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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. CHAIR’S REPORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Senate Cabinet Actions and Discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting(s) – November 6 &amp; 23, 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. CONSENT ITEMS</td>
<td>2A (pg. 3-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Draft Minutes – October 30, 2012 (Not available online until approved.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERITI AFFAIRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Status Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. FACULTY WELFARE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW - None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. UCI SENATE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW</td>
<td>5A (pg. 8-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. UCI Review of UCI Abroad White Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Reviewers: AF Subcom. – Saphores, Blumberg, Schlicter, Yokomori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue: Request for Formal Cabinet Review and Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Deadline: Comments/Memo to Senate Chair prior to Dec. 4 Cabinet Mtg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. UC SENATE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW</td>
<td>6A (pg. 25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. UC Review of Proposed Revision to APM 430, Visiting Scholars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Reviewers: FW Subcom. - Meenakshisundaram, Dalton, Guidotti, Olivieri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue: Request for Formal Systemwide Review and Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Deadline: Comments/Memo to Senate Chair prior to Dec. 4 Cabinet Mtg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. UC Review of APM 700, Leaves of Absences</td>
<td>6B (pg. 31-39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Reviewers: FW Subcom. - Meenakshisundaram, Dalton, Guidotti, Olivieri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue: Request for Formal Systemwide Review and Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Deadline: Comments/Memo to Senate Chair prior to Dec. 4 Cabinet Mtg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. UC Review of Open Access Policy</td>
<td>6C (pg. 40-78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Reviewers: AF Subcom. – Saphores, Blumberg, Schlicter, Yokomori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue: Request for Formal Systemwide Review and Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Deadline: Comments/Memo to Senate Chair prior to Dec. 4 Cabinet Mtg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. STATUS REPORTS</td>
<td>7A (pg. 79-81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopi Meenakshisundaram, UCFW Rep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1st Mtg. of UCFW – October 12, 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity</td>
<td>7B (pg. 82-84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Tonner, UCAAD Rep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1st Mtg. of UCAAD – October 18, 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. University Committee on Academic Freedom</td>
<td>7C (pg. 85-87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Daniel Saphores, UCAF Rep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agendas, minutes, and enclosures are for your information only. 
Please do not share the document(s) with others.
(Mtg. of UCAF – November 8, 2012)

D. Academic Personnel
   Joan Tenma, Director, AP

E. Equal Opportunity & Diversity Status Report
   Gwen Kuhns Black, Associate Director, OEOD

F. Human Resources/Benefits Status Report
   Melody McCulloch, Benefits Supervisor
   (Alternate: Kellie Jones)

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS (Includes correspondence generated from previous meeting)

A. CFW memo Re: Negotiated Salary Trial Program (11/05/12) 8A (pg. 88-89)
B. CFW memo Re: “Rebenching” Report (11/05/12) 8B (pg. 90-91)
C. Status Report for 2012-13 8C (pg. 92-94)

IX. NEW BUSINESS

X. ADJOURNMENT

Distribution
Gopi Meenakshisundaram, Chair
Bruce Blumberg
Zhongping Chen
Teresa Dalton
Lucile Faurel
Michelle Garfinkel
James Given
Patrick Guidotti
Sabee Molloi
Vincent Olivieri
Jean Daniel Saphores
Annette Schlichter
Grace Tonner
Kyoko Yokomori

Emeriti Members: (3)
   Alan Elias
   Julian Feldman
   William Parker

(UCIEA President is Ex-Officio to Emeriti Subcom.)

Representatives:
   Linda Murphy, LAUC-I Rep
   TBA, ASUCI Rep
   Victor Quintanar, AGS Rep

Consultants:
   Gwen Kuhns Black, OEOD
   Melody McCulloch, Human Resources
   Alternate: Kellie Jones
   Joan Tenma, Academic Personnel

c: Mary Gilly, Senate Chair

A Reminder:
Members should be prepared to lead discussions on topics for which they are listed on the agenda. For more complex issues, the reviewers may want to engage in an email dialogue or meeting prior to the CFW meeting. Senate Councils are working to improve the level of advice and counsel that they offer, and this step will improve the quality of CFW’s discussions. Following the Council’s discussion, and if a written response is required, a reviewer may be asked to prepare a draft memo for the Chair’s signature. To promote careful review, each agenda item will be distributed to the designated reviewers and/or subcommittee a week prior to the meeting.
I. CHAIR’S REPORT
Senate Chair Welcome
Senate Chair Mary Gilly welcomed everyone to the Council on Faculty Welfare and thanked them for their service to the Council. Senate Chair Gilly also informed the Council total remuneration was discussed at the last Academic Council meeting. In regards to retirement accounts, UC is falling behind the Comp 8 schools. In 2008-09 total remuneration (salary, medical, dental, vision, life insurance, retirement, etc.) was at 29% positive relative to the Comp 8 schools. In 2012-13 UC was at -8%. The 2013-14 projection is even lower at -14%. More information regarding total remuneration will be given to CFW in the near future.

Informational Items
Chair Meenakshisundaram reviewed informational items with the Council including the membership roster, meeting schedule, subcommittee assignments, information sharing, bylaws, retreat agenda, senate recusal policy, annual report, status of ongoing business, and the Council Web site.

CFW Message Board
Chair Meenakshisundaram introduced a new message board with the Council. The web page address is http://sites.uci.edu/scfw. Members are encouraged to access the page to review and comment on discussions items in advance of scheduled meeting dates so as to facilitate a faster review process. As new items are introduced, they will be posted to the blog with a notification sent to each member. At this time no automatic notification process exists for new comments posted. Chair Meenakshisundaram and the senate analyst are working with OIT to address this issue. In the interim, the senate analyst will monitor the site daily and send the Council notifications as new comments are added. Each member was sent an e-mail notification to their UCI account inviting them to join the site. Members who have not yet joined were asked to complete their registration. Once members have joined, their respective e-mail address can be changed from UCI to other service providers such as Yahoo or Gmail.

UCI Mental Health Initiative
Chair Meenakshisundaram attended the October 18 UCI Mental Health Initiative group meeting. The group created a three point agenda to be presented to the EVCP and has requested CFW support for the initiative. To that end, a letter from the Council will be drafted incorporating the three points listed below.

1. We ask you to consider the development of training programs for new Chairs on dealing with colleagues who are in acute distress, and to promote a culture of openness in the department in dealing with these issues.

2. We ask you to expand the scope of mental health training programs now available for students to include staff and faculty, include specific issues that bring about distress among the faculty and how to handle them. This may include both information sessions to provide and educate about the resources available for this purpose, and also wellness programs like stress management.

3. Finally, we ask you to consider the development of a program that would identify a faculty representative in each School, who would be the “go to” person for faculty and staff who seek assistance in dealing with students or colleagues who are in acute distress. These individuals would obviously not be trained psychologists or psychiatrists, but they would receive training in how to link those in need with the appropriate resources on campus. This would give heightened visibility to the importance of mental health as a key part of our commitment to
creating a culture of “wellness” on campus. If it came with the official imprimatur of the EVC and Chancellor, it would also, we are convinced, do much to destigmatize the problems associated with mental illness and encourage those in need to seek assistance.

II. CONSENT ITEMS
The minutes from June 12, 2012 were unanimously approved with no changes.

III. SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERITI AFFAIRS – Status Report
None

IV. FACULTY WELFARE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW
None

V. UCI SENATE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW
None

VI. UC SENATE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW
A. UC Review of “Rebenching” Report
   Issue: Request for Formal Systemwide Review and Comment
   The Council was asked to review and comment on the UC Review of “Rebenching” Report and recommendations made by the Rebenching Budget Committee. The intent of rebenching is to increase transparency and equity in the formula for allocating state funds across campuses in the UC system. Rebenching is scheduled for implementation starting 2012-13 with recommendations the funding be spread out over six years through 2018 using new State General Funds.

   Discussion
   Council members agreed with the Rebenching Budget Committee’s consensus the University needs a more transparent and equitable process for allocating funds received from the State of California to its ten campuses. However the Council did not believe the rebenching report and recommendations adequately address this process.

   Council members expressed concern the rebenching model did not address adequately the redistribution of resources during a time of waning resources and assumes there will be new state funds. Members noted the UC system has experienced a significant decline in state funding since 2008 and if Proposition 30 does not pass on November 6, state funding will continue to decline. Campuses such as UC Los Angeles and UC Berkeley have the ability to increase non-state revenue to balance the drop in funding while schools similar to UC Irvine and UC Merced cannot. Further, UC-San Francisco’s differential funding through increase and decrease of state funds is not proportionate.

   Council members noted several exceptions to the rebenching model for UC Merced and UC San Francisco. Members also noted the overall intent to provide growing campuses such as UC Merced funding enabling them to grow their graduate programs through hiring additional faculty and building laboratories to attract graduate students; essentially prefunding graduate growth. Council members felt these exceptions will create an inequitable playing field benefitting schools such as UC San Francisco while continuing to disenfranchise schools such as UC Irvine who have historically been underfunded.

   Council members support the idea that increased transparency and equity is needed. The proposed formula would allocate funds based on the number of California resident students based on target numbers. However the actual target numbers are not clearly laid out.

   Action
   Council comments will be forward via memo to the Senate Cabinet.
B. UC Review of Negotiated Salary Plan

Issue
The Council was asked to review and comment on the negotiated salary trial program for the general campus. The trial program is a result of the systemwide review of proposed APM – 668 in 2011 – 2012. The goal of the proposal was to make salaries more competitive by making technical changes in the way salaries are computed using grant or other external funding.

UC Irvine, UC Los Angeles, and UC San Diego will participate in the trial program over the next four years. At the three year mark, a report will be made on the progress. The trial period is applicable for faculty who have received a normal merit increase over the past two years. The benefits will continue to be computed based on the actual salary. The UC Retirement Plan will not be affected by the increase.

Discussion
Council members shared the report offers a framework with unclear implementation details. In order to proceed with the trial, the Council believes that certain questions must be answered. How will the trial be evaluated? What parameters are being used to measure success?

The Council believes there may be positive side effects with the trial program. For example, faculty would be incentivized to pursue additional grants. Faculty may choose more non-modular grants. If properly administered, there could be an increase in funding to the university. But, it should also carefully consider the impact of shifting allocation of money earmarked for other research expenditure towards faculty salaries.

Council members felt if the trial moves forward, under local implementation in the department, there should be metrics for ensuring faculty obtain the same agreement regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, or a person’s ability to negotiate to prevent exacerbation of equity issues already in place. Council members suggested Advance or an equity advisor be consulted when crafting the local guidelines for implementation.

Council members noted not all funding sources can be used in this plan. If within the same department, two faculty members with two different funding sources, both highly and equally competitive may be unequally treated under this plan, not because of the relative merits of the faculty, but purely because of the differences in funding sources. This may lead to unpleasant situations if they are in the same department since faculty within the same department affect each other’s professional life more than those in different departments. Members suggested implementing this plan within a department only if all faculty have access and opportunity to get funding from the sources that allow use of funds in the negotiated salary plan.

Action
Council comments will be forward via memo to the Senate Cabinet.

VII. STATUS REPORTS

Faculty Welfare Subcommittee (UCFW, 10/12/12) – Gopi Meenakshisundaram, Rep to UCFW
University of California Online Education (UCOE) Copy Right Issues
UC San Diego raised concern regarding copyright issues of faculty contributing to the UCOE program. Once faculty contribute teaching material to UCOE, the copyright is held by UCOE. UCOE will give first preference to faculty if there is a need for modifications to existing course material. However if faculty decline or fail to make modifications within a certain period of time, UCOE reserves the right to change the course material provided by the faculty and can use another instructor to teach the course without participation of the original faculty member contributing to the course. More information regarding this issue is coming soon.

Lab Safety Issues
Instructions regarding lab safety procedures and regulations can be received from the UC Irvine safety managers and director. New regulations have been put into place that go far beyond the
settlement terms that the UC Regents agreed as a result of the UC Los Angeles lab accident where a student was killed. The issue centered around a lack of documentation the student to show the student was trained correctly and that the student was not wearing proper protective gear. The faculty member at UC Los Angeles was tried. The UC Regents were let go based on an agreement to put in place regulations, training, etc. for staff and faculty using labs. UCFW is working with the Director of Lab Safety for the UC system. Issues such as whether or not visitors get trained if they visit will be evaluated.

Health Care Task Force
Open enrollment started October 29. Co-pays have increased across the board. Monarch has left Healthnet Blue and Gold, but Healthnet has picked up two additional groups including Memorial Care. In 2014, UC will get bids for all healthcare plans with the exception of Kaiser.

UC Irvine now has a healthcare facilitator on campus, Glen Rodriguez. He can facilitate any issues related to healthcare or insurance including authorization, billing issues, and Medicare.

Members also have the option of switching to Blue Cross PPO when traveling outside of the country beyond three months as this is considered a disruption in service and many plans only cover emergency service outside the country. Additionally, members can switch back to their original plan at any time upon their return.

Affirmative Action Subcommittee – Grace Tonner, Rep to UCAAD
No Report

Academic Freedom Subcommittee – Jean-Daniel Saphores, Rep to UCAF
No Report

Academic Personnel – Joan Tenma
No Report

Equal Opportunity and Diversity Status Report – Gwen Kuhns Black
Climate Survey
The Climate Survey will launch on January 14, 2013 at UC Irvine. Systemwide there have been incentives committed to the survey. Incentives include one $10,000 scholarship for an undergraduate student, two $5,000 stipends for graduate/professional students, two $5,000 research grants for faculty, five $2,000 professional development grants for staff, and two iPads per campus. This is based on participants that complete the survey.

