



Notes From the Academic Senate Chair George Blumenthal

george.blumenthal@ucop.edu

Dear Colleagues – As I reported in the November *Senate Source*, this year the systemwide Senate leadership will be more pro-active in asserting the faculty's voice on proposed state and federal legislation that directly affects students, faculty and curricula. As the 2005 legislative year ramps up, we will be monitoring proposed new legislation and drafting responses as appropriate. I expect there to be a number of bills on admissions and transfer issues, as well as cost cutting proposals that could have negative implications for UC. In addition, there has already been a proposal by the governor for a state constitutional amendment that would eliminate defined-benefit retirement programs, such as our UCRS program, for new state employees hired after 2007. Although such an amendment would not affect current faculty, the absence of a defined-benefit retirement program could severely and adversely affect retention and recruitment of the next generation of faculty at UC. With the help of our Senate committee chairs, we have already reviewed and submitted comments on several bills. You will find an update on page 2 of those and other proposed legislation that we are tracking.

In a related activity, at its December meeting, the Academic Council unanimously approved a proposal to introduce this year in both houses of the Legislature a Concurrent Resolution on Graduate Education at the University of California. For some time now, the deteriorating state of graduate education has been a matter of intense concern to UC faculty. The Academic Council believes that this resolution is a crucial first step in our efforts to educate our political leaders about graduate education and to let them know why it is critically important to the state's economic health and cultural vitality for them to support policies that will enable the University of California to compete for the strongest possible pool of talent from within the state, across the nation and around the world. The Senate leadership will be working with UC's Office of State Government Relations on crafting the final language and on getting this important initiative before legislators. The Assembly of the Academic Senate will be asked to endorse this action at its March meeting. To my knowledge, this is the first time ever that the UC Academic Senate has initiated state legislation, and as

-continued on page 2

Q/A WITH UC PROVOST M.R.C. GREENWOOD

This past April, M.R.C. Greenwood (pronounced "Marci") left her position of eight years as the UCSC chancellor to become UC's Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs. We thought that you might like to hear, first hand, her views on a few of the important issues facing the University of California today.



Provost Greenwood

Q: You and President Dynes have embarked on a long-range planning mission to define what the University of California should look like in the next ten to twenty years, and to set the University on course for attaining that vision. You have been meeting with groups of administrators, faculty, students, alumni, regents and others to help you with this mission. Have you been surprised by anything that has emerged from these discussions so far?

A: The long-range planning discussions have not been terribly surprising except for how frequently the different groups within the University community agree with each other. There are twenty or so issues that are fairly consistent across the groups, including the ones you would expect – student access, the balance of graduate and undergraduate programs, the need for professional schools, increasing globalization, finances, and erosion of state support. The President has been very clear that he wants us to create a vision that will stimulate the support needed to make it a reality. The next step will be for us to have some focused discussions on the issues we've identified.

Q: In talking about a future vision for UC, there are those who question whether, going into the 21st century, the University should continue to make policy based on the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. In their view, the Master Plan is a forty-plus year old document that is out of alignment with the changes that are taking place in the state of California today. How do you respond to this view?

A: I think that the Master Plan was one of the most strategically well thought out documents in educational policy history, and it has served the University extremely well. It allowed the University of California to develop as the premier research university in the nation, if not the world. The bedrock component of that success is the differentiation of functions among the three institutions of higher education – the CCC, CSU and UC. Often, these days, when people talk about the Master Plan they talk only about the 12.5% issue. They talk about whether we are educating enough undergraduates or whether we should change the ratio. This question is one that we will be discussing over the coming years, and there will be differences of opinion on that.

But a larger issue of the Master Plan is finding the right balance of programs that will help fill the current and future workforce needs of the state. This is a

[-click to continue](#)

TO ALL UC FACULTY

[A Joint Academic Council-UC Librarians Letter to Faculty](#)

on current contract negotiations with academic publishers Blackwell, Springer and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

this effort moves along, I will be asking you to lobby your local legislators for their support.

Another important action taken by the Academic Council in December was a recommendation to the Provost that the start of all [terms for undergraduate instruction](#) be aligned on campuses using the quarter system and similarly on campuses using the semester system. This change, which will to be implemented over the next several years, will save the University significant resources and further the University's educational mission, while facilitating the most efficient use of fully funded summer sessions, off-campus programs, and transfer of credit.

An issue currently under systemwide review that has stirred debate among faculty and received some media attention is the Academic Council [Resolution](#) on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources. The Resolution supports the right of faculty members to "accept or refuse research support from any source consistent with their individual judgment and conscience, and with University policy." The Academic Council endorsed this Resolution in July 2004; however, each campus Senate and all systemwide committees are undertaking a formal reconsideration of the Resolution so as to ensure a full and open discussion of the statement and the academic freedom issues associated with it.

Finally, as part of our continuing effort to strengthen shared governance at UC, I have invited a number of members of the Board of Regents to join the Academic Council for in-depth discussions on issues of mutual interest and concern. These informal discussions give us the opportunity to share our perspectives on, and priorities for the University of California. We have already had excellent discussions with Regents Novack and Blum and will soon be meeting with Regents' Chair Gerald Parsky, as well as the student regent and student regent designate.

If you have any questions, concerns or comments, I would be pleased to hear from you.

Wishing you a happy and prosperous New Year!

-George Blumenthal

Academic Senate
University of California
1111 Franklin St., 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

THE SENATE SOURCE

is published bi-monthly during the academic year (September - June), for UC faculty by the University of California Systemwide Senate.

George Blumenthal, 2004-05 Chair
Systemwide Academic Senate

Betty Marton, Lead Editor

Brenda Foust, Co-editor

Your comments are welcome. Send to: senatenews@ucop.edu

UPDATES and EVENTS

► **Geographical Preferences in Admissions.** In considering the question of whether local geographic preferences in the undergraduate admissions process is permissible under UC's admissions policies, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has clarified in a recent position [statement](#) that this practice is inconsistent with current policy.

► **Alignment of Campus Calendars.** The Academic Council has recommended to the Provost that [campus calendars](#) be aligned quarter to quarter and semester to semester.

► **Academic Council-Executive Vice Chancellors.** A joint meeting is scheduled for March 31, 2005.

► **UC Policy on Sexual Harassment.** President Dynes has issued the [revised UC Policy](#) on Sexual Harassment and Procedures for Responding to Reports of Sexual Harassment, effective December 14, 2004.

► **Strategic Sourcing.** UC Administration has negotiated a strategic sourcing agreement with [Office Max](#) for all general office supplies.

► **2005-06 Budget.** The Governor has released his [2005-06 state budget](#).

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

California's legislators began the 2005-06 legislative session on January 3 facing a \$8.1 billion deficit. The shortfall will be covered by deeper spending cuts but no new taxes. For [UC](#), if the [compact](#) with the Governor holds, there will be a general 3% budgetary increase to fund student enrollment growth, faculty and staff compensation, and the opening of UC Merced.

New legislation introduced, to date, in which the Senate is taking an active interest:

► [ACAX 1](#) would establish the California Public Employee Defined Contribution Plan and provide that on and after July 1, 2007, any person hired as a new employee by a public agency may enroll only in a defined contribution plan of a public pension or retirement system, and is prohibited from enrolling in a defined benefit plan.

► [SB 5](#) would add language to the Education Code requesting UC and directing CSU and CCC to develop guidelines and implement prescribed principles in a "Student Bill of Rights."

► [SB 13](#) would prohibit state agencies from giving university researchers access to personally identifiable data.

► At the federal level, as part of the reauthorization of the federal Higher Education Act, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is [proposing](#) an expanded effort to collect information on students in order to provide accountability information on colleges and universities.

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTES FOR SCIENCE AND INNOVATION

What are they? Where are they? What do they do? [Click here](#) to read the first installment of a two-part article that covers these and other questions about the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (CAL ISIs).

Under Senate Review

Unless otherwise noted, send comments to your [Divisional Chair](#) or relevant [Divisional Committee](#). Response date for divisions follows listing.

► [Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources](#) – General Review (3/14/05)

► [Review Process for the California Institutes for Science and Innovation](#) – Preliminary Review by UCORP, UCPB and CCGA (1/21/05)

► [Proposed University Statement of Core Values and Standards of Business Conduct](#) – Preliminary Review by UCFW (1/26/05)

► UC Senior Management Compensation – Review by the Academic Council [Previous reports by the Academic Council on this issue were produced in [1995](#) and [2002](#).]

[Click here](#) for a comprehensive list of items currently under review.