date to February, in order to have more time to acquaint themselves with the nominees. Other members noted that the January selection date is preferable to allow the vice chair-elect more time to plan for Senate service. Council members also discussed what information should be brought forward about the nominees, including evidence of campus support, input from colleagues, staff and campus leaders, and experience in Senate service.

ACTION: The Academic Council approved by consensus the Election Process for the 2007-08 Academic Council Vice Chair, with minor corrections. The election process materials will be distributed following the meeting to all members of the Academic Assembly and Academic Council, and the Divisional Senate Offices.

VI. Study Group on University Diversity

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

ISSUE: In July 2006, The Regents approved the formation of a group to study the current status of diversity, propose recommendations on how to improve diversity at UC, and support a climate of inclusion at the ten campuses. Council is to determine its next steps concerning the October 10, 2006, letter from Council Chair Oakley and Vice Chair Brown (see agenda enclosure 6), which proposes a significant Senate role in The Regents' Study Group analysis and report.

DISCUSSION: Council Chair Oakley referred Council members to enclosure 6 of the meeting agenda, and commended Vice Chair Brown on his drafting of the letter requesting the assistance of select Senate committees in providing analysis to The Regents with respect to UC's inclusiveness. Council members then asked questions about The Regents' plans in conducting the analysis, and the Senate's role in this effort. Vice Chair Brown reported that because he and Chair Oakley will be included in the Regents' Study Group on University Diversity, they will know the details of the report and how it is being conducted, and therefore be able to prevent

duplication among The Regents' and the Senate's efforts. Regent Ledesma noted that because the Study Group's charge is so expansive, they will be working in sub-study groups and perhaps the Senate committees could be involved in that way. Many Council members voiced support for the Senate effort, however noting the need to prevent overlap, and have clear leadership and direction. Vice Chair Brown reported that the questions listed in enclosure 6 are intended as suggestions only, and may be adjusted according to input received by the committees; and that the plan is for UCAAD to take the lead on this project, with coordination and support by Vice Chair Brown. One Council member suggested that the divisions could produce a report on each of the suggested questions in enclosure 6, to which Chair Oakley replied that the divisions could report through the systemwide Senate committees instead. Another Council member commented that the faculty need to strongly engage in this effort to support the Study Group, but that perhaps the Study Group should engage the faculty from the top-down in order to produce a quality report. Vice Chair Brown said that this conversation is helpful, and will be reported to the Study Group when it meets next week. He also reported that The Regents are expecting the Study Group to complete its report for presentation at the May 2007 Regents' meeting. Many Council members noted their preference for a "command and control" leadership style in producing the Senate report, to hold committees to deadlines and create a coordinated, credible study for The Regents.

ACTION: The Academic Council approved by consensus the Academic Senate's provision, via its systemwide committees, of analysis for The Regents to consider with respect to the University's inclusiveness.

ACTION: Main responsibility for the collection and coordination of the Senate analysis, as submitted by five lead Senate committees (UCPB, BOARS, UCEP, UCAP and CCGA), shall be assigned to Academic Council Vice Chair Brown and UCAAD, who are authorized to accomplish the effort on behalf of the Academic Senate in a diligent and swift manner. Further amendments to the questions proposed in Vice Chair Brown's letter of October 10, 2006, may be proposed and adopted, and further issues may be submitted for consideration, at a later date.

ACTION: UCPB, BOARS, UCEP, UCAP and CCGA shall submit progress reports to the Academic Council for discussion at the November 29, 2006, meeting of the Academic Council.

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

- **Robert C. Dynes, President**
- **Wyatt R. Hume, Provost and Executive Vice President, Academic and Health Affairs**
- **Bruce Darling, Executive Vice President, University Affairs**
- **Lawrence Hershman, Vice President, Budget**

REPORTS: The Senior Managers provided the following reports to the Academic Council:

President Robert C. Dynes: President Dynes reported on the welcome reception he has received from UC constituencies regarding UC's "One University, Ten Campuses" model. He reported that the final report of the Long Range Guidance Team will be made public at The Regents'

meeting in November, and following, all senior managers intend to take the report to the campuses and other state-wide stakeholders to gain input, and refine the report. He thinks of the final report as a working document right now, and a vehicle to lay out UC's vision and muster support. President Dynes also reviewed with Council members his priorities for the 2007-08 UC budget, and reported his gratitude for Provost Hume's work on the transition of the Science and Mathematics Initiative (SMI) to a decentralized, campus-based program. He reported that a central issue facing UC right now is diversity, and how UC can strengthen its mission as a gateway to opportunities in California. He is especially concerned with anecdotal reports that UC campuses are expensive and unfriendly towards minority students, therefore minority students choose to attend non-UC institutions. President Dynes looks forward to seeing the report of The Regents' Study Group on University Diversity, expected to be presented in May 2007. Lastly, President Dynes commended the UC recipients of the Nobel Prize, and the UC faculty who were recently elected to the Institute of Medicine.

Provost and Executive Vice President Wyatt R. Hume: Provost Hume reported that the Long Range Guidance Team conducted its final meeting, and signed off on the report to be presented to The Regents in November. He noted that the first of three steps in the academic planning initiative is underway this year, consisting of discussions with campus provosts and their invitees. Four formal meetings have been held so far, and the meetings have shown there are strong views and compelling planning processes being defined. The second step involves discussions with Academic Senate committee chairs; and the third step involves the campus chancellors. Provost Hume's goal is to make public the academic planning and decision-making processes at UC. Provost Hume also reported on the following: the work group on Planning for Professional Development and Professional Education (PDPE) is close to finishing its charge; the Information Technology Planning Council is currently discussing UC's systemwide information technology needs; the work group on Planning for Enrollment Growth in the Health Sciences will present its final report to The Regents in November; and the Academic Planning Council (APC) has agreed to look at undergraduate education and student life upon the recommendation of the Academic Council last year.

Provost Hume also noted that the decentralization of SMI is a positive move, and he is encouraged by the focus and devotion of the campus SMI leaders. The SMI Consortium has invited the Academic Council's Science and Mathematics Initiative Group (SMIG) to join their group, and Provost Hume has retained all staff support for the Consortium. He views SMI's biggest challenges as securing funding and coordinating fundraising efforts, as well as fulfilling UC's commitment on credentialing. Lastly, Provost Hume reported that The Regents' Study Group on University Diversity will meet twice before The Regents' November meeting to discuss its work plan and form subgroups; and the group has a six-month timeline.

Executive Vice President Bruce Darling: EVP Darling reported on the importance of the upcoming vote on Proposition 1D, which will provide the entire state-funded capital budget for UC if it passes, and encouraged Council members to get out the vote. He updated Council members on the Livermore Lab proposal, which is due to the Department of Energy this Friday, and the National Science Foundation initiative for the next generation of high performance computers, which will involve the Livermore and Berkeley labs, as well as UCSD. There is also a British Petroleum Initiative for biofuels, which UCB and UCSD have been asked to submit proposals for, along with three other universities world-wide. EVP Darling reported on the San

Francisco Chronicle's renewed request for all payroll data of all UC employees, which UC will provide along with a UC analysis and interpretation. Finally, he reported that Regent Parsky has appointed a task force to look at future state funding opportunities for UC, to which Chair Oakley, Vice Chair Brown, UCPB Chair Newfield and EVP Darling have been appointed.

Vice President for Budget Lawrence Hershman: Vice President Hershman reported on his views on the UC budget and accomplishments over the past forty years. He will be presenting the UC budget proposal to The Regents' for approval in November. He noted the biggest issue for UC in the state budget is to receive what it is promised under the Compact: a 4% general increase in base funding and a 2.5% increase in enrollment growth, including the health sciences, funded at over \$10,000 per student. UC also faces the restart of retirement contributions, and Vice President Hershman believes that UC needs a multi-year agreement with state to fund UC retirement. He noted that there is no understanding on student fees in this year's budget proposal because The Regents wish to wait until after the Governor's budget proposal is introduced in January to make a decision. The Regents have said they are committed to increasing faculty and staff salaries by five percent next year, however UC will only receive a four percent increase from the state. The Regents are also expected to approve restoration of the student-faculty ratio at \$10 million per year; funding for expansion of graduate student enrollment and support; and a proposal to match campus savings from strategic sourcing up to \$10 million per year to use towards graduate student support. Lastly, Vice President Hershman affirmed EVP Darling's comments on the November education bond issue, and its importance to the UC capital budget.