The work team is reviewing whether or not to have incentives locally and what they will look like. It’s been demonstrated in the past that smaller incentives proved to be successful in increasing participation rates for undergraduate students. The graduate student representative shared that for graduate students, it comes down to whether or not faculty encourage students to participate. The goal is to get at least a 30% response rate across the system and in local areas to get useful information. The higher the responses rate the better. ASUCI and AGS have questioned the transparency of the report. The consultant will write the report for each campus and the system. There is Web site for the survey http://campusclimate.ucop.edu/.

UCOP plans to post all results and reports. The survey has been written to meet IRB requirements as much as possible so as any faculty that want to use the date for research purposes should expect to have that expedited. Work team has considered ideas to help increase response rates such as giving travel grants, or funding to schools. Any ideas for the work team to consider should be forwarded to Gwen Kuhns Black. This is the benchmark year. Another survey will be done in four or five years measure comparatively.
Department of Labor Audits
Chief Personnel Officers in each school and academic unit have been asked to get all faculty and staff who have not identified their race/ethnicity and encourage them to complete the Demographic Data Transmittal Form. This is a voluntary form. The reason for this is that unknown ethnicity has been one that comes up at all of these audits and the government cannot do the statistical analysis they want to do. We are on notice because this is an issue that has come up on three audits. The next step after the chief operating officers is to have our office reach out to faculty and staff directly. One campus is in a conciliation agreement with the department of labor and Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs. The goal is to reach 2-3%. Systemwide is thinking of broadening categories to include mixed races.

Sexual Harassment
Office is working on a state mandate for sexual harassment prevention requirement. Life of the year will be coming on November 7 from 10 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Life Theater is offered twice a year, in the Fall and Spring, offering a more interesting sexual harassment training option. In person training is also offered in our office.

Human Resources Status Report on Benefits – Melody McCulloch
Health Care Coverage
Open Enrollment began October 29 and will close on November 20 at 5:00 p.m. Health Net is more expensive than Blue Cross at this time. Flexible spending and Dep Care is also going on now. Members must re-enroll every year to maintain coverage. The limit has been reduced from $5,000 to $2,500. The old cards expire on December 31. If members choose not to re-enroll, they can still incur expenses for 2012 through March 15, 2013 and have until April 15, 2013 to file claims. Members who choose to re-enroll have the same grace periods and will receive new cards in January. Additionally, there have been three name changes in insurance carriers: Accidental Death and Dismemberment Insurance has changed from Charter to AIG, United Health has changed to Optum, and Sitter City has changed to Select Plus and will now have senior care. Secova will continue to handle family audits. Whenever a family member is added, an audit will follow two months later to verify dependent eligibility.

Fidelity Funds
UC is reducing the Fidelity Funds that members can invest in. Anyone with funds to be closed will be notified with the option to transfer to another investment. There will be a brokerage fee for members who choose to keep the investments. If members do not changed their investment, the funds will default to whatever fund has been chosen by UC.

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS
None

IX. NEW BUSINESS
None

X. ADJOURNMENT: 5:20 P.M.

Submitted by Charlene Mandau
At its meetings of October 23, Vice Provost Michael Clark presented to the Senate Cabinet a brief summary based on the UCI Abroad White Paper. The white paper describes a “feasibility study for establishing a branch campus of the University of California, Irvine—“UCI Abroad” — in a location outside the United States to be determined. UCI Abroad would actively recruit students from all over the world with the aim of creating a genuinely international community on the branch campus. It would operate according to the qualitative standards, educational principles, and institutional values and practices of the home campus in Irvine.”

During the presentation it was noted that UC Davis has proposed a similar program called UC Davis-Spain. The Senate office at UC Davis has reported that a formal review of the proposal is contingent upon receipt of a market analysis similar to what we require for our campus review for the Self Supporting programs.

In light of this consideration, a formal proposal should take into account various issues raised in the Self Supporting Guidelines (please see attached). The following is a preliminary list of Senate issues that might be considered in a formal proposal in addition to the requirement for a market analysis.

- CUARS: Admissions policies for both undergraduate and graduate students
- GC, CEP: Oversight and evaluation of course quality and content; instructors in charge of courses
- GC: Graduate student support; TAs; GSRs; labor union agreements
- CEP, Assessment: Accreditation issues
- CSE: Academic integrity/discrimination complaints
- CORCL: Research and lab considerations
- CPB: Start-up costs and revenue sharing
- CPB, CAP, CFW: Faculty resources required for a branch campus and impact on the main campus
- CFW (Academic Freedom): Academic freedom
- CAP, CFW: Faculty service and evaluation
- SCIE: International educational goals and integration with other programs
- CPT: Faculty grievance process
Please provide a summary of the concerns and additional items that your Councils/Committees might require in the formal proposal. The Self-Supporting Guide provides a basic template for issues related to development of a program that does not require state resources. Please note that the documents that have been provided should not be distributed except for your councils/committees review.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Mary Gilly, Senate Chair
Academic Senate, Irvine Division

C: Luisa Crespo, Executive Director
Senate Analysts
Executive Summary

This white paper describes a feasibility study for establishing a branch campus of the University of California, Irvine—“UCI Abroad”—in a location outside the United States to be determined. The purpose of UCI Abroad is to establish a global presence and influence for UCI equivalent to that of many of our peer institutions; extend the international scope of our research, educational, and creative activities; and serve as a significant source of on-going revenue for our university. UCI Abroad would actively recruit students from all over the world with the aim of creating a genuinely international community on the branch campus. It would operate according to the qualitative standards, educational principles, and institutional values and practices of the home campus in Irvine.

The academic plan for UCI Abroad assumes the campus would begin by offering four different degree programs in areas that are most often selected by international students studying in the U.S. Curricula, instructional staff, and academic support services would be modeled on majors that we currently offer in Business, Mechanical Engineering, Biological Sciences, and Computer Science. Admissions could range from a small cohort of 500 to a large cohort 1,000 new students per year, depending on demand, faculty and support staff, and facilities.

UCI Abroad would be financed principally through non-resident tuition of approximately $35,000 per student. In the fourth year after students arrived, the small cohort model would produce standing enrollment of 1,800 students and net annual revenues, less all expenditures (salaries, facilities, etc.), of $5.1 million. At that point, there would be an outstanding balance of approximately $37 million in start-up costs. The large cohort would reimburse all start-up costs in the second year after students arrived, and by the fourth year it would produce standing enrollment of 3,600 students and net annual revenues of $39.6 million.
UCI Abroad
White Paper for Discussion

This white paper describes a feasibility study for establishing a branch campus of the University of California, Irvine—“UCI Abroad”—in a location outside the United States. The study is intended to be concrete enough to serve as the basis for realistic discussion on the campus and among our supporters in the community, yet general enough to be open to substantive revision pending the outcome of that discussion.

Among the many contingencies that would influence that revision, the prospective location of the campus is likely to be the most significant. UCI Abroad would actively recruit students from all over the world with the aim of creating a genuinely international community on the campus. Nevertheless, the campus would inevitably reflect the culture and customs of its host nation to some extent, and it would certainly be subject to the local laws and policies. The choice of a site is therefore likely to have a significant effect on facilities costs and other operational expenses, and on many other aspects of the campus that are impossible to determine in advance. Nevertheless, wherever UCI Abroad may be located, it must operate according to the qualitative standards, educational principles, and institutional values and practices of the home campus in Irvine. The study described here is therefore modeled on what it would cost in Irvine to offer the designated majors, meet the General Education Requirements, build and maintain the necessary facilities, and operate an educational program that is more limited in scope but otherwise equivalent to what we offer our students now.

The objective of UCI Abroad is to establish a global presence and influence for UCI equivalent to that of many of our peer institutions, including some of the most respected and prestigious universities in the U.S. A branch campus outside this country would extend the international scope of our research, educational, and creative activities; provide a broader base for our faculty and students whose work extends beyond the borders of the U.S.; and serve as an important portal for students and faculty around the world who want to come to UCI. The nonresident tuition paid by students at UCI Abroad would also be an important source of revenue for the university once the start-up costs for UCI Abroad had been reimbursed.

UCI Abroad is intended to complement, not replace or curtail, current efforts to increase the number of international students at Irvine and otherwise enhance the global dimension of our research and educational programs. Recruitment of international students is a key part of our strategy to grow non-resident enrollments at Irvine. That strategy includes the goal of roughly doubling the number of new non-resident freshmen and transfers admitted each year through Fall 2014 while increasing the quality of the incoming class. That target is very ambitious, however. Even if we can attract that number of highly-qualified applicants and accommodate them in terms of our instructional staff and facilities, as it now appears we can, the rapid growth will quickly surpass the 10% limit on non-residents proposed by UCOP and is likely to meet political resistance from the State. UCI Abroad would enable us to expand our international
enrollment beyond these physical and political limits on the Irvine campus while creating a new and exciting campus that would eventually be open to all of our students.

The academic plan for UCI Abroad assumes the campus would begin by offering four different degree programs in areas that are most often selected by international students studying in the U.S., with curricula, instructional staff, and academic support services modeled on majors that we currently offer.

- Business
- Engineering—Mechanical
- Biological Sciences
- Computer Science

The curriculum is based on the course-requirements for the selected majors coupled with courses needed to meet our General Education requirements. UCI’s General Education requirements would be accommodated through

- an integrated approach to Humanities and Writing modeled on the Humanities Core Course (Categories I and IV and VII)
- courses required for one or more of the majors but open to all of the students: Math 2A-B and Stats 7 (Category V); Chem 1A-B-C (II); Econ 2A-B + one other Social Science course (III)
- the special circumstances of an international campus with students for whom English is not the first language (Categories VI and VIII)

Two enrollment scenarios were considered for this study: a large cohort of 1,000 students, and a small cohort of 500 students. (Detailed enrollment plans for each of the majors, by quarter and by year, with faculty and “Lecturers” [i.e., lab assistants, discussion leaders, and non-faculty instructors] are available on the UCI Abroad Website.) For the “Large Cohort” scenario, enrollments are based on current maximum enrollment for the courses as presently offered at UCI. For the “Small Cohort scenario, enrollments are scaled back to the minimum required to generate enough revenues to support the campus within four years exclusive of start-up costs. For the “Larger Cohort,” the number of faculty increases, though not at the rate of enrollment because much of the increased enrollment is accommodated simply by larger class-size. The number of lecturers increases more in proportion with enrollment. Together, these two scenarios establish the range of enrollment that could be supported by this array of degree-programs and these numbers of faculty assuming the courses are offered as they are now at UCI.

A conceptual budget was developed for each of those scenarios to test their fiscal viability. The budgets assume revenues from tuition of $35,070/student based on the current UC tuition rate and associated fees. Expenditures are based on current costs for services and facilities at Irvine, including salaries and benefits, operating costs, financial aid, maintenance, and debt service (or lease costs) for facilities. We would not necessarily have to charge that full non-resident tuition, of course, and it is highly
unlikely that all these costs, especially those for facilities and some administrative functions, would be borne directly by UCI Abroad. Branch campuses, especially during start-up periods, customarily operate in partnership with a local institution and are supported in part by private philanthropy and government agencies. Nevertheless, in order to provide a comprehensive projection of potential revenues and expenditures, we have included all costs and no ancillary revenue sources in our estimates.

The budgets cover a start-up period beginning with a planning year with staff on site but no students (Year 0) through build out of the academic plan four years later (Year Four). Based on those assumptions, the Small Cohort would require about $37 million in start-up funding before it began producing net annual revenues (i.e., less expenditure) of $5.1 million in Year Four. If all revenues were devoted to repaying the start-up funding, it would take the Small Cohort about ten years. The Large Cohort would require about $35 million in start-up funding, but it would produce net revenue of $8.4 million in the second year of instruction (Year 2) and $23.2 million in Year 3. By Year 4, the Large Cohort would have repaid all of its start-up funding and still have net revenue of $35.8 million. In the following years, the Large Cohort would produce net revenue of $39.6 million annually. Budget details and the facilities plan are available on the website.

Comments:

Location of UCI Abroad

If the campus decides to proceed with planning for UCI Abroad, one of the first tasks will be to develop a set of criteria for the selection of a site, starting with those characteristics that will best support the academic plan of the branch campus and enhance our international visibility and influence. We must avoid any location that conflicts with the fundamental values and policies of UCI and the University of California generally while remaining sensitive to and respectful of the local laws and customs of our prospective hosts.

The Academic Plan

The academic plan for UCI Abroad assumes that the campus would start by offering those majors most in demand by international students studying in the U.S. according to the Institute of International Education (http://www.iie.org/opendoors). Matching those majors to the majors we offer at UCI, we used the programs listed above for this feasibility study. For the sake of clarity and simplicity in planning, we have assumed these majors would be designed and delivered as they are now, based on the three-quarter academic year. All instruction would be in English and based on technologically-enhanced classroom delivery, supplemented to a limited extent by on-line courses as they are developed and proven to be effective.

Numerous options could be explored, however, starting with a required set of courses in the summer before students matriculate, i.e., a bridge program that would stress English-
language skills, acculturation to U.S. model of higher education, etc. It would also be desirable to imagine, from the beginning, UCI Abroad as operating on a four-quarter academic year, using the summers to offer minors in any of the four disciplines, additional intensive language training in oral and written English, etc. We might also use UCI Abroad to experiment with more fundamental curricular innovations, including blended majors for the sciences and engineering, a fully-integrated first-year experience for all students, or different approaches to General Education.

Other options might include exploration of different kinds of delivery, including more on-line courses, blended modes of delivery (on-line, Web-supported classrooms, etc.), and exchange programs between UCI Abroad and the home campus at Irvine. The latter option might accommodate an even wider range of majors very quickly, using the UCI Abroad lower-division courses in any of the majors as a step toward more specialized majors available in Irvine, such as Biological Sciences majors at UCI Abroad coming to Irvine to complete a major in Nursing Science. Focusing UCI Abroad on lower-division education would also be a way of limiting costs for the international campus in the first few years while maintaining at least some of the projected revenues from the non-resident tuition, assuming at least some of the students would complete the last two years of their degrees at the Irvine campus.

