REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY
OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
JANUARY 30, 2008

The first meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate for the academic year 2007-2008 was held on January 30, 2008, at the Oakland Professional Development and Conference Center (1000 Broadway), Oakland, Calif. Chair Michael Brown called the meeting to order. Roll call established that 41 of 61 members were present for a quorum.

Assembly Chair Michael Brown
Chair Brown made the following announcements:
1) The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), which accredits campuses and not systems, at the request of UC completed a review of the University of California system. The report, which will not affect the accreditation of any campus, made the following recommendations to correct areas of grave concern: (i) in light of the compensation crisis, UC was urged to develop comprehensive procedures to assure that policies adopted at any level within the organization are preserved and understood by persons responsible for implementing them, including the establishment of an Audit Committee supported by state-of-the-art financial accounting and control systems; (ii) with the search for the new President underway, there is an urgent need for a document that clearly defines the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of the President, along with those of the Board of Regents; and (iii) the Office of the President should develop protocols for supporting the campuses, especially campus leaders during periods of turmoil, and UCOP should seek closer alignment with the chancellors on all matters of common concern and support the campuses with effective central systems for common functions, such as personnel management and finance.

The entire WASC Report, UC's responses to it, and the Report of the Working Group on the Roles of the Office of the President can be found at:

2) As a result of the WASC Report, an Academic Senate committee is presently restructuring the Office of the President, with the roles of the President and Regents being clarified and restated. Further, formal procedures for conducting a search for the President of UC were developed and implemented by Chair Brown and the Academic Council.

3) With regard to changes in "UC eligibility" proposed by BOARS, campuses will receive additional data and simulations of the effects of the proposed changes on enrollment. The report is scheduled to be available in April 2008.

President Robert Dynes
President Dynes' announcements, as one might expect, were dominated by discussion of the budget. 1) Dynes began by stating that UC is in for tough times due to the Governor's budget and necessary introspection on governance resulting from the WASC Report. He expressed fears that our honest evaluation of ourselves will serve as fodder for the Legislature and public and alluded to powers trying to carve up UC. Dynes vowed to fight this and reiterated his belief that the strength of UC lies in its role as a public institution, that each of the 10 campuses is world class in something and that no university or university system can compare to UC. He noted that UC has six campuses in the AAU; other systems have no more than two. Dynes called on everyone to be a better advocate for UC and admitted that UC needed to do a better job in getting its many friends to lobby on UC's behalf with regard to the Governor's budget. Note: At the end of the Assembly meeting, we received word that UC had secured the consulting services of Alan L. Hoffman for six months, effective March 1, 2008, at a cost of only $106,000, to assist
Provost Rory Hume in coordinating UC's advocacy efforts. According to a later memo from Hume, "Mr. Hoffman has a long career in Washington, D.C. Most recently, he has served as chief of staff for Sen. Joseph Biden after holding posts in the U.S. Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services, as well as the Clinton White House. He also recently worked for two years as Vice President for External Affairs for the RAND Corporation in Santa Monica."

2) With regard to the state budget, Dynes spoke against restricting enrollment for fall 2008-2009. He felt that it was unfair to the students since the process is already ongoing. He left enrollment restrictions as an option for 2009-2010 and beyond. Dynes is floating the idea of raising fees by 7% but itemizing the increase as an "enrollment surcharge due to State budget cuts" as a way to ensure that students and parents understand that the source of their financial burden is the Governor and State Legislature, not UC. The surcharge would be eliminated when the State returns UC's funding to an adequate level. Three items related to enrollment should be noted: (i) for 2008-2009 there will be no financial reward for over enrollment, which should benefit UC-Riverside and UC-Merced; (ii) UC applications for Fall 2008 increased 9.2% at the freshman level and 8.5% at the transfer level (the increase in freshman applications substantially exceeded the Department of Finance's projection of only 3.2%); (iii) UCOP and campuses are completing long-range enrollment plans that will extend through academic year 2020-2021; these are due to the Legislature on March 25, 2008.

3) President Dynes (and Chair Brown) took the optimistic stance that the Governor first fully funded the University’s budget as called for under the Compact, and then imposed the 10% reduction, a cut similar to the level proposed for most other State agencies, making the cut to UC only 4.78% in reality. However, it still translates to a cut of $332 million. The cut is not specified, with one exception: the Governor asks that 10% of the cut be taken in administrative programs. The UC budget reduction is significant - at present all options are before the Regents, but Dynes reiterated that UCOP priorities were (i) faculty salaries and (ii) graduate student support. There are no mid-year cuts proposed, not even rumblings of possibilities.

4) With regard to reinstatement of UCRP contributions, the Compact states that the State will contribute its share when UC starts contributing its share. The Governor is still funding other state employee pensions. Therefore, UC is trying to get UCRP contributions up and running so the Governor has to contribute. Note that the position of the Academic Senate is that UCRP contributions have to be offset by salary increases.

