

Statewide Senate Report

From Michael Cowan, Chair of the Statewide Senate,
University of California

December 2000

Dear Colleagues:

Welcome to this year's first issue of *Statewide Senate Report*, a publication intended to keep those faculty currently or recently active in the Statewide Senate apprised of Senate issues. Information on subscribing to *Statewide Senate Report*, or on "unsubscribing" from it, can be found at the end of this e-mail.

This issue of *Statewide Senate Report* deals not only with questions facing the Senate, but with a planned survey of Statewide Senate committee members. Details on the survey are set forth below.

Issues Facing the Senate

DOE Labs Contract Renewal

The issues confronting the Senate this year have been a mixture of the familiar and the new. A University issue with a long record of predictability is that of UC's management of three Department of Energy laboratories -- at Berkeley, Livermore, and Los Alamos. UC's labs management contracts traditionally have had five-year life-spans, meaning that once every five years the Regents and DOE must make a decision about whether they want to remain partners in labs management.

The current labs contracts don't expire until September 2002. In the normal course of things, negotiations for new contracts would begin this summer (both parties willing) and then conclude in time for new five-year contracts to take effect on October 1, 2002. This timetable has now been altered for the Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos labs. In November, the UC Regents agreed to a DOE proposal to enter into contract negotiations immediately for Los Alamos and Livermore contracts that are likely to run from winter 2001 through September 2005. Both the administration and DOE hope to deliver revised contracts to the Regents in time for their consideration in January. In sum, there may be (a) early renewal of the contracts (b) contracts that will run for a little less than five years and (c) a negotiation period of perhaps six weeks, as compared to the normal 18 months.

This drastically reduced negotiation period is feasible because neither side intends to put many contract issues on the table. But why the change in the first place? Both the Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore labs have been through traumatic periods recently, to put it mildly -- Los Alamos with the Wen Ho Lee and missing hard-drive incidents and Livermore with its management of the National Ignition Facility. (None of this concerns the Lawrence Berkeley lab, whose contract is likely to be renewed under the old timetable.) Morale at the two labs is low and UC's management of the labs is believed to be a considerable morale booster. DOE wanted to act to reassure lab workers about the continuity of UC management. Second, in response to the incidents noted above, DOE wanted to make some changes to current practices, but thought it better to implement those changes within new contracts. The two most significant changes in the offing are that UC will hire a full-time Vice President for Laboratory Management and it will begin to subcontract out duties in several areas, including security and project management.

Where does all this leave the Senate? The normal time-period for campus and statewide Senate lab contract discussions would have been this winter and spring. With the shortened timetable, divisional chairs have been busy organizing such discussions as they can on their campuses.

At the statewide level, our University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) has taken the lead in developing a Senate response to the prospect of new contracts. It has prepared a report whose recommendations the Academic Council considered at its December meeting. At that meeting, the Council voted to support two central UCORP recommendations, with a modification of one of them. First, the Council voted to endorse the extension of the Livermore and Los Alamos contracts. Second, the Council voted to establish a Senate task force charged with evaluating UC's management of the DOE laboratories. This panel will be asked, among other things, to address the question of whether there should be a permanent Senate panel, separate from any present Senate committee or subcommittee, that will evaluate UC's management of the labs and regularly communicate its findings to the UC faculty. Though the task force will be composed entirely of Senate faculty, it is expected to consult broadly with labs personnel, UCOP administrators, and others as it sees fit. The Senate faculty making up the task force will be selected from among faculty who are neutral about UC's management of the labs.

UCLA's Global Film School

One of the issues facing the Senate this year poses such a unique set of questions that the Senate has spent a considerable amount of time merely figuring out how to approach it. It concerns a proposal from UCLA to become part of an Internet-based Global Film School (GFS), in partnership with two other schools, one in England and the other in Australia. UCLA's Department of Theater, Film, and Television (TFT) would be an equal partner with these two schools in the venture, which will be a for-profit business, financed with equity shares sold to investors. The three founding schools would initially hold equal amounts of equity in the enterprise, which will have a governing board composed of representatives from the three schools. Should GFS turn a profit, part of that profit would return to TFT to be used for teaching, research, and public service. GFS course content will be governed by a Curriculum Review Board composed of two representatives from each of the three founding schools, with one of each school's representatives being a faculty member. UCLA faculty may become providers of course materials for GFS, but only as independent agents contracted to GFS.