After this start-up plan was completed, or even during its later stages, UCI Abroad could expand to replicate much more of the home campus, including a wider range of majors, graduate programs (as faculty and research facilities at UCI Abroad expanded), and a more ambitious on-site research agenda that might even include programs unique to the international campus.

Instructional Staff

Instructional staff includes faculty FTE at customary course-loads for each of the four disciplines, and Lecturers as section leaders where appropriate, with section-sizes based on current practices for that discipline. For planning purposes, we assume all sections are led by Lecturers, not graduate students. The necessary number of faculty and lecturers was determined by the way we currently staff and deliver those courses, i.e., in many cases at the lower-division level via a large lecture taught by a member of the faculty with smaller discussion sections and/or labs staffed by lecturers. This study assumes no TAs would be used, at least in the earliest years of UCI Abroad. Non-faculty instructors include those needed to oversee discussion sections and run labs, up to more independent section leaders such as those who might staff composition courses and sections of the Humanities Core Course.

The overall student-faculty ratio in both scenarios exceeds what would be acceptable at a UC campus generally, but that is an effect of starting with these high-enrollment majors, using a lecture-section format in most courses, offering few options for electives, and assuming students will not take more than the minimum number of courses required for graduation (i.e., 45 4-unit courses). These limitations would be mitigated somewhat by the extensive support services planned for UCI Abroad, on-line delivery of some
electives, and effective use of Summer Session to offer supplemental courses and more options. We also imagine extensive exchange opportunities that would allow UCI Abroad students to take some of their coursework at the Irvine campus, ranging from courses in Summer Session up to and including one or two years of more specialized upper-division work. As enrollments at UCI Abroad grow, cohorts would increase in size, more faculty would be hired, the range of courses and majors offered at UCI Abroad would expand. Eventually, graduate-level programs could be launched as research facilities allowed.

Student Life

A key part of the academic plan for UCI Abroad is the creation of a residential college environment for all students, with tutorial services and advising integrated into the campus life. We imagine all students living on-campus, at least for the first year or two of their time at UCI Abroad. Support services, recreational and social opportunities, and student-life in general would be closely integrated with coursework and less formal educational activities to create a setting characteristic of honors-colleges or small liberal arts campuses.

Administrative and Support Staff

Staffing policies and practices for courses and support services are modeled on current levels at UCI. Hiring standards and terms of employment for faculty and staff would be the same for people hired and working at UCI Abroad and the Irvine campuses. At the beginning, most and perhaps all faculty and Lecturers will be resident on the Irvine campus and travel to UCI Abroad for brief periods of time up to one year. Eventually, UCI Abroad would probably hire on-site and establish a resident faculty whose research programs would be based at the branch campus. Staff and many Lecturers are more likely to be hired locally, though in the earliest years people from the Irvine campus will be needed for training and oversight. A stipend to encourage participation at UCI Abroad is part of the planning budget for faculty and may be needed for Lecturers and staff as well, but travel and stipends are not budgeted for Lecturers or staff in this plan.

Administrative roles/offices for UCI Abroad reflect the current range of services provided at Irvine and assume most of those services would need to be provided or at least overseen on site, while some services could be provided remotely from the Irvine campus. Numbers of support staff in the study estimate personnel needed to provide/oversee those services for the proposed number of faculty and students at the branch campus and by expanding the staff at Irvine.

Facilities

The nature and cost of facilities are more dependent on the actual site chosen for the branch campus than most other parts of this study. The facilities described here are rough estimates based on the number of students, faculty and staff distributed according to needs of the different courses, support services, and administrative functions.
facility plan for the Small Cohort includes 71,450 assignable square feet, which equates to approximately 117,500 gross square feet. The Large Cohort plan would require 105,100 asf and 174,400 gsf. The cost estimate for facilities is based on the budgets for several recent projects completed at UCI with similar space types. A more detailed account of the space is included.

Planning Group

This study was developed by the Vice Provost for Academic Planning through extensive consultation with a small informal group of faculty and administrators.

Michael P. Clark, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Committee Chair
Albert F. Bennett, Dean, School of Biological Sciences
Michael Dennin, Chair, Council on Educational Policy
Gail Hart, Director, Campuswide Honors Program
Janet Mason, Director, Capital Planning
Gary Matkin, Dean, Continuing Education, Distance Learning, and Summer Session
Andrew J. Policano, Dean, Paul Merage School of Business
Norma Price, Director, Academic Budget
Hal S. Stern, Dean, Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences
Gregory Washington, Dean, Henry Samueli School of Engineering

Any questions about this study and the process of development should be addressed to Michael P. Clark, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, at mpclark@uci.edu or (949) 824-6503.
A conceptual budget was developed for each of those scenarios to test their fiscal viability. The budgets assume revenues from tuition of $35,070/student based on the current UC tuition rate and associated fees. Expenditures are based on current costs for services and facilities at Irvine, including salaries and benefits, operating costs, financial aid, maintenance, and debt service (or lease costs) for facilities. We would not necessarily have to charge that full non-resident tuition, of course, and it is highly unlikely that all these costs, especially those for facilities and some administrative functions, would be borne directly by UCI Abroad. Branch campuses, especially during start-up periods, customarily operate in partnership with a local institution and are supported in part by private philanthropy and government agencies. Nevertheless, in order to provide a comprehensive projection of potential revenues and expenditures, we have included all costs and no ancillary revenue sources in our estimates.

The budgets cover a start-up period beginning with a planning year with staff on site but no students (Year 0) through build out of the academic plan four years later (Year Four). Based on those assumptions, the Small Cohort would require about $37 million in start-up funding before it began producing net annual revenues (i.e., less expenditure) of $5.1 million in Year Four. If all revenues were devoted to repaying the start-up funding, it would take the Small Cohort about ten years. The Large Cohort would require about $35 million in start-up funding, but it would produce net revenue of $8.4 million in the second year of instruction (Year 2) and $23.2 million in Year 3. By Year 4, the Large Cohort would have repaid all of its start-up funding and still have net revenue of $35.8 million. In the following years, the Large Cohort would produce net revenue of $39.6 million annually. Budget details and the facilities plan are available on the website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 0 Planning</th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four and Continuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Faculty Instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,535,000</td>
<td>35,070,000</td>
<td>49,098,000</td>
<td>63,126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,880,555</td>
<td>31,731,555</td>
<td>40,310,555</td>
<td>49,987,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Less</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(16,880,555)</td>
<td>(14,196,555)</td>
<td>(5,240,555)</td>
<td>(889,555)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,112,445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Cumulative start-up/revenue shortfall Years 0-3 = $37,207,220
Note: Remaining facilities debt service after Year Four = $79,105,546

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 0 Planning</th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four and Continuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Faculty Instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,070,000</td>
<td>70,140,000</td>
<td>98,196,000</td>
<td>126,252,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,960,480</td>
<td>48,575,480</td>
<td>61,730,480</td>
<td>74,912,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Less</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(21,960,480)</td>
<td>(13,505,480)</td>
<td>(8,409,520)</td>
<td>(23,283,520)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>39,626,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Cumulative start-up/revenue shortfall Years 0-1 = $35,465,960
Note: Remaining facilities debt service after Year Four = $117,594,800
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Course 3</th>
<th>Course 4</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Quarter</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Quarter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

7. Faculty workload = 3 courses per year. Lecturer workload = 16 sections/year except as noted in Humanities Core, ESL, and American Culture.

5. First year students should be required to participate in Bridge programs the summer before their first Fall Quarter. Bridge Program would consist of Academic English/ESL coursework and an American Cultures course.

1. Summer before Year 1: required ESL/General Bridge courses, counseling, etc. Instructors would be in addition to totals listed here, or some of the ESL, etc. instructors from FWS could be moved to Summer.
## International Education - Draft Budget - Overview - Larger Cohort

### Inaugural Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1st Year of Instruction</th>
<th>2nd Year of Instruction</th>
<th>3rd Year of Instruction</th>
<th>Steady State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue from program fee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,070,000</td>
<td>70,140,000</td>
<td>98,196,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Inaugural Year</th>
<th>1st Year of Instruction</th>
<th>2nd Year of Instruction</th>
<th>3rd Year of Instruction</th>
<th>Steady State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty &amp; other instructors s&amp;b and related expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,733,000</td>
<td>12,421,000</td>
<td>16,387,000</td>
<td>19,294,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noninstructional staffing s&amp;b</td>
<td>4,422,000</td>
<td>8,829,000</td>
<td>11,026,000</td>
<td>12,797,000</td>
<td>14,615,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard nonsalary s&amp;e, equipment</td>
<td>1,171,000</td>
<td>4,913,000</td>
<td>6,207,000</td>
<td>7,725,000</td>
<td>8,976,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student financial aid @ 15% of revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,261,000</td>
<td>10,521,000</td>
<td>14,729,000</td>
<td>18,938,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service on space</td>
<td>11,759,480</td>
<td>11,759,480</td>
<td>11,759,480</td>
<td>11,759,480</td>
<td>11,759,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMP (maintenance)</td>
<td>1,744,000</td>
<td>1,744,000</td>
<td>1,744,000</td>
<td>1,744,000</td>
<td>1,744,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (unplanned expenses)</td>
<td>2,864,000</td>
<td>6,336,000</td>
<td>8,052,000</td>
<td>9,771,000</td>
<td>11,299,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,960,480</td>
<td>48,575,480</td>
<td>61,730,480</td>
<td>74,912,480</td>
<td>86,625,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Revenue Less Annual Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Inaugural Year</th>
<th>1st Year of Instruction</th>
<th>2nd Year of Instruction</th>
<th>3rd Year of Instruction</th>
<th>Steady State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repay start-up costs</td>
<td>(21,960,480)</td>
<td>(13,505,480)</td>
<td>8,409,520</td>
<td>23,283,520</td>
<td>39,626,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for other needs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(8,409,520)</td>
<td>(23,283,520)</td>
<td>(3,772,920)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assumptions

16. Start-up costs repaid over subsequent years
17. Standard nonsalary expenses calculated as % of S&B 26%
18. Financial aid will be available; calculated as % of revenue 15%
19. Debt service: 15 years at 5.75% for $116M facility 5.75% 15 116,100,000
20. OMP: $10 per square foot; 174,400 OGSF 10 174,400
21. Contingency calculated as percent of projected expenses 15%
22. Self-supporting functions include: student residence halls; bookstore; dining services, parking, recreation services
23. Functions that will be handled remotely by personnel at Irvine campus include: Equal Opportunity and Diversity; sponsored projects administration; administrative policy and records
## International Education - Draft Budget - Overview - Smaller Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Inaugural Year</th>
<th>1st Year of Instruction</th>
<th>2nd Year of Instruction</th>
<th>3rd Year of Instruction</th>
<th>Steady State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Enrollments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Revenue from program fee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,535,000</td>
<td>35,070,000</td>
<td>49,098,000</td>
<td>63,126,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Expenditures                                  |                |                        |                        |                        |              |
| 3 Faculty & other instructors s&b and related expenses | -              | 5,531,000               | 7,521,000               | 11,105,000              | 13,517,000   |
| 4 Noninstructional staffing s&b              | 4,422,000      | 7,023,000               | 8,851,000               | 10,257,000              | 11,700,000   |
| 5 Standard nonsalary s&e, equipment          | 1,171,000      | 3,323,000               | 4,334,000               | 5,655,000               | 6,675,000    |
| 6 Student financial aid @ 15% of revenue     | -              | 2,630,000               | 5,261,000               | 7,365,000               | 9,469,000    |
| 7 Debt service on space                      | 7,910,555      | 7,910,555               | 7,910,555               | 7,910,555               | 7,910,555    |
| 8 OMP (maintenance)                          | 1,175,000      | 1,175,000               | 1,175,000               | 1,175,000               | 1,175,000    |
| 9 Contingency (unplanned expenses)           | 2,202,000      | 4,139,000               | 5,258,000               | 6,520,000               | 7,567,000    |
| 10 Total                                     | 16,880,555     | 31,731,555              | 40,310,555              | 49,987,555              | 58,013,555   |

| 11 Annual Revenue Less Annual Expenditures   | (16,880,555)   | (14,196,555)            | (5,240,555)             | (889,555)               | 5,112,445    |
| 12 Repay start-up costs                      | -              | -                       | -                       | -                       | (5,112,445)  |
| 13 Available for other needs                 | -              | -                       | -                       | -                       | -            |

| 14 Start-up costs to be recovered in years beyond those illustrated here | 32,094,773 |
| 15 Debt service to be paid in years beyond those illustrated here        | 79,105,546 |

**Assumptions**

16 - Start-up costs repaid over subsequent years
17 - Standard nonsalary expenses calculated as % of S&B 26%
18 - Financial aid will be available; calculated as % of revenue 15%
19 - Debt service: 15 years at 5.75% for $78M facility 5.75% 15 78,100,000
20 - OMP: $10 per square foot; 117,500 OGSF 10 117,500
21 - Contingency calculated as percent of projected expenses 15%
22 - Self-supporting functions include: student residence halls; bookstore; dining services, parking, recreation services
23 - Functions that will be handled remotely by personnel at Irvine campus include: Equal Opportunity and Diversity; sponsored projects administration; administrative policy and records
## UCI Abroad

**Draft Space Program and Estimated Cost**

Based on July 2012 costs (CCI 5950 and EPI 3125)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Space Needs</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space Type</td>
<td>Estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Type</td>
<td>No. Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 seats</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 seats</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 seats</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Classrooms</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Laboratories and Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Class Lab Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Class Labs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Instructional and Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Project Rooms (Engineering)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Computer Lab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Classroom Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Support</td>
<td>7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Instructional Space</strong></td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Offices</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Offices</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Academic offices</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Staff</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Administrative Offices</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Office Support Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Office and Support Space</strong></td>
<td>39,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Equipment ($/ASF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL - UCI ABROAD</strong></td>
<td>71,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Draft Space Program and Estimated Cost

**Based on July 2012 costs (CCCI 5950 and EPI 3125)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>Estimated Space Needs</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Needed</td>
<td>ASF/each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Laboratories</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Instructional and Support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Offices</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Offices</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Staff</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Office and Support Space</strong></td>
<td>56,450</td>
<td>94,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Equipment ($/ASF)</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL - UCI ABROAD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>ASF/each</th>
<th>Total ASF</th>
<th>OGSF</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost/OGSF</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105,100</td>
<td>174,400</td>
<td>$116,063,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Academic Council has sent for Systemwide review a proposal for a new APM Section 430, which creates a new Visiting Scholar title in response to requests from campus administrators. The proposed new APM section is available online at the following website:

http://www.ucop.edu/acadpersonnel/apm/review.html

I would ask that your Councils consider the proposal, and be prepared to discuss this item at the Senate Cabinet meeting scheduled for December 4, 2012. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Mary Gilly, Senate Chair

C: Shira Long
   Mia Larson
   Charlene Mandau
COUNCIL OF VICE CHANCELLORS
LABORATORY DIRECTOR ALIVISATOS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR POWELL
ANR VICE PRESIDENT ALLEN-DIAZ

Dear Colleagues:

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed New Policy APM - 430, Visiting Scholars

Enclosed for Systemwide Review is proposed new policy APM - 430, Visiting Scholars. The proposal is responsive to campus requests to create a new title to accommodate domestic and international visitors who are students enrolled in universities in the United States and abroad, and academics employed at other institutions who are visiting the University of California for short-term academic or cultural exchange experiences.