DISCUSSION:

Graduate Student Support: Vice Chair Brown asked President Dynes about his plan to implement the 2006 Senate Memorial on Non-Resident Tuition, and commented that graduate student support is systemwide issue that requires a systemwide response. President Dynes responded that he does not believe in telling the campuses what they should do, or how their funds should be allocated. He noted that campus leaders need to agree that money collected from non-resident tuition that goes back to the campuses must be returned to graduate support programs, which not all campuses do right now. He will discuss this issue more with the Council of Chancellors next week. President Dynes also noted that he sees huge potential savings in non-academic programs that could be consolidated across the system (i.e., student records and payroll systems, etc.), an issue that is being discussed in context of the "One University" plan.

One Council member asked for a clear accounting of the non-resident tuition money that goes back to the campuses, to lend transparency to the process. President Dynes responded that the tuition money could be labeled, and Vice President Hershman noted that they intend to do so this year. Vice President Hershman agreed to provide Council in November with an oral report regarding the non-resident tuition fee process and how the funding is returned to the campuses.

Faculty Salaries: UCFW Chair French summarized the UCFW Analysis and Recommendation on Total Remuneration (see agenda enclosure 9), and asked President Dynes for comment. He responded that the "One University" plan can also be used to find additional funding for faculty salaries. He would like to see more progress from the administration-Senate working group charged with looking into faculty salaries and the step system, and would also like to add some Executive Vice Chancellors to the group. President Dynes suggested that the UCFW analysis

would be useful to the working group. Vice President Hershman noted that the merit money allocated to the campuses is counted as additional funding to the salary base for all faculty.

A Council member added that most faculty believe that the current degradation of the faculty salary scale system leads to pressure on individual faculty members to establish their own market value, usually resulting in an embittering choice between personal income and academic goals. President Dynes acknowledged the comment, and repeated his intent to realign faculty salaries to the scale system. Finally, another Council member noted that the real drain on salaries at his campus is high housing costs, and suggested that other funding mechanisms besides salaries be developed to alleviate this problem. Vice President Hershman commented on the creative housing solutions at UCSB and UCD, and Chair Oakley reported that UCFW is very attentive to this issue.

Slotting: One Council member asked about the status of The Regents' "interim slotting plan," and commented that the slotting system is causing serious recruitment problems at his campus. EVP Darling responded that Regents' Chairman Parsky has set up a group to look at slotting, and that he encourages all campuses to recruit the best person for the position, and fight for that person whether they fit within a slot or not. President Dynes seconded, and noted that the slotting system is largely disfavored and will certainly be reviewed. Provost Hume added that UC needs to recapture competitive salaries in order to adjust the salary scale upwards, a possible solution being the rapid increase of COLAs. At the moment, UC is committed to funding merit increases, but high COLA increases could both realign the salary scale and help recruit and retain faculty.

Other: A Council member suggested that senior management could change their strategy in dealing with requests from the Senate, and instead take one particular issue that the faculty care deeply about, and implement the necessary policies to accomplish the Senate's goals. Vice President Hershman commented that this was an interesting suggestion and welcomed additional discussion, but added that they also have to balance the Chancellors' and Regents' priorities as well.

ACTION: none

VIII. Regent Maria Ledesma, Student Regent of the University of California

- **Maria Ledesma, Regent of the University of California**

ISSUE: Regent Ledesma was invited to Council to discuss The Regents' Study Group on University Diversity, and her priorities and goals this year as Student Regent.

REPORT: Regent Ledesma provided Council members with a brief biographical statement, and recounted her academic background that has led to her Ph.D. program at UCLA and becoming Student Regent. She then reported that her goal this year as Regent is to enable UC to understand what Proposition 209 has meant for UC and the state. She looks forward to The Regents' Study Group to undertake a holistic study that understands how UC can enhance academic excellence, and what Proposition 209 has meant to UC undergraduate admissions; graduate and professional school admissions and retention; faculty and staff recruitment, promotion, and retention; and its impact on campus climate. Regent Ledesma hopes that the final report will be presented to The Regents no later than May 2007, but that the recommendations will be carried forward beyond this academic year. She sees the Study Group's outcomes, recommendations and goals as vital to UC's long range planning efforts.

DISCUSSION: Council members discussed with Regent Ledesma issues affecting campus climate, and her personal experiences at UC campuses. Council members agreed that research on campus climate would be very important to include in the Regents' study. UCPB Chair Newfield commented on the impact of UC's high tuition/high financial aid model on minority enrollment, and offered UCPB's assistance on this type of research. BOARS Chair Rashid reported that BOARS would be ready to act should the Study Group conclude that UC's admissions practices should be reevaluated, especially regarding the UC eligibility construct. Regent Ledesma reported that she believes there is a critical mass of Regents right now that understand the importance of the Study Group's charge, and she looks forward to producing a report that validates these issues through empirical study and practical recommendations. She noted that the Study Group will most likely explore getting independent analytical support to ensure the final report is completed on time, and also to allow the report to withstand scrutiny. Regent Ledesma also said that last year's report of the Faculty Diversity Task Force will be used as a baseline informational report concerning faculty diversity issues, and they will follow-up on implementation of the report's recommendations at the campuses. One Council member suggested the Study Group look at the CSU Sacramento report on the decline of diversity in California higher education. Other Council members requested that the Study Group not focus entirely on the widely-reported diversity issues at UCLA; that the Study Group look at the impact on graduate and professional school student populations; to utilize existing data and reports that the campuses have already produced; to include subjective feelings on campus climate in the final report as well as real data; to include data and information on faculty in the health sciences, which was left out of the Faculty Task Force on Diversity report last year; and lastly, to include data on veterans and mature students as well.

ACTION: The Academic Council expresses its sincere gratitude to Regent Ledesma for attending the meeting today, and participating in an informative and extremely engaging discussion with members of the Academic Council.

IX. General Discussion [none]

X. UCFW Proposal on Total Remuneration and the 2007-08 UC Budget

- **Susan French, UCFW Chair**

ISSUE: UCFW has submitted a proposal concerning faculty compensation and the 2007-08 UC budget, for consideration of the Academic Council.

DISCUSSION: UCFW Chair French reviewed the UCFW salary proposal with Council members (see agenda enclosure 9, and the addendum distributed at the meeting). She explained the UCFW analysis, noting the Senate's support for the ramp-up in eventual employee contributions to the UC Retirement Plan (UCRP) and redirect, but pointing out that these actions will reduce overall faculty total remuneration. Further, Chair French reported UCFW's proposal that Council recommend for the 2007-08 UC budget, an additional four percent increase in faculty salaries plus the amount lost for the UCRP redirect, totaling a seven percent increase up to the Social Security wage base and a ten percent increase above that.

Council members expressed support for the UCFW proposal, commending UCFW's work and timing of the document in preparation for the budget presentation at the November Regents' meeting. Some members asked specific questions about faculty merit increases, and whether they are accounted for in the Comparison Eight figures. One Council member noted

that this proposal should be incorporated into a broader discussion concerning the faculty salary scale, and suggested a possible resolution alerting The Regents to the paramount problem of UC's lag in faculty salaries. Chair Oakley recommended that the UCFW proposal be sent forward now, and that the faculty salary scale system be dealt with through other avenues.

ACTION: The Academic Council, in a unanimous vote, endorsed the UCFW position on total remuneration and the 2007-08 UC budget as a position of the Academic Council, for transmission to President Dynes and The Regents.

XI. Joint Senate-Executive Vice Chancellors Meeting

- **John Oakley, Academic Council Chair**

ISSUE: The Academic Council is scheduled this year to meet with the Executive Vice Chancellors, most likely in spring 2007. Council is to decide on a list of possible agenda items for discussion at this meeting.

DISCUSSION: Council Chair Oakley reviewed with Council members the agenda-setting process for the joint meeting with the executive vice chancellors, as follows: the Council proposes agenda topics, which are then sent to the executive vice chancellors for approval and/or further amendment. Council Chair Oakley reminded Council members that the meeting usually only lasts three to four hours so an abbreviated list of topics is preferred for a productive meeting. He then invited members' suggestions for agenda topics.

ACTION: The Academic Council approved the following topics to be forwarded to the Executive Vice Chancellors as possible agenda items for the 2007 Joint Meeting of the Academic Council and Executive Vice Chancellors (EVCs):

1. **The faculty salary system and the involvement of the EVCs**
2. **Stratification of the campuses and executive job slotting: solutions**
3. **The role of the EVCs role in supporting the mission of the Academic Senate at the divisional level**
4. **Following the NRT money trail, and overall graduate student support**
5. **Solving the faculty housing crisis**

XII. University Committee on International Education (UCIE) Resolution on Student Enrollment in the UC Education Abroad Program

- **John Oakley, Academic Council Chair**

ACTION: This item is postponed for consideration at the November 29, 2006 Academic Council meeting.

XIII. University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB)

- **Chris Newfield, UCPB Chair**

ISSUE: UCPB has offered the following three topics for Council's consideration:

1. The Competitive Graduate Student Financial Support Advisory Committee (GSAC) Final Report: UCPB Chair Newfield reported that UCPB is concerned that the recommendations contained in the GSAC report may not be implemented, and that there is no oversight over the report's implementation now that GSAC has been disbanded. Council Chair Oakley noted that although the report's recommendations are not

controversial, perhaps UCPB could propose a plan of action at the November Council meeting. Council Vice Chair Brown requested that instead, UCPB should draft a letter for Council in November that distinguishes top priorities for Council and UCOP to accomplish this year, perhaps including salaries, non-resident tuition, and the recommendations of the GSAC final report.

ACTION: UCPB will propose a list of budget priorities for the Council’s consideration at its November meeting.

2. UCPB’s “Current Budget Trends and the Future of the University of California” (The Futures Report): Due to lack of time, Council Chair Oakley proposed, and UCPB Chair Newfield agreed, that this item be trailed for now, emphasizing that the Futures Report is not being set aside.
3. Assignment of Budget Function at UCOP: UCPB Chair Newfield reported that UCPB drafted a letter (see agenda enclosure 11) to lend support to the future UC senior budget officer’s placement within the UCOP Office of Academic Affairs. He noted that this appointment is crucial in order for the essential budgeting functions at UCOP to be made accountable to academic planning priorities within UC. UCPB has learned that this view is supported by Provost Hume, and the draft letter might assist Provost Hume in his recruitment efforts.

ACTION: The Academic Council unanimously endorsed UCPB’s recommendation that, in the context of the current reorganization of UCOP, the future senior budget officer be placed within the Office of Academic Affairs, for transmittal to President Dynes and Provost Hume.

XIV. Senate Issues/Topics of Concern

- **Henry Powell, UCSD Divisional Chair**

REPORT: UCSD Divisional Chair Powell alerted Council members to the “topics of concern” listed in the agenda, and noted that the issues are intended as information items only for the Council’s attention this year.

ACTION: none

XV. 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 – October 25, 2006

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									
Michael Brown, Vice Chair		X	X									
Divisional Chairs												
William Drummond	UCB	X	X									
Linda Bisson	UCD	X	X									
Martha Mecartney	UCI	X	X									
Vivek Shetty	UCLA	X	X									
Shawn Kantor	UCM	X	X									
Thomas Cogswell	UCR	X	X									
Henry Powell	UCSD	X	X									
Deborah Greenspan	UCSF	X	X									
Joel Michaelsen	UCSB	X	X									
Faye Crosby	UCSC	X	X									
Committee Chairs												
Mark Rashid	BOARS	X	X									
Reen Wu	CCGA	X	X									
Mary Croughan	UCAP	X	Alt									
Richard Weiss	UCEP	X	X									
Susan French	UCFW	X	X									
Wendy Max	UCORP	X	X									
Chris Newfield	UCPB	X	X									
Alternates												
Pauline Yahr	UCAAD		X									
Jim Hunt	UCAP		X									
Guests												
Maria Ledesma, Student Regent			X									
Ann Shaw, Act. Sec. of Regents			X									
Gibor Basri	UCAAD	X	Alt									
Ben Crow	UCOL	X										
President & Senior Management												
Robert Dynes, President		X	X									
Rory Hume, Provost		X	X									
Bruce Darling, Exec. VP-UR		X	X									
Lawrence Hershman, VP-Budget			X									
Council Staff												
Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Director		X	X									
Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst		X										
Michelle Ruskofsky, Policy Analyst			X									
EVCs												