5) In response to President Dynes' comments, numerous Assembly members cited evidence of the steady erosion of UC faculty salaries and negative consequences to recruiting and retaining high quality faculty, erosion of staff support and problems of staff morale and retention, and erosion of UC infrastructure. There was strong agreement among Assembly members that during the budget crisis, the success of UC-Merced must be protected.

President Dynes' full report to the Assembly is available at: http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/jan2008/RCD.report.01.08.pdf.

**Action Items**

Action items requiring a vote were all housekeeping items that were approved with minimal discussion, with the exception of the proposed Academic Senate Resolution on Limiting UC's Role in Manufacturing Nuclear Weapons (Drafted by the Academic Council, December 19, 2007). The issue arose from changes that took place since UC entered into contracts as the direct contractor for the Lawrence-Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) and as a member of a limited liability company that holds the prime contracts to operate the Lawrence-Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) and the Los Alamos National
Laboratory (LANL). First, the DOE used its right to unilaterally extend the contracts for all three laboratories for up to 20 years. Second, due to the non-negotiated nature of the contract extensions, UC lost its right to terminate the contract with 18 months' notice. Third, the contracts give the DOE the unilateral right to increase the production of plutonium pits. Fourth, on December 18, 2007, the National Nuclear Security Administration announced that LANL was selected as the DOE's preferred alternative site for plutonium research, development and manufacturing, an action designed to concentrate the nation's nuclear weapons into a smaller enterprise more responsive to future security threats. Whereas, UC has produced plutonium pits at Los Alamos since the 1940's for research purposes, the change marks the pits for warheads and increases the number from 10 per year to 80 per year, with the annual number now under control of the DOE, not UC. The following resolution was passed and sent to President Dyne's with the request that he deliver it to the Regents:

WHEREAS:
The Academic Senate has grave concerns about UC's role in managing the LANL under the current contract and;
The Academic Senate has learned that the Prime Contract for Los Alamos allows for the possibility of the DOE/NNSA increasing the number of plutonium “pits” to as many as the DOE/NNSA deems necessary, beyond any UC-imposed limits;
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:
1. The President, or the President’s designee, should carefully monitor the level of production of plutonium pits at the labs, as well as any role of the labs in the oversight and management of such production, and issue a report on the results of this monitoring on an annual basis to the Academic Senate; and
2. If the level of production of plutonium pits at the labs can not be accurately reported to the Academic Senate for any reason, UC should reassess its participation in the management of the pertinent labs; and
3. Should any National Laboratory managed by UC directly or through a lab-management partnership begin either to produce or to manage the production of plutonium pits for any purpose beyond current low levels, or for the purpose of nuclear warhead replacement or production, UC should reassess its participation in the management of that Laboratory.

General Items of Interest
1) The search for the President stalled: (i) the Regents lost confidence in the Office of the President (OP) and (ii) the Regents were acting as individuals and not as a cohesive group. Chair Brown and the Academic Senate Advisory Council drafted a set of procedures for conducting the search for the President, which the Regents have now accepted. The Regents lack of trust in OP resulted in greater trust in the Academic Senate. As a result, the Regents will not pick a President the faculty isn't happy with. The Regents want a President in place to solve all the problems identified in the WASC Report.

2) The Regents took a stand opposing Proposition 92 because it would redirect funds from the State General Fund to the Community Colleges, leaving less for UC. They denounced approaches that pitted one aspect of State education against another and made their approach one that supported all education - K-12, Community Colleges, CSU and UC.

3) The Office of the President is committed to taking a cut of $20M at OP. Provost Rory Hume has committed $40M on top of the $20M cut. The Regents think OP can absorb $100M.

4) Provost Hume's position is that faculty salary will be the last item to be cut. He will fund all merits and promotions, estimated at $40M. If he funds the 2.5% range adjustment and 8% market parity adjustment proposed in the Faculty Salary Plan, it will cost $92M. If he proceeds with the accelerated plan to finish
salary adjustments in 3 or 2 years, not 4, it would cost $124M (5% range adjustment and 8% parity adjustment) for this coming year.

5) There was a 3.78% increase designated for above scale faculty, but each campus got to decide what to do with the money.

6) A Chancellor's Compensation package was going to be drawn up. Regents were informed that Chancellors' salaries are off-market by 36%, but actually it is more as the consultant employed over values benefits. The problem is that the Regents start with the President's salary and work down. The Academic Senate is trying to get the Regents to start with the teaching and research mission of UC and, therefore, with faculty salaries and the rest will fall into place.

7) Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs confirmed what we all know to be true - we are not competitive with regard to graduate student support and that we need get rid of NRT. Solving these two problems will cost $80-$100M. It was proposed that a plan be put in place using in-house budget reallocations so that when funding is restored we have a plan in operation into which we can slot new funds.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol J. Lovatt, Senior Representative
Assembly of the Academic Senate