These visitors are ineligible for any other academic title. Educational criteria is flexible, and there is no salary requirement beyond the established campus minimum funding standards already in place to satisfy federal visa requirements relating to funding for exchange visitors. Self-funding, either by personal funds or third-party funding payable directly to the Visiting Scholar, is required. Visiting Scholars are ineligible for University compensation. University of California titles available for compensated appointments are within the postdoctoral scholar title series and the specialist title series.

This policy is intended to support the International Students and Scholars Offices (ISSO) as well as Visiting Scholars. The policy does not provide instruction related to visa classification. However, it assumes that the ISSO and Visiting Scholars will abide by current federal regulations as well as University and campus policy related to visa sponsorship.

Systemwide Review is a public review distributed to the Chancellors and Executive Vice Chancellors requesting that they inform the general University community, affected employees and unions about policy proposals. Systemwide Review also includes a mandatory, three-month full Senate review.

Employees should be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the draft new policy, available online at: http://www.ucop.edu/acadpersonnel/apm/review.html. Attached is a model communication which may be used to inform non-exclusively represented employees affected by these proposals.
This letter and enclosures anticipate that you will begin Systemwide Review of the proposed draft and submit comments no later than November 30, 2012. Please send comments on the proposed policy to ADV-VPCARLSON-SA@ucop.edu. Questions may be directed to Janet Lockwood at Janet.Lockwood@ucop.edu or (510) 987-9499.

Sincerely,

Susan Carlson
Vice Provost
Academic Personnel

Enclosures:  
Draft new policy APM - 430
Model communication

cc:  
President Yudof
Chancellors
Provost Dorr
Executive Vice President Brostrom
Senior Vice President Vacca
Vice President Beckwith
Vice President Duckett
Vice Provosts – Academic Personnel
Academic Personnel Directors
Executive Director Fox
Executive Director Rodrigues
Executive Director Tanaka
Executive Director Winnacker
Deputy General Counsel Birnbaum
Senior Counsel Van Houten
Systemwide Policy Director Capell
Assistant Director Ernst
Manager Lockwood
Human Resources Policy Analyst Bello
Senior Administrative Analyst Rupert
Administrative Officer Abbott
430-4  **Definition**

A Visiting Scholar is a student enrolled in an institution outside of the University of California or an individual employed by or affiliated with an outside institution or agency who is visiting the University of California for the purpose of participating in UC-sponsored conferences and partnerships, or for a short-term educational, academic, or research project under the supervision of UC faculty.

430-10  **Criteria for Appointment**

Visiting Scholars will possess:

1) a baccalaureate degree; or

2) equivalent; or

3) recognized expertise in a field.

Undergraduate students may be sponsored as well at the discretion of the host campus.

430-18  **Salary**

a. Visiting Scholars are ineligible for compensation from the University of California.
b. Visiting Scholars are self-supported or have adequate support funds from external sources and provide evidence of such funding to the campus office charged with the responsibility to oversee these appointments.

430-20 **Conditions of Appointment**

a. Visiting Scholars are appointed for short periods of time not to exceed one year (12 months), and more typically, for six (6) months or less. The appointment is self-terminating unless the appointee is otherwise notified.

b. Service as a Visiting Scholar constitutes neither formal employment nor enrollment as a student at the University of California.

c. Visiting Scholars may not be UC-registered students, currently working for UC as contractors, or have any other active appointment or employment with the University of California.

d. The University of California reserves the right to withdraw the privileges and terminate the appointment without prior notice.

e. Visiting Scholars may be eligible for reimbursement of business and travel expenses. A reimbursable expense is an expense incurred which is related to activities that contribute to any one of the University’s major functions of teaching, research, patient care, or public service.\(^1\)

---

1 See Business and Finance Bulletin G-28 for guidelines related to reimbursement of business and travel expenses.
430-24 Authority to Appoint

a. The Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost or the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost’s designee may approve an exception to extend an appointment beyond twelve months when conditions warrant.

b. Subject to the provisions of this policy statement, each campus should establish authority and procedures to appoint and reappoint Visiting Scholars.
ALAN TERRICCIANO, CHAIR  
COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL*

GOPI MEENAKSHISUNDARAM, CHAIR  
COUNCIL ON FACULTY WELFARE, DIVERSITY, AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

RE: SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF PROPOSED REVISION TO APM 700, LEAVES OF ABSENCE

EXPECTED COUNCIL DUE DATE: December 12, 2012  
EXPECTED CABINET AGENDA DATE: December 4, 2012

The Academic Council has sent for Systemwide review proposed revision to APM 700, leaves of absence, which would create a presumption of resignation and spell out procedures for notifying the academic employee of that presumption in certain circumstances in which an academic employee is absent from his/her duties without having secured a leave of absence. The policy is available online at:

http://www.ucop.edu/acadpersonnel/apm/review.html

I would ask that your Councils consider the proposal, and be prepared to discuss this item at the Senate Cabinet meeting scheduled for December 4, 2012. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Mary Gilly, Senate Chair

C: Shira Long  
Mia Larson  
Charlene Mandau
COUNCIL OF VICE CHANCELLORS
LABORATORY DIRECTOR ALIVISATOS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR POWELL
ANR VICE PRESIDENT ALLEN-DIAZ

Dear Colleagues:

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised APM - 700, Leaves of Absence/General, Presumptive Resignation

Enclosed for Systemwide Review are proposed revisions to APM - 700, Leaves of Absence/General. The proposal is responsive to campus requests to address the need for a presumptive resignation policy.

This policy is proposed to address circumstances under which an academic appointee chooses not to return to his/her University appointment following the expiration of a leave of absence, or if he/she chooses to be absent from that appointment without obtaining approval for a leave. The presumptive resignation policy is designed to prompt an appointee under these circumstances to take affirmative steps to counter the University’s presumption that the appointee’s intention is to resign the University appointment.

The policy is intended to address resignation from an appointment due to absence from duty: it does not address dismissal procedures; it does not apply when it is established that an academic appointee is absent due to intersession, illness, injury or disability; and it does not address disciplinary matters or academic competency matters.

Key concepts in the policy cover advance written notice of the intent to presume resignation as well as the appointee’s right to respond to the notice, to return to service, to appeal any decision, and to request a hearing before the appropriate governing body. The appointee continues on pay status during the notice period, and pay status terminates on the response deadline date.

The proposed policy applies to academic- and fiscal-year faculty and academic appointees. Absence from duty is defined as a period of thirty (30) days following the expiration of an approved leave or 30-day absence from academic duty without approval. Instances of neglect of academic duty that do not meet this standard will be handled according to applicable academic personnel policies, including but not limited to APM - 015, The Faculty Code of Conduct, APM - 016, University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline, APM - 150, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal, and APM - 075, Termination for Incompetent Performance.

Proposed draft language describes the process of providing written notice by which the campus would implement good faith efforts to locate the absent appointee, the content of such notice, to whom the appointee would respond, and the date the response is due. It requires that the Chancellor confer with the
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Chair of the Privilege and Tenure Committee should a faculty member fail to respond to the initial written notice within sixty (60) days. Communications between the Chancellor and the Privilege and Tenure Committee Chair must be documented.

Systemwide Review is a public review distributed to the Chancellors and Executive Vice Chancellors requesting that they inform the general University community, affected employees and unions about the policy proposals. Systemwide Review also includes a mandatory, three-month full Senate review.

Employees should be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the revisions, which are available online at: http://www.ucop.edu/acadpersonnel/apm/review.html. Enclosed is a model communication which can be used to inform non-exclusively represented employees affected by these proposals.

This letter and enclosures anticipate that you will begin Systemwide Review of the proposed draft and submit comments no later than November 30, 2012. Please send comments on the proposed policy to ADV-VPCARLSON-SA@ucop.edu. Questions may be directed to Janet Lockwood at Janet.Lockwood@ucop.edu or (510) 987-9499.

Sincerely,

Susan Carlson
Vice Provost
Academic Personnel

Enclosures: Draft revised policy APM - 700
Model Communication

cc: President Yudof
Chancellors
Provost Dorr
Executive Vice President Brostrom
Senior Vice President Vacca
Vice President Beckwith
Vice President Duckett
Vice Provosts – Academic Personnel
Academic Personnel Directors
Executive Director Fox
Executive Director Rodrigues
Executive Director Tanaka
Executive Director Winnacker
Deputy General Counsel Birnbaum
Senior Counsel Van Houten
Systemwide Policy Director Capell
Assistant Director Ernst
Manager Lockwood
Human Resources Analyst Bello
Senior Administrative Analyst Rupert
Administrative Officer Abbott
700-0 Policy

The basic policy for academic leaves of absence is set forth in Standing Order 100.4(e) of The Regents.

The President is authorized to grant leaves of absence with or without pay, in accordance with such regulations as the President may establish.

Academic year appointees are expected to be present from the beginning of the Fall Semester (Quarter) through the end of the Spring Semester (Quarter). Any appointee returning after the beginning of the Fall Semester (Quarter) or leaving before the end of the Spring Semester (Quarter) should apply in advance for a leave of absence in accordance with these sections.

Fiscal-year appointees who render service throughout the calendar year (12 months) shall also apply in advance for leaves requested outside of vacation days.

700-8 Types

Specific regulations have been established by The Regents and the President on for certain types of leaves of absence. These are as follows:
a. Sick leave (APM - 710)

b. Family and medical leave (APM - 715)

c. Holidays (APM - 720)

d. Vacation (APM - 730)

e. Sabbatical leave (APM - 740)

f. Leave for service to governmental agencies (APM - 750)

g. Military leave (APM - 751)

h. Leave to attend professional meetings or other University business (APM - 752)

i. Other leaves with pay (APM - 758)

j. Other leaves without pay (APM - 759)
k. Family accommodations for childbearing and childrearing (APM - 760)

700-30 Presumptive Resignation Policy & Procedures

If any academic appointee is absent from academic duty for 30 calendar days or more without an approved leave, or does not return to academic duty for 30 calendar days or more after an approved leave expires, the University shall presume (subject to the conditions set forth below) that the academic appointee has resigned from his or her University appointment and shall separate that appointee consistent with the timelines and provisions below.

This presumptive resignation policy does not apply to absences due to intersession nor does it apply when it is established that an academic appointee is absent due to:

- illness, injury, or disability addressed by APM - 710 (medical leave) and APM - 080 (medical separation) when medical leave is no longer approved in anticipation of medical separation; or

- discipline imposed by University APM - 015 (The Faculty Code of Conduct), APM - 016 (University Policy on Faculty Conduct and Administration of Discipline) and court action(s) including stay-away orders.
a. Written Notice of Intent to Separate the Appointee

Following a 30-day absence as described above, as well as a documented effort to contact the appointee via phone, mail, email and internet search, the Chancellor will send to the appointee’s home address on payroll file a written notice of intent to deem the appointee’s unapproved absence as a presumed resignation. The notice shall state that within 60 calendar days after the date of the letter if the appointee has not (a) returned to academic duty or (b) sought and been granted an appropriate leave, the appointee may be deemed to have resigned from the University effective on the 61st day after the date of the letter with a resulting cessation of pay and benefits. The written notice of intent to deem the appointee’s unapproved absence a presumed resignation shall advise the appointee that s/he has a right to make an oral or written response to a named campus administrator within 60 calendar days of the date of the letter. The notice shall include the name and address of the person to whom the appointee should respond, and the date by which a response must be received.

b. Response to Written Notice of Intent

1. Subject to b.2. (below), an appointee’s oral or written response that s/he is not resigning shall be followed by either (a) return to academic duty or (b) an approved leave. An appointee’s failure to return to duty or to
obtain an approved leave may result in a deemed resignation effective on the 61st day after the date of the notice of intent to deem the appointee’s absence as a presumed resignation, with a resulting cessation of pay and benefits.