After reviewing the GFS proposal, the UCLA Senate Division gave its blessing to it this past summer. Because it will require Regental approval, the proposal was forwarded by UCLA to the Office of the President for review. As is its usual practice, UCOP then sent it to the Academic Council in order to obtain statewide Senate input. Statewide Senate committees and divisions other than UCLA considered the proposal through the fall. This review culminated last week with a final Academic Council consideration of the GFS proposal. The Council voted to support the proposal as "an experiment in the establishment of business and educational relationships between the University and the private sector," as I phrased it in a letter to UC Provost Judson King. The Council's approval was contingent upon two provisos: That approval sets no precedent with respect to similar proposals that may come before the University; and that the UCLA administration and Senate jointly establish a GFS oversight panel, to be composed of personnel not affiliated with TFT. Because this is not a University of California School, but instead is a UC-affiliated school, the Senate's role in this process is advisory; final judgment on it rests with the Office of the President and the Regents.

The GFS proposal is, so far as anyone can tell, *sui generis* within the University of California, but it may not be for long. Given the exploding world of technology-assisted learning, the consensus among Academic Council members is that similar proposals are likely to come to the Senate in the future. Therefore the Academic Council concluded in December that UCOP and the Universitywide Academic Senate must establish a panel that will (a) recommend a process for evaluating similar proposals in the future and (b)

recommend criteria under which such proposals should be evaluated. What parts of such proposals are the Statewide Senate's business in the first place? (Curriculum, conflict of interest, intellectual property, business issues?) To what extent is the "good name" of the University at stake in such ventures? What standards should be used in deciding on these issues? My expectation is that the Academic Council soon will be cooperating with UCOP in the formation of a panel that will address these issues.

Expanded Summer Enrollment

Plans for expanded summer enrollment are proceeding. This year, the state provided an appropriation of \$13.8 million to reduce the fees that UC students pay for summer session beginning in 2001. Thus, on a per-unit basis, summer-term instruction will cost students no more than regular-year instruction. Lower fees make summer term more attractive to students, but they do not provide the University with any more money to make summer term a true fourth quarter (or third semester). UC needs funds to increase its summer course offerings, increase financial aid, hire additional ladder-rank faculty for summer instruction, and so forth. Regular-term support is provided by state at the level of \$9,600 per student FTE. Ultimately, UC would like to have all UC-enrolled summer-term students supported at this same level. Thus, there is a request in the Regents' 2001-2002 budget to increase summer support to the \$9,600 level on three campuses -- Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara -- with this support beginning in the summer of 2001. (These campuses were chosen because they are the three closest to their official enrollment growth limits.) The idea is to provide this funding for three more campuses in 2002 and two more in 2003. The Senate has been playing several roles in this process. One of the issues before us is to make sure that our own Senate Regulations do not provide impediments to UC students taking summer courses at UC campuses other than their "home" campus. The Senate's University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) is taking the lead on this issue. A lot of the Senate activity will, of course, be taking place at the departmental level, where faculty will need to make decisions about additional summer course offerings and who will teach them.

Graduate Education

UC is now fully engaged in the issue of increasing graduate enrollments and providing more incentives for recruitment of the very best graduate students. Last year, the Statewide Senate's Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) expressed, in strong terms, its view that UC was entering a crisis because of its low proportion of graduate students and its lack of competitiveness for high-quality graduate students. The administration has likewise been concerned with the situation. One comparison in this issue is

very telling. In 1965, graduate students made up 30 percent of UC's total enrollment; today they make up 17 percent. The Regents had a major presentation on this issue in November. Further, they have agreed to the formation of a Commission on Graduate Education, chaired jointly by UCOP Provost Judson King and Regent S. Sue Johnson, and including as members the Chair and Vice Chair of the Senate's Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) and the Chair of the Academic Council. The commission will issue its recommendations by July 1, 2001. Money lies at the heart of this issue. UC needs to spend more money to attract and support graduate students. CCGA and our Graduate Councils will be taking the lead for the Senate on this issue, but it is a subject that should concern us all.