2. An appointee’s response may rebut the presumption of resignation by establishing through the provision of reliable information that, through no fault of his/her own, the leave could neither have been obtained prior to the first day of absence nor during the intervening period.

3. An appointee’s response that s/he is resigning constitutes an actual, not a presumptive, resignation.

c. Written Notice of Action to Separate the Appointee

Following review of the appointee’s response, if any, and written notification of the chair of the Privilege and Tenure Committee and the Committee’s response, the Chancellor will make a final determination whether an appointee shall be deemed to have resigned and so notify the appointee in writing. The written notice shall advise the appointee of a right to a hearing (see APM - 700-30-d).
The authority to make the final determination rests with the Chancellor and may not be redelegated with respect to Academic Senate members. The authority may be redelegated with respect to non-Senate academic appointees.

d. **Right to Grieve a Hearing**

Academic Senate faculty members who are deemed to have resigned pursuant to this policy have the right to a hearing before the division Privilege and Tenure Committee under Academic Senate Bylaw 337. Other academic appointees who are deemed to have resigned pursuant to this policy have the right to a Step III Hearing as described in APM – 140.

**700-94 Applications**

Applications for certain leaves require information in addition to that included on the standard form. If additional information is required, it will be described in subsection 94 of the section covering the particular leave.
The Academic Council has sent for Systemwide review a proposed Open Access Policy developed by the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC). The policy would expand open access to research publications by University of California faculty by changing the default relationship between faculty authors and scholarly publishers to one in which authors grant the University a non-exclusive license to the work.

The proposed policy would also require that authors deposit a digital copy of the final version of their published works with the California Digital Library. Authors would be allowed to opt out of the license grant at their own discretion. However, publishers that demand exclusive rights would need to ask authors to choose to opt-out. The proposed policy, UCOLASC’s transmittal letter, and a paper responding to specific faculty concerns are posted on the Systemwide Senate website. Additional material will also be made available on the web over the coming months.

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/MKW2DivCtteChairs_OAproposalAug2012FINAL.pdf

I would ask that your Councils consider the proposal, and be prepared to discuss this item at the Senate Cabinet meeting scheduled for December 4, 2012. Please advise the Senate office if your Council opts out of the review. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.
C: Michelle AuCoin
   Shira Long
   Jill Kato
   Charlene Mandau
   Thao Nguyen

Mary Gilly, Senate Chair
August 9, 2012

CHAIRS OF SENATE DIVISIONS
CHAIRS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Dear Division and Committee Chairs:

On behalf of Academic Council Chair Bob Anderson I am forwarding for full Senate review a proposed Open Access Policy developed by the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC). The policy would expand open access to research publications by University of California faculty by changing the default relationship between faculty authors and scholarly publishers to one in which authors grant the University a non-exclusive license to the work. The proposed policy would also require that authors deposit a digital copy of the final version of their published works with the California Digital Library. Authors would be allowed to opt out of the license grant at their own discretion. However, publishers that demand exclusive rights would need to ask authors to choose to opt-out. The proposed policy, UCOLASC’s transmittal letter, and a paper responding to specific faculty concerns are attached. Additional material will also be made available on the web over the coming months.

Because the proposed policy touches on core faculty concerns, Council encourages every division and committee to engage a broad constituency in discussing it. Representatives of UCOLASC are prepared to offer input into your discussions if this would be helpful, and my office will is ready to assist with the necessary arrangements if needed.

Please provide comments by January 11, 2013. In the meanwhile, please feel free to contact me or 2012-13 Council Chair Bob Powell at any time if you have questions or concerns about how to conduct this review.

Sincerely,

Martha Kendall Winnacker, J.D.
Executive Director, Academic Senate

Encl. (4)
Monday, July 16, 2012

Robert Anderson, Chair
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Proposed Policy to Expand Open Access to Research Publications at the University of California

Dear Bob,

I hereby submit for review by the Academic Council a policy to expand open access to research publications by University of California faculty. UCOLASC requests that Academic Council adopt this policy and forward it to the President for implementation as a presidential policy.

The proposed policy is one strategy in an ongoing effort at UC to transform the scholarly publishing industry and improve the accessibility and visibility of our scholarly research. UCOLASC has worked continuously for the last 8 months to understand the issues, address diverse concerns and to prepare a policy we think will both benefit and protect the UC system and the faculty. The proposed policy will provide unprecedented access to research publications by the public and send a strong message to scholarly publishers that any changes to the scholarly publishing system must include full and permanent open access to our research publications.

The key function of this policy is to change the default relationship that faculty have with scholarly publishers. Currently, each faculty member must individually negotiate open access rights with each individual publisher for each publication. The proposed policy would invert that relationship. It would make open access the default right of faculty and instead force publishers to request exclusive rights (by asking authors to opt-out). By making this a collective policy, individual faculty benefit from their membership in the policy-making group. Moreover, under this policy faculty members both retain ownership of their copyright and have an unobstructed right to opt out of the license for any reason.

Over 140 universities worldwide have implemented policies such as the one we propose here, including most recently our own UCSF, who voted on May 21st to implement a nearly identical strategy. Faculty at peer institutions such as Harvard, Duke, Princeton, MIT, Kansas University and many others have passed policies promising to make their work available to the world via open access digital repositories. Many of these policies were based on lessons learned from UC’s own previous attempt to formulate an open access policy in 2007. As a result, there is now much experience on which assess the effects of this policy.
All current policies are similar in design to the one proposed here. Although they differ in minor details, they each do basically the same two things. First, they collectively grant to the university a non-exclusive license for each research publication so that the university might make a version of that work available via an open access repository. Second, they obligate faculty to assist in this effort by providing a copy of each article (or the URL of an open access version) to that repository—in our case the well-established eScholarship repository run by the California Digital Library. eScholarship is prepared to begin implementation immediately.

The current proposed policy has been crafted in conversation with many constituencies. It has been extensively discussed and has the support of the Library and COLASC committees of all ten campuses, The California Digital Library, the University Council of Librarians, several Graduate Student Associations, the Library Association of the University of California, as well as the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) and the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP). The University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) and the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) both communicated concerns that were discussed and addressed at UCOLASC’s May 25th meeting. UCOLASC has replied by letter addressing these concerns in detail.

The issue of open access to scholarly publications is a thorny and complicated one involving many technical issues related to copyright law, the rapid transformation of new information technologies and the changing practices of publishers and libraries. It is clear to UCOLASC that the current system is both economically unsustainable for UC and its libraries and that it does not function in our interests. There are many different ideas circulating for how to make open access both possible and sustainable, and the scholarly publishing ecology changes rapidly. Many publishers have already committed to open access, but others (especially the largest and most profitable) have not: they remain committed to a subscription-based model that puts artificial and insupportable restrictions on scholarly research and excessive strain on library budgets.

The proposed open access policy is a single component in an effort to transform this system; it is not an overnight solution to the challenges of scholarly publishing; but in our considered opinion, neither is it a dangerous one. It is, however, a crucial and necessary first step in transforming our collective relationship to publishers, it sends a powerful message from the largest public university in the world, and it charts a path towards a sustainable, healthy scholarly publication system openly available to everyone.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher M. Kelty, Chair, UCOLASC

Encl:
The Final Draft Open Access Policy
Presentation “An Open Access Policy for the University of California”
Proposed UC Open Access Policy: Questions and Concerns
The Faculty of The University of California is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In particular, as part of a public university system, the Faculty is dedicated to making its scholarship available to the people of California. In keeping with this commitment to open dissemination and public access, the Faculty adopts the following policy:

Each Faculty member grants to the University of California a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same. The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles published before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with Faculty authors under existing University of California policy. Application of the license will be waived for a particular article or access delayed for a specified period of time upon express direction by a Faculty member to the University of California.

To assist the University in disseminating and archiving the articles, each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of his or her final version of the article to the University of California by the date of its publication. The University of California will make the article available in an open access repository. When appropriate, a Faculty member may instead notify the University of California if the article will be freely available in another repository or as an open-access publication.

The Academic Senate and the University of California will be responsible for implementing this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending any changes to the Faculty. The Academic Senate and the University of California will review the policy within three years, and present a report to the Faculty.

The Faculty calls upon the Academic Senate and the University of California to develop and monitor mechanisms that would render implementation and compliance with the policy as convenient for the Faculty as possible.
An Open Access Policy for the University of California

Christopher M. Kelty, UCLA
Chair, University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
What is Open Access?

In 2002, the Budapest Open Access Initiative defined open access as:

"the world-wide electronic distribution of the peer-reviewed journal literature, completely free and unrestricted access to it by all scientists, scholars, teachers, students, and other curious minds."
Who Benefits from Open Access?

• Scholars in universities
  o increase visibility, usage, and impact of research
  o Retain rights to use and reuse research publications, including derivatives

• Industry, business, arts and scholarship beyond the university
  o Gain access to cutting edge research and new ideas
  o Fuels innovation, discovery, creativity and progress
  o Stimulates and guides public discourse and debate

• The people of California (and the world)
  o Get a return on their investment and taxes when research is freely available
  o Promotes knowledge and free expression as a public good

• Libraries, K-12, educators generally
  o Gain access to the latest research
  o Creates a basis for better learning and teaching everywhere

• Publishers
  o Reduced transactions costs in managing complex subscriptions
  o Doing the right thing with scholarly research
Who has access now?

• **Scholars in universities**
  - increase visibility, usage, and impact of research
  - Retain rights to use and reuse research publications, including derivatives

• **Industry, business, arts and scholarship beyond the university**
  - Gain access to cutting edge research and new ideas
  - Fuels innovation, discovery, creativity and progress.
  - Stimulates and guides public discourse and debate

• **The people of California (and the world)**
  - Get a return on their investment and taxes when research is freely available
  - Promotes knowledge and free expression as a public good

• **Libraries, K–12, educators generally**
  - Gain access to the latest research
  - Creates a basis for better learning and teaching everywhere

• **Publishers**
  - Reduced transactions costs in managing complex subscriptions
  - Doing the right thing with scholarly research
What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

• The Scholarly publishing industry is concentrating, and subscription costs are out of control. Meanwhile, the largest for-profit publishers have profit margins between 30-40%.

• Library revenues have been dropping for decades, and faculty are losing access to content as subscriptions are canceled.

• Faculty provide all of the content and most of the labor: authorship, peer review, editorship, advisory board service, copyediting, even typesetting in some cases.

• Publishers seek greater control over content and its uses. They exert pressure on university libraries through complex negotiations.

• Digital content remains expensive to produce, but is getting cheaper to distribute.

• Open Access is not the solution to the crisis of scholarly publication, but is a necessary component of any future system.
What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

- The Scholarly publishing industry is concentrating, and subscription costs are out of control. Meanwhile, the largest for-profit publishers have profit margins between 30-40%.

![Percent Increase in Cost for the Average Health Sciences Journal versus the CPI](chart.png)
What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

- The Scholarly publishing industry is concentrating, and subscription costs are out of control. The largest for-profit publishers have profit margins between 30-40%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010/2011 Profits, Four Largest Commercial Publishers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

• Library revenues have been dropping for decades, and faculty are losing access to content as subscriptions are canceled.

Cancellations
9 database contracts cancelled since 2008.

600 journals (7.5%) cancelled in 2010-2011, including one entire contract.

More journal cancellations in 2013.
What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

- *Faculty* provide all of the **content** and most of the **labor**: authorship, peer review, editorship, advisory board service, copyediting, even typesetting in some cases.

Examples: UC authorship contribution to Elsevier journals

- UC authors: 2.2% of all Elsevier articles
- UC authors’ estimated contribution to Elsevier revenue: $31M
- UC authors’ estimated contribution to Elsevier profit: $9.8M

UC authors: 12% of all published articles in *Nature*

- UC authors’ estimated contribution to *Nature* revenue: $5M
- UC authors’ estimated contribution to *Nature* profit: $700K
What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

- *Publishers* seek greater **control** over content and its uses. They exert pressure on university libraries through complex negotiations.

---

**Systemwide Subscription Expenditures Negotiated in 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>CDL</th>
<th>10 Campuses</th>
<th>UCLA (e.g.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscription</td>
<td>$38,743,006</td>
<td>$6,261,137</td>
<td>$32,481,869</td>
<td>$4,804,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated in 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$32,481,869**

- **12%** of total
- **16%**
- **84%**

---
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What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

• Digital content remains expensive to produce (the cost that scholars and universities bear) but is getting cheaper to distribute (the cost publishers have traditionally borne).

• *There is no free lunch*: publishing has costs, and someone has to bear them— but it shouldn’t be the public that has already paid for research.

• **Open Access is not the solution to the crisis of scholarly publication, but is a necessary component of any future system.**
How can we achieve Open Access?

• Federal Legislation
  o The NIH Public Access Act, passed in 2006, in effect since 2008. Most medical and health sciences campuses are as predominantly OA already.
  o In Congress now: The Federal Research Public Access Act (FRPAA) would expand OA requirements to all Federal Agencies.

• Open Access Journals
    • Many different funding models, and a range of quality—just as in traditional publication.

• Open Access options from existing publishers
  o Springer Open Pilot with UC and Max Planck— a success, but cancelled by Springer.
  o SCOAP3-consortium to pay for open access to high energy physics research.
  o Sage Open, Nature Communications, Cell Reports.

• Institutional Policies like the one we are proposing
  • 141 Institutions have already passed such policies.
Major US Institutions with OA Mandates

As of June 2012 there are 141 institutional mandates worldwide:

- **Harvard** – February 2008
- **Stanford University** – June 2008
- **MIT** – March 2009
- **Kansas University** – November 2009
- **Duke** – March 2010
- **Emory** – June 2011
- **Princeton** – September 2011
- **USCF** – May 21st, 2012

UC made its first attempt at a System-wide OA Policy in 2006 (upon which many of the above were subsequently based)
What can UC do to achieve open access?

• Negotiate with publishers to demand more open access and better business models to support the mission of maximum access for everyone.
  o UCOLASC regularly reviews, advises and joins in such negotiations with CDL’s negotiators.

• Encourage more publication in OA venues, where appropriate—Lead by Example
  o Senior scholars especially should take the risk of publishing outside of the non-OA journals.
  o Those with the most funding should be encouraged to publish in OA journals.

• Adopt an Open Access policy to change the default relationship to publishers
  o **Before the policy:** Individual scholars must plead with publishers to make a work OA in every case
  o **After the policy:** Publishers must plead with faculty to make the work closed access.
What do Open Access Policies do?

"An Open Access Publication is one that meets the following two conditions:

1. The author(s) and copyright holder(s) grant(s) to all users a free, irrevocable, worldwide, perpetual right of access to, and a license to copy, use, distribute, transmit and display the work publicly and to make and distribute derivative works, in any digital medium for any responsible purpose, subject to proper attribution of authorship, as well as the right to make small numbers of printed copies for their personal use.

2. A complete version of the work and all supplemental materials, including a copy of the permission as stated above, in a suitable standard electronic format is deposited immediately upon initial publication in at least one online repository that is supported by an academic institution, scholarly society, government agency, or other well-established organization that seeks to enable open access, unrestricted distribution, interoperability, and long-term archiving (PubMed Central is such a repository)."

From the 2003 Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing
The Proposed UC Open Access Policy

1. Preamble
2. License Grant
3. Scope
4. Waiver/Opt-out clause
5. Deposit Obligation
6. Review and Oversight
1. Preamble

“The Faculty of The University of California is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In particular, as part of a public university system, the Faculty is dedicated to making its scholarship available to the people of California. In keeping with this commitment to open dissemination and public access, the Faculty adopts the following policy:

2. License Grant

Each Faculty member grants to the University of California a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same.”
3. Scope

The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles published before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with Faculty authors under existing University of California policy.

4. Waiver/Opt-out clause

Application of the license will be waived for a particular article or access delayed for a specified period of time upon express direction by a Faculty member to the University of California.

The policy will apply only to articles published after the policy is adopted. “Scholarly articles” is left somewhat flexible so faculty members may determine whether a given work is covered. Books, artworks, and textbooks are clearly outside the current scope.

The policy contains a strong opt-out waiver in order to balance open access with academic freedom. Faculty may opt-out of the license for any reason, without asking permission. The down-side is that publishers can use this clause to force faculty to opt-out.
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5. Deposit Obligation

To assist the University in disseminating and archiving the articles, each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of his or her final version of the article to the University of California by the date of its publication. The University of California will make the articles available in an open access repository. When appropriate, a Faculty member may instead notify the University of California if the article will be freely available in another repository or as an open-access publication.

The deposit obligation will make the policy into one that facilitates **actual** as opposed to **potential** open access. Without this obligation, only a small portion of the published research would be made available. Although faculty can opt out of the license grant, the expectation is that faculty will nonetheless be obligated to deposit their work in the repository. There are many reasons for depositing work in this repository, whether or not it is made openly available.

- UC (via CDL) often negotiates OA rights independently, and can sometimes make a work OA after an embargo period.
- It provides an easily accessible, permanently archived copy for use and re-use in teaching, in providing copies to scholars, and in republishing or reusing elements of an article.
- It facilitates the creation of a dossier of publications in the promotion and tenure review process.
- It creates a meta-data record that facilitates findability and citation of work.

"Final version" generally means the version after peer review and copyediting. Some publishers allow deposit of the final typeset version, others do not.

The policy allows faculty to meet this obligation in many different ways. Some of the work of deposit can be automated by CDL, especially when faculty already use existing open access repositories.
6. Review and Oversight

The Academic Senate and the University of California will be responsible for implementing this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending any changes to the Faculty. The Academic Senate and the University of California will review the policy within three years, and present a report to the Faculty.

The Faculty calls upon the Academic Senate and the University of California to develop and monitor mechanisms that would render implementation and compliance with the policy as convenient for the Faculty as possible.

The review and oversight of the policy is intended to be carried out jointly by the faculty and the university. In practice, this means the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) and the California Digital Library (CDL). CDL and UCOLASC have a long-standing and collegial relationship, and will represent the primary point of contact for this policy.
The Faculty of The University of California is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In particular, as part of a public university system, the Faculty is dedicated to making its scholarship available to the people of California. In keeping with this commitment to open dissemination and public access, the Faculty adopts the following policy:

Each Faculty member grants to the University of California a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same. The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles published before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with Faculty authors under existing University of California policy. Application of the license will be waived for a particular article or access delayed for a specified period of time upon express direction by a Faculty member to the University of California.

To assist the University in disseminating and archiving the articles, each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of his or her final version of the article to the University of California by the date of its publication. The University of California will make the articles available in an open access repository. When appropriate, a Faculty member may instead notify the University of California if the article will be freely available in another repository or as an open-access publication.

The Academic Senate and the University of California will be responsible for implementing this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending any changes to the Faculty. The Academic Senate and the University of California will review the policy within three years, and present a report to the Faculty.

The Faculty calls upon the Academic Senate and the University of California to develop and monitor mechanisms that would render implementation and compliance with the policy as convenient for the Faculty as possible.
Implementing the Policy

- Depositing in the eScholarship Repository
  - A simple two step process of uploading an article and confirming metadata
  - Some aspects of deposit can be automated by CDL.
- Using the Waiver generator and addendum
  - One-click access to standard forms.
- Improving campus education and support for faculty
- Assessing the Costs and Success of the Policy
Depositing an article

Depositing an article can be achieved in two ways:

1. eScholarship can “harvest” some publications from existing online sources and deposit them on behalf of faculty, or request a copy from faculty.

2. Faculty can deposit a copy of the publication themselves, or provide a URL of the existing OA version.

Faculty can choose to provide additional data about a publication, which can improve its discoverability.
Waiver and Addendum Generators

• **Waiver**
  - Generate a written and signed waiver of open access license
    - For use in any case where a faculty member does not want to make a work OA permanently or for a specified time (embargo)
    - Or where publishers demand confirmation of opt-out
    - Includes option to deposit a version of the article at the time of opt-out/embargo

• **Addendum**
  - Generate an addendum that alerts a publisher to the OA policy and pre-existing non-exclusive license.
    - Easily generated and attached to a publication agreement.
Example Addendum and Waiver

ADDITION TO PUBLICATION AGREEMENT

1. This Addendum modifies and supplements the attached or accompanying agreement (the "Publication Agreement") concerning the article titled,

Test Article Title
(Including any figures and supplementary materials, the "Work")

and published in,

Test Journal Title (Journal).

2. The parties to the Publication Agreement as modified and supplemented by this Addendum are:

a. **Sam Test Author**
   (Individually or, if more than one author, collectively, "Author"); and

b. **Test Press** (Publisher).

3. The parties agree that wherever there is any conflict between this Addendum and the Publication Agreement, the provisions of this Addendum will control and the Publication Agreement will be construed accordingly.

4. Notwithstanding any terms in the Publication Agreement to the contrary, Author and Publisher agree as follows:

a. All of the terms and conditions of the Publication Agreement (including but not limited to all grants, agreements, representations and warranties) are subject to and qualified by a non-exclusive license previously granted by Author to the University of California ("UC"). Under that license, UC may make the Work available and may exercise all rights under copyright relating to the Work, and may authorize others, including the Author, to do the same, provided that the Work is not sold. In the exercise of that license, UC may use a facsimile of the final published version of the Work if Publisher permits use of that version; otherwise, UC may use the Author's final manuscript version of the Work (including all figures and modifications from the peer review process). If UC makes the Work available in an online repository under that license, UC will use all reasonable efforts both to cite to Publisher's definitive version of the Work if it has been published, and to link to Publisher's version if it is available online.

b. Where applicable, all of the terms and conditions of the Publication Agreement (including but not limited to all grants, agreements, representations and warranties) are subject to and qualified by any non-exclusive license previously granted, or previously required to be granted, by Author to a funding entity that financially supported the research reflected in the Work as part of an agreement between Author or Author's employing institution and such funding entity, such as an agency of the United States government, and/or to Author employing institution.

5. Either publication of the Work or Publisher's signature below will constitute Publisher's acceptance of and agreement to this Addendum.

PUBLISHER: ___________________________ Date: __________

26 June 2012

Dear Sam Test Author,

Pursuant to the Open Access Policy adopted by UCSF Faculty on 21 May 2012, this communication serves to notify you that your request for a waiver of the Open Access license for "Example Article Title" to be published in Example Journal Title has been granted.

However, please be aware that even though you are being granted a waiver of the application of the OA license to your article as specified above, if that article is subject to the NIH Public Access Policy because it is a peer-reviewed manuscript that arose, in whole or in part, from NIH-funded research and was accepted for publication on or after April 7, 2008, your obligations under the NIH policy cannot be waived. You must be sure to reserve rights sufficient to comply with the NIH policy when you enter into a publication agreement for the article.

Independent of the waiver, our OA Policy still requires that your article be deposited in a UC repository. This can be done regardless of the waiver status of the article or any agreement that you may have signed with a publisher.

Although you have received a waiver of the OA license, the publisher's agreement may provide sufficient rights to allow copies of your article to be made publicly available in the UC repository. The publisher may ask that certain conditions be met, some of which the repository can easily accommodate (for example, an embargo period during which the article will not be made publicly available). Even if you conclude that your article cannot be made publicly available, depositing a copy of your article in the repository is useful for archival and indexing purposes. The bibliographic information will be made available for harvesting and indexing by search engines, such as Google Scholar, creating increased awareness of your article.

If you have any questions about the UCSF Policy for Open Access, the waiver of the OA license, or depositing your article in the UC repository, please feel free to contact either of us.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Schneider  
Associate Professor  
Chair, UCSF Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC)

Karen Butter  
University Librarian  
Assistant Vice Chancellor
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Improving Campus Education and Support

• Extensive support already exists, courtesy of the Library
  o Scholarly communications officers on each campus
  o Annual “Open Access Week” talks, conferences and festivities
  o Existing (small) funds for OA publication on some campuses
  o Extensive general knowledge about copyright, fair use, publisher practices and digital archiving
  o Campus-specific knowledge about different fields and disciplines

• But...
  o Need for more services does not come free.
  o More support for the library is imperative—it is the center of the entire scholarly communication edifice at UC.
Costs of the Policy

• The start-up costs of the policy are zero, because they have already been paid for. But several things will put pressure on ongoing costs at CDL and the campuses:
  o Dealing with constant publisher and faculty requests will put strain on existing resources.
  o Any improvements to the current repository in order to enhance its functions may be costly.
  o Assessing the success of the policy will require staff time and money, in proportion to the quality of the assessment desired.

• In the absence of additional funding, costs will likely be covered by cancelling existing subscriptions and shrinking collections. The more open access the better for balancing accessibility with costs.
The Future of Open Access

- The proposed policy is one part of achieving sustainable open access in scholarly publishing. Other aspects of this transformation will continue:
  - UCOLASC and CDL will continue to negotiate with publishers to change the funding model and experiment with forms of payment that include open access but do not adversely affect faculty.
  - Researchers and funders will need to continue to explore the use of research money to pay for open access publication.
  - Universities and libraries must continue to set aside funds for open access publishing for scholars in funding-poor disciplines.

- The overall goal of a sustainable scholarly publishing model is to move more towards paying for services we value, rather than paying for access to content.
  - Preservation, findability, promotion, design, and other services that improve quality and accessibility are well worth paying for. Skyrocketing subscription costs that limit access to only the richest institutions are not.
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This document lists the most commonly expressed questions and concerns about a proposed open access policy for the University of California. Concerns and questions were submitted by the Library and COLASC committees of all ten campuses, The California Digital Library, the University Council of Librarians, several Graduate Student Associations, the Library Association of the University of California, as well as the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) and the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) and the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), as well as many faculty members on each campus polled via town-halls, surveys and on-line discussions between Dec 2011 and July 2012.

Additional questions not addressed here can be found on the Reshaping Communication Website (http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/openaccesspolicy/)

Academic Freedom/Waiver of license
Issues of academic freedom are the most commonly expressed concerns about an open access policy. Many, if not all of these concerns, are answered by the fact that the proposed policy has an extremely generous opt-out clause. Scholars may opt out for whatever reason: if they disagree with the policy, or want to support subscription access, or co-author with others who disagree with it, or want to retain full control over their own copyright, or are asked to by a publisher, etc. Thus the policy balances the need for academic freedom with the need for greater access to research. The disadvantage, of course, is that it allows publishers to abuse the opt-out clause by routinely demanding opt-out waivers in order to publish. But from the perspective of achieving more open access, a policy with an opt-out clause is preferable to no policy at all.

Commercial use and Reuse
The proposed policy limits the use that UC may make of our scholarly articles to depositing them in an open access repository. Other uses (such as republication or resale by UC) are not authorized by the policy. However, the policy does not restrict the uses that end-users may make of these articles. In effect, it requires that articles by default be released under a Creative Commons Attribution license (CC-by), a form of license that requires attribution but does not restrict the use, commercial or otherwise, that may be made of these articles. Many faculty have insisted that open access versions of articles must be restricted to non-commercial uses only. The expressed intention in most cases is to protect our work from unscrupulous commercial re-use. In practice, the only legal way to attempt this (a so-called “non-commercial” restriction on the license used to redistribute the work) may also drastically restrict legitimate commercial reuses, such as republication of the work in another scholarly volume, re-use in a course reader, print republication in a foreign country, text mining, etc. It is also not clear that unscrupulous uses can be so prevented—fraud and plagiarism are not forestalled by copyright license restrictions. Furthermore, a more “open” license also introduces more, rather than less, competition into the scholarly publishing marketplace, something that is desperately needed in an industry that currently operates largely in secrecy and with little overt competition.
Deposit Requirement
Another concern occasionally raised about the policy is the requirement to provide a copy of each article for deposit in eScholarship. This concern takes two forms. The first concerns the extra amount of work it will require of faculty; the second concerns the lack of ability to opt out of this requirement (the opt-out waiver applies only to the license requirement). While it is undeniable that this requirement makes work for faculty in an absolute sense, it is not clear whether that work is onerous. In fact, it may well have extensive benefits for faculty. In practical terms, the amount of work required is extremely small—far less work, for instance, than submitting an article to a manuscript management system for a journal. Some of the deposit of articles may be automated; eScholarship can find and deposit some articles on behalf of faculty, requiring only a simple email response agreeing to the action, some articles (those that are already open access) may require no action at all. For those that do require deposit, the process can be streamlined to the point where it requires only a simple upload and verification of basic data.

Deposit benefits faculty in the discoverability of their research—the more accessible, and the better the metadata about an article, the more likely it will be found in a search or linked to by other sources, improving the impact of the research. In addition, because eScholarship is designed to function as an archive, it also provides faculty with a permanent place to store and retrieve all articles, for any purpose—from promotion and tenure, to requests for articles, to use as a backup personal archive.

The obligation to make our work available is paramount, and the proposed policy has no simple opt-out clause as in the case of the license. Allowing opt-out from deposit would have the unfortunate effect of giving publishers the power to demand even more rights (including the right to archive the work) which many faculty members do not want to give up. In the case where there are concerns about the use of previously copyrighted materials (images, graphs, passages requiring permission, etc), those concerns can be dealt with in the implementation of the deposit process itself.

Definitions: “scholarly article” and “final version”
Some have expressed concern about the definition of the terms “scholarly article” and “final version.” In both cases, the language has been chosen for two reasons. First, because it is strategically “vague” meaning that the definition of “scholarly articles” and “final version” is not specified in the text of the policy itself, but in the implementation and oversight of the policy. It will be easier to create a FAQ and an interface in the deposit process that explains what kinds of materials are covered by the policy and where the limitations might be, than it is to do the same in the policy language itself. The more tightly worded a policy is, the more exceptions it creates, and so the option has been to use this wording. The second reason is that this is the same language that nearly all of the other existing scholarly policies use, and so in preference for compatibility with other universities and publishers, the proposed policy retains these terms as well.

Faculty Oversight and Review
A final concern often expressed is that this policy will require clear faculty oversight and review. The policy thus requires oversight by both the Academic Senate and the UC Office of the President. In practice, oversight has been and will continue to be the primary responsibility of UCOLASC and the California Digital Library, who historically have worked very closely with each other and are in frequent consultation on issues regarding scholarly communication. The policy sets a limit of three years within which these two entities must report on the policy to the Faculty.
Other Issues

Many other concerns have been raised which are valid, but which would not in fact be at issue if this policy were passed. These include:

Copyright transfer to the University

- The policy does not transfer copyright to the university, only a very limited non-exclusive license.

Peer review concerns

- The proposed policy assumes no change in the current system of peer review.

- Further, open Access has no effect on how peer review is conducted. The quality of a journal and its peer review is independent of whether it is distributed freely or not, and under this policy, faculty are not required to publish in OA journals—they may and must continue to publish in the most appropriate venue.

Faculty (or students) should not be limited in where to publish

- Although we might want to encourage publication in OA venues, this policy makes no requirements on where to publish; there is no expectation or requirement to publish articles in open access venues, only that UC will have the right to make a version available in eScholarship.

Additional questions not addressed here can be found on the Reshaping Communication Website (http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/openaccesspolicy/)
AGENDA*

Action Item

Information/Discussion 9:30-10 I. Composite Benefit Rate
- Peggy Arrivas, AVP/Controller

Information/Discussion 10:10:15 II. Chair’s Announcements
- Dan Hare, UCFW Chair

Action III. Consent Calendar
1. DRAFT October 2012 UCFW minutes

Discussion 10:15-10:45 IV. Consultation with the Council of UC Staff Assemblies (CUCSA)
- Steve Garber, CUCSA Chair (UC Berkeley)
1. Health and Welfare Benefits for Future Employees
2. UC’s Educational Benefits for Current Employees

- Robert May, HCTF Chair

Information/Discussion 11:15-11:45 VI. Report: UCFW Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR)
- Shane White, TFIR Vice Chair

Discussion 11:45-12:30 VII. Executive Session
1. Total Remuneration: The Way Forward

Discussion/Action 12:30-2 VIII. Systemwide Review Items
   - Rebenching: A Guide and Update
2. Proposed Pilot – Negotiated Salary Plan (Comments due Nov. 16, 2012)
3. **APM 430, Visiting Scholars** (Comments due Dec. 8, 2012)
4. **APM 700, Leaves of Absence** (Comments due Dec. 8, 2012)
5. APM 600 Series, Salary Administration (Comments due Nov. 14, 2012) (*management review only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information/ Discussion 2-2:30</th>
<th>IX. UC Online Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rita Hao, Office of General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Keith Williams, Interim Director, UC Online Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also: [Proposed Open Access Policy](#) (Comments due by January 11, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion 2:30-3</th>
<th>X. Consultation with UCOP – Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Patrick Lenz, Vice President (via phone)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion 3:30-3</th>
<th>XI. Divisional Reports and Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion [as available]</th>
<th>XII. New Issues for Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Agenda Enclosures:**
1. Composite Benefit Rate Background Materials: (pp. 1-24)
   a. CBR Steering Committee Notes (pp. 1-14)
   b. Fund Impact Analyses (pp. 15-20)
   c. Senate Questions re CBR (pp. 21-24)
2. DRAFT October Minutes (pp. 25-30)
3. APM 600 Proposed Revisions (pp. 31-121)
4. UC Online Education Background Materials: (pp. 122-149)
   a. Template Agreement (pp. 122-133)
   b. Copyright Q&A (pp. 134-135)
   c. Senate Concerns RE Online Education (pp. 136-149)

**Information Items:**
A. [Systemwide Guidelines for Academic Senate Committees](#)
B. Approved minutes can be found at: [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucfw/](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucfw/)

---

**Important Meeting Information**

**Location:**
The meeting will convene in Room Lobby 1, University of California, Office of the President, 1111 Franklin Street, 1st Floor, Oakland. Directions and a map are located online at: [http://www.ucop.edu/services/directions-franklin.html](http://www.ucop.edu/services/directions-franklin.html)

**Parking:**
Visitor parking is available at UCOP on the 12th Street side of the building. The rate is $11 per day if you enter the parking structure before 9:00a.m. Daily parking is also available at a number of lots in the vicinity of the building.

**Expenses:**
Request for reimbursement of meeting expenses should be submitted with a local campus
travel expense voucher or the Systemwide Academic Senate travel expense voucher at: Reimbursement Form (PDF file; fill-out on-line & print)

Please submit completed and signed travel voucher with original receipts to:

Business Resource Center - Team Blue
University of California Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street 9th floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Account/Fund Number: M-430384-19900-3

The Academic Senate’s Travel Policies and Procedures are located online at:

- Arranging Senate Travel
- Getting Reimbursed for Senate Travel

Alternates: If you are unable to attend this meeting, please ask your Divisional Senate office to find an alternate, and notify the committee analyst, Kenneth Feer: kenneth.feer@ucop.edu
Divisional Senate contact information can be found at:
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/links.html
### Notice of Meeting

**Thursday, October 18, 2012**  
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.  
UCOP, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland – Room 5320  
Primary Dial-In: 1-866-740-1260 | Passcode: 9879466  
[http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Information 10:00-10:25** | **I. Chair’s Report/Announcements/Updates**  
Chair Manuela Martins-Green  
- Introductions  
- October 3 Academic Council Meeting  
- Update on UCAAD 2011 Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex and, among Men, Ethnicity, 2009-2011 and extending due date for plans on campus salary equity studies.  
- Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Task Force  
- The Great California ShakeOut (10:18 a.m.)  
- UC ADVANCE PAID Day | 1 (pp. 13-17)  
2 (pp. 18-20) |
| **Action 10:25-10:30** | **II. Consent Calendar**  
- Approval of the Agenda  

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Approve the agenda as noticed. |
| **Information 10:30-10:45** | **III. Overview of Committee Charge, Processes, Member Roles and Responsibilities, and Resources**  
Chair Martins-Green and Members  
Chair Martins-Green will provide an overview of UCAAD’s charge and program review processes, and with Committee members, discuss individual roles, responsibilities, and resources. | 3 (p. 21) |
| **Discussion 10:45-11:30** | **IV. Executive Session** (members only please)  
**Discussion of Priority and Goal Setting for 2012-13**  
Chair Martins-Green and Committee Members |
| **Information 11:30-11:45** | **V. Announcements from the President’s Office**  
Vice Provost Susan Carlson, Academic Personnel  
Jesse Bernal, Diversity Coordinator Jesse Bernal |

This agenda may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited.
VI. Review of 2002 UCOP Guide to Recruitment and Retention of Faculty – Chair Martins-Green and Vice Provost Susan Carlson, Academic Personnel

The committee will continue to discuss the revision of the guide and input from the campuses with the ultimate goal of creating a new document that is jointly authored by the Administration and the Senate in consultation with Academic Personnel.

12:30-1:30 – Working Lunch –

VII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership –
Robert Powell, Academic Council Chair
William Jacob, Academic Council Vice Chair
Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director
Todd Giedt, Associate Director (Introduction to SharePoint)

Senate leaders will provide an overview of the policies, procedures, protocols, 2012-13 Senate priorities, and other generally helpful information for new committee members.

VIII. Systemwide Senate Review Items

Proposed Pilot for a Negotiated Salary Plan
Comments due November 16.

ACTION REQUESTED: Compile comments for UCAAD response.

IX. Consultation with UCAP on Proposed Changes to APM 210-1.d
– Chair Martins-Green and Members

Last year, UCAAD consulted with UCAP and UCAF on proposed changes to APM 210-1.d and expressed serious concern about the tenor of comments and the positions expressed by some members. Chair Martins-Green will discuss with the committee possible actions to send to UCAP for their consideration.

ACTION REQUESTED: Develop a series of points to send to UCAP for their consideration.

X. Roundtable: Campus Updates – Committee Members

Members will share campus updates on diversity-related activities including anticipated issues and initiatives from their respective campus.
Discussion 3:15-4:00

XI. New Business

**Agenda Enclosures:**
1. Information: 2012-13 UCAAD Roster (pp. 4-7)
2. Information: Draft 2011-12 UCAAD Annual Report (pp. 8-12)
4. Background: Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Task Force draft charge
5. Background: Bylaw: 140. Affirmative Action and Diversity (Am 13 May 97)
7. Background: Academic Senate Travel Policy and Procedures: Arranging/Booking Travel
8. Background: Getting started with SharePoint
9. Background: Consultation with UCAP on Proposed Changes to APM 210-1.d

**Important Meeting Information**

**Location:**
The October meeting will convene in room 5320 at the UC Office of the President in downtown Oakland. UCOP is located at 1111 Franklin Street, between 11th and 12th Streets. Upon arrival, please check in at the security desk where you will be issued a visitor badge. Directions and a map are available online at: [http://www.ucop.edu/services/directions-franklin.html](http://www.ucop.edu/services/directions-franklin.html).

If you are arriving by way of the Oakland International Airport, you may taxi or BART to the UCOP building. For BART, purchase an AirBART ticket from the shuttle operator. The shuttle will take you to the Coliseum BART Station. From there board a Richmond-bound BART train and exit at the 12th Street/Oakland City Center BART Station.

**Parking:**
Visitor parking is available at UCOP on the 12th Street side of the building. The rate is $11 per day if you enter the parking structure before 9 a.m. Daily parking is also available at a number of lots proximate to the building.

**Travel Regs:**
Detailed travel information is available online at: [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/travelregs_2012-13_booking.pdf](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/travelregs_2012-13_booking.pdf).

Please submit completed and signed travel voucher with original receipts within 21 days after the meeting to:

**Business Resource Center – Team Blue**  
**University of California Office of the President**  
**1111 Franklin Street, 9th Floor**  
**Oakland, CA 94607-5200**

**Account/Fund Number:** M-430384-19900-3

**UCAAD 2012-13 Remaining Meeting Schedule:**
- January 10, 2013 – Room 11326
- April 18, 2012 – Room 5320
- June 20, 2012 – Room 5320

This agenda may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited.
### Agenda

#### Thursday, November 18, 2012, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

**NOTICE OF MEETING**

**UC Office of the President – Room 5320**

**Academic Senate Phone: 510.987.9143**

**http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/ucaf**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10:00-10:30</strong></td>
<td><strong>I. Welcome and Introductions</strong> – <em>UCAF Chair Cameron Gundersen</em></td>
<td>1 (pp. 4-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>1. General Announcements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Review of the Committee Charge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Review of the Meeting Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10:30-11:00</strong></td>
<td><strong>II. APM 210</strong></td>
<td>SEE LINK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Information/</td>
<td>UCAF will discuss to remove controversial wording in APM 210 that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion**</td>
<td>currently appears to prescribe certain research results and unduly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reward efforts related to “diversity.” The link to APM 210 is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11:00-11:30</strong></td>
<td><strong>III. Proposed Open Access Policy</strong></td>
<td>2 (pp. 9-45) &amp; SEE LINK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Information/</td>
<td>UCAF will discuss a proposed Open Access Policy developed by the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/</td>
<td>University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action**</td>
<td>following is a link to the UC-wide OA policy page:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/openaccesspolicy/index.html">http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/openaccesspolicy/index.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The UCSF policy can be found at this link:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.library.ucsf.edu/help/scholpub/oapolicy">http://www.library.ucsf.edu/help/scholpub/oapolicy</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments are due on January 11, 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Action Requested: Provide comments.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11:30-11:35</strong></td>
<td><strong>IV. The Electronic Privacy and Information Security Initiative</strong></td>
<td>SEE LINK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Information/</td>
<td>UCAF will discuss the systemwide University of California Privacy and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion**</td>
<td>Information Security Initiative which provides a formal structure and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>process for discussion of evolving privacy and information security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issues and development of systemwide policies and guidance. Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of their mission are given at: <a href="http://privacyinitiative.universityof">http://privacyinitiative.universityof</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>california.edu/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11:35-12:15</strong></td>
<td><strong>V. Dual Use Research Of Concern</strong></td>
<td>SEE LINK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Information/</td>
<td>UCAF will also address possible academic freedom concerns associated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion**</td>
<td>with new regulations that DHHS plans to propose for “dual use research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of concern.” An AAUP report on dual use research is available at the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>following link:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**12:15 to 12:30 - Working Lunch**
VI. Contentious Issues Forums
UCAF has previously discussed pro-active strategies that might be deployed to confront hostile responses to research activities at UC. The committee will consider how UC could host forums that bring together disparate constituencies for discussions concerning crucial issues dividing the groups.

VII. The Future of Academic Freedom
UCAF will discuss next steps related to the survey of students’ understanding of academic freedom conducted by UCAF’s graduate student representative. A scholarly communication based on this survey is to be published and the committee will discuss the implications of this report and possible actions that could/should be taken.

VIII. UC Online Education Copyright Issues
UCAF will discuss questions raised by the San Diego division regarding the copyright and licensing agreements presented to faculty who develop courses for UC’s Online Education program. The UC Policy on Ownership of Course Materials provide essential context for this deliberation. **Comments are due on October 31, 2012.**

  *Action Requested: Provide Comments.*

IX. FYI Issues
The chair will update the committee on the status of APM10/15 revisions; online education deliberations; academic freedom considerations in the development of self-supporting educational programs; and the implications of the current move by UC campuses to acquire hospitals with the attendant issue as to whether the medical staff will be offered faculty positions. Contingent on developments in the next month, one or more of these issues may be considered in more detail.

X. Campus Reports and Member Items
UCAF members report on issues facing local committees and campuses.

XI. New Business

XII. Executive Session (if necessary)

**Agenda Enclosures:**
1) Notes for November 8th Agenda
2) Proposed Open Access Policy
3) Survey of students’ understanding of academic freedom
4) UCOE Copyright Issues
### Meeting Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location:</strong></th>
<th>The meeting will convene in Room 5320, University of California, Office of the President, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland. Directions and map can be viewed at <a href="http://www.ucop.edu/services/directions-franklin.html">http://www.ucop.edu/services/directions-franklin.html</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking:</strong></td>
<td>Visitor parking is available at UCOP on the 12th Street side of the building. Daily parking is also available at a number of lots in the vicinity of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meals:</strong></td>
<td>A continental breakfast and a lunch will be provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Expenses:** | Request for reimbursement of meeting expenses should be submitted with a local campus travel expense voucher or the Systemwide Academic Senate travel expense voucher at: [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/tev.xls](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/tev.xls)  
Please submit completed and signed travel voucher with original receipts to:  
**Fiscal Assistant**  
**Academic Council Office**  
**University of California**  
**1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor**  
**Oakland, California 94607-5200**  
**Account/Fund Number:** M-430384-19900-3  
The Academic Senate’s Travel Policies and Procedures are located online at: [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/travelregs_2012-13_booking.pdf](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/travelregs_2012-13_booking.pdf) |
November 5, 2012

MARY GILLY, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE, IRVINE DIVISION

RE:  Systemwide Review of Negotiated Salary Trial Program

The Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (CFW) discussed the negotiated salary trial program for the general campus at its meeting on October 30, 2012. The trial program is a result of the systemwide review of proposed APM – 668 in 2011 – 2012. The goal of the proposal was to make salaries more competitive by making technical changes in the way salaries are computed using grant or other external funding.

UC Irvine, UC Los Angeles, and UC San Diego will participate in the trial program over the next four years. At the three year mark, a report will be made on the progress. The trial period is applicable for faculty who have received a normal merit increase over the past two years. The benefits will continue to be computed based on the actual salary. The UC Retirement Plan will not be affected by the increase.

The Council offers the following for the Senate Cabinet’s consideration:

Implementation Details. The report offers a framework but the implementation details are unclear. In order to proceed with the trial, the Council believes that certain questions must be answered. How will the trial be evaluated? What parameters are being used to measure success? The Council recommends the Senate at each of the three campuses work closely with administration to develop and approve local guidelines to support the framework.

Research Program Effects. The Council believes there may be positive side effects with the trial program. For example, faculty would be incentivized to pursue additional grants. Faculty may choose more non-modular grants. If properly administered, there could be an increase in funding to the university. But, it should also carefully consider the impact of shifting allocation of money earmarked for other research expenditure towards faculty salaries.

Salary Equity. If the trial moves forward, under local implementation in the department, there should be metrics for ensuring faculty obtain the same agreement regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, or a person’s ability to negotiate to prevent exacerbation of equity issues already in place. The Council recommends consulting Advance or an equity advisor when crafting the local guidelines for implementation.

Equitable Treatment Due to Funding Sources. It is noted that not all funding sources can be used in this plan. This is not a reflection of the how competitive the funding award is, but the regulations on its usage that goes with that specific award. If within the same department, two faculty members with two different funding sources, both highly and equally competitive may be unequally treated under this plan, not because of the relative merits of the faculty, but purely because of the differences in funding sources. For example, a plant biologist is usually funded by NSF and a stem-cell biologist is funded by NIH. Both funding sources are competitive, but the plant biologist will be disadvantaged under negotiated salary plan. This may lead to unpleasant situations if they are in the same department since faculty within the same department affect each other’s professional life more than those in different departments. So we suggest implementing this plan within a department only if all faculty have access and opportunity to get funding from the sources that allow use of funds in the negotiated salary plan.
Use of Contingency Fund. The intent behind the negotiated salary plan is not just to provide a non-state source of income for salary, but also to generate income to the university through taxing the grant source in the form of contingency fund. The implementation plan should carefully monitor and study the use of this contingency fund.

CFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on this proposal. We would also be happy to provide input while ironing out the details for its implementation.

Gopi Meenakshisundaram, Chair
Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom

c: Luisa Crespo, Executive Director
Shira Long, Senate Analyst
November 5, 2012

MARY GILLY, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE, IRVINE DIVISION

RE: Systemwide Review of “Rebenching” Report

The Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (CFW) discussed the June 25, 2012 report and recommendations made by the Rebenching Budget Committee at its meeting on October 30, 2012. The intent of rebenching is to increase transparency and equity in the formula for allocating state funds across campuses in the UC system. Rebenching is scheduled for implementation starting 2012-13 with recommendations the funding be spread out over six years through 2018 using new State General Funds.

The Council agreed with the Rebenching Budget Committee’s consensus the University needs a more transparent and equitable process for allocating funds received from the State of California to its ten campuses. However the Council does not believe the rebenching report and recommendations adequately address this process and, in fact, create inequity.

The Council offers the following points for the Senate Cabinet’s consideration:

Declining State Funds. The rebenching model does not address adequately the redistribution of resources during a time of waning resources and assumes there will be new state funds. The UC system has experienced a significant decline in state funding since 2008 and if Proposition 30 does not pass on November 6, state funding will continue to decline. Campuses such as UC Los Angeles and UC Berkeley have the ability to increase non-state revenue to balance the drop in funding while schools similar to UC Irvine and UC Merced cannot. Further, UC-San Francisco’s differential funding through increase and decrease of state funds is not proportionate.

Exceptions to Rebenching Model. The Council noted several exceptions to the rebenching model for UC Merced and UC San Francisco. Members also noted the overall intent to provide growing campuses such as UC Merced funding enabling them to grow their graduate programs through hiring additional faculty and building laboratories to attract graduate students; essentially prefunding graduate growth. Nonetheless, these exceptions create an inequitable playing field benefitting schools such as UC San Francisco while continuing to disenfranchise schools such as UC Irvine who have historically been underfunded.
Unclear Target Number. The Council supports the idea that increased transparency and equity is needed. The proposed formula would allocate funds based on the number of California resident students based on target numbers. However the actual target numbers are not clearly laid out.

While there are reservations among the members regarding the details of the proposal, CFW acknowledges that this is a result of complex negotiation and this is a compromise proposal. Members appreciate the over-arching intent of the proposal and urge its swift implementation without further delay.

CFW appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Gopi Meenakshisundaram, Chair
Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom

c: Luisa Crespo, Executive Director
    Shira Long, Senate Analyst
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Date of CFW Mtg.</th>
<th>Designated Reviewers</th>
<th>Action Required w/Response Deadline</th>
<th>Review Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. UC Retirement Plan - Ongoing Issue</td>
<td>Status reports will be provided when available</td>
<td>CFW Chair reports at all meetings if information is available from UCFW or Senate Cabinet meetings.</td>
<td>Ongoing issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emeriti Issues from Subcommittee on Emeriti Affairs</td>
<td>Status reports at all meetings. 5/8/12</td>
<td>Emeriti Subcom.</td>
<td>Status Reports may be provided at all meeting. Issues to consider: - Are there new issues with increase in retirements? -Office space and staff support issues for retired faculty - Recalls: Are there new issues and policy implications?</td>
<td>Ongoing issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution from the Emeriti Re: Request for UCI to consider a retirement community for the campus</td>
<td>5/8/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution – Requested CFW’s support. CFW approved a statement that will be forwarded to the Senate Chair. memo dated 5/24/12. Senate Cabinet endorsed CFW’s statement at its mtg. on 6/5/12. A memo was forwarded to the EVC/Provost requesting consideration for a retirement community at UCI (6/13/12). Follow-up with Luisa for an update re: discussions during the summer. Report at 1st FQ Meeting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Faculty Housing (University Hills and ICHA Management)</td>
<td>Status reports will be provided when available</td>
<td>AA&amp;D Subcom.</td>
<td>Issues to consider: -Future development plans for faculty housing off &amp; on campus. -When University Hills reaches build-out, will ICHA’s role as developer change. If yes, how? - defer 2012-13</td>
<td>Ongoing issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Campus Child Care</td>
<td>Gopi Meenakshisundaram will be CFW’s rep. for the Chancellor’s Advisory Com. on Child Care.</td>
<td>Meetings: February 3, 2012, (Agenda and minutes are in CFW Status Report notebook.)</td>
<td>Ongoing issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OEOD’s Data</td>
<td>Gwen Kuhns Black provides CFW with data and reports when available.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Elect a Vice Chair for CFW</td>
<td>Vice Chair would attend Cabinet mtgs. when Chair is not available.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parking and Transportation Services – Annual Report from Director Ron Fleming</td>
<td>Usually a Spring Quarter Meeting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Information Item – No action</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. UCI Librarian – invite new UCI Librarian, Lorelei Tanji</td>
<td>Invite new UCI Librarian to report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Senate Membership for Clinical Professor</td>
<td>College of Medicine will be asked about its plans to improve morale for Clinical Professors. Meno sent to Dean Clayman, School of Medicine (11/15/11) Dean Clayman’s memo of response (12/27/11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Mtg. Date</td>
<td>Reviewers</td>
<td>Action Required w/ Response Deadline</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10. Faculty Welfare – Mental Health Support Issues | | – deferred to 2/14/12 | Members | -Will request additional information on the number of clinical faculty at SOM, w/ a breakdown by years of service.  
- Will consider eligibility criteria for Univ. Hills housing, as a possible new benefit for clinical faculty.  
- Ted Quilligan’s report to UCI Emeriti Assoc. provided data on retention.  
- CFW Memo to Chair (3/17/12) – memo on hold  
-Luisa reviewing COHS/SOM Faculty Bylaws and will be checking with Dan/CRJ.  COHS’s Senate not equal to campus Senate.  
- - - - - - - - - -  
As of 3/20/12 - Issue is on hold.  UCSF has an action for clinical faculty membership on the table.  CFW will wait to see the outcome before moving forward with its proposal.  
- - - - - - - - - -  
| 11. ICHA Priority Sales List | | Brought forward from last year | Prof. Robert Moeller and Dr. Negar Shekarabi, UCI Counseling Center | Shall we invite Chuck Hayward or Sales person?  
Moving Clinical Faculty from Tier 3 to Tier 2 – is that a feasible request?  
- - - - - - - - - -  
As of 3/20/12 - Issue is on hold.  UCSF has an action for clinical faculty membership on the table.  CFW will wait to see the outcome before moving forward with its concerns.  See related Issue #9 | On Hold |
| 12. Memorial Resolutions  
For more information – see notebook w/ procedures and records on Carol’s bookcase. | | Ongoing CFW duty – see Irvine Bylaw 99 | | CFW’s bylaw includes a duty for requesting memorial resolutions from Dept. Chairs when a faculty member dies.  
When received, the Memorial Resolution will be published in the next Divisional Senate Assembly Agenda under Section 5.  Special Orders – Consent Calendar.  The document will also be forwarded to the UC Senate Office for publication. | Annual Responsibility |
| 13. Hearing Issues | | Brought forward from last year | | Emeriti Member of CFW requested assistance in improving the sound quality in the Senate Conference Room, sent along a NY Times’ article + offered several options.  
Disability Services has been contacted – awaiting a reply | |

**UCI SENATE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW**

| 14. UC Climate Survey | | Brought forward from last year | Monthly updates when available | Gwen Kuhns Black, OEOD, reported on issue and will provide updates.  
Grace Tonner will be CFW Rep to UCI Work Group | Trial to begin