Dual Admissions

The Senate has made great progress in its consideration of President Atkinson's dual admissions plan, under which high school students who attain a ranking between the top 4 and 12.5 percent of their graduating class could be admitted to UC with the understanding that, as a condition of enrollment, they would first attend a community college for two years, meeting normal performance expectations and course requirements. Such students would then go to the UC campus they were admitted to as high school seniors. The pool of such students is rich in underrepresented minorities.

The Senate's lead committee on this issue is its Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), which in December provided the Academic Council with a proposal that was both refined from its original state and endorsed by BOARS. The Council went on to endorse the proposal in principle, while setting in motion a review of it by the campuses. My hope is that BOARS' recommendations will be reviewed not only by the relevant campus committees -- admissions and educational policy, for example -- but that a broader group of Senate faculty can attend campus presentations on it as well. This is an important proposal and we need to gather as many views as possible about it.

The Council would like campus views on the proposal to come back to BOARS by March. If they do, the Council could render a final judgment on it by April. Should sentiment be positive about the proposal, it could be presented in May to the Senate's Universitywide Assembly for final Senate consideration. The UC Regents have the last word on any such proposal.

Conflict of Commitment

The contentious issue of conflict of commitment was back before the Senate this fall in the form of a reconsideration of changes to section 025 of the

University's Academic Personnel Manual. The issue has to do mostly with compensated, outside professional activities and their potential to compromise the commitment of UC faculty to their University duties. In November, the Academic Council got input from both the campuses and Statewide Senate committees on language proposed for a revised APM 025 and related APM sections. The Council agreed to have the Senate's University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) work with the Office of the President to craft language acceptable to both Senate and administration.

UCFW and UCOP worked together in December in what some Council members called a model of shared governance to craft final APM language. At its December meeting, the Academic Council voted unanimously to accept the wording the two sides agreed to. If all goes as expected, I should be able to point you, in a subsequent *Statewide Senate Report*, to a website that will set forth the revised APM provisions.

Survey of Committee Members

When the Chairs of the Statewide Senate committees gathered in Oakland in September, I told them that this year I intended to distribute to all statewide committee members a questionnaire aimed at providing information about various aspects of committee operations. That effort is going forward; I expect that, early in 2001, committee members not only from this year but from last year will be asked to provide views on a number of issues. One of these concerns the consonance -- or lack of consonance -- between what a committee actually does, what its members believe it should be doing, and what Senate Bylaws call for it to do. Included within this broader issue are questions about committee membership, length of service, and the means of selecting committee members. There are also some purely logistical questions I think the Statewide Senate needs to look at. To name one, it may be cheaper and easier for committees to meet at hotels near airports, rather than on campuses. Yet there is a symbolic value to meeting on campuses. What should Senate practice be? I hope you'll do the Senate leadership a favor by filling out and returning the questionnaire once you receive it.

Does the Name *Notice* Mean Anything to You?

Finally, all of you should have seen this year's first issue of the Senate publication *Notice*. I bring it up because its editor and I believe it would be hard to find a less meaningful name than *Notice*. (Why not just call it *Printed Words*?) We are therefore casting about for a new name for *Notice*, and would welcome any suggestions faculty might have. Ideas can be sent to *Notice* Editor David Krogh at: david.krogh@ucop.edu.

It is likely that we will produce two more issues of *Statewide Senate Report* this year, one probably in March and another in July. I'd be happy to hear from any faculty about SSR or about Senate affairs in general. You can write me at: michael.cowan@ucop.edu.

Sincerely,

Michael Cowan
Chair, Academic Council

Statewide Senate Report Subscriptions

Subscribe: If the return address on this e-mail is ssr@ucop.edu, you already are on our subscriber list and need do nothing further to keep receiving *Statewide Senate Report*. If this e-mail was forwarded to you by a colleague, and you would like to be put on *SSR's* mailing list, send an e-mail to: subscribe@ucop.edu. Thereafter, you will receive issues of *SSR* until you stop your subscription. No message is necessary; receipt of the e-mail will be sufficient to put you on the list.

Unsubscribe: If you would like to be removed from the *Statewide Senate Report* mailing list, send an e-mail to: unsubscribe@ucop.edu. No message is necessary; receipt of the e-mail will be sufficient to take you off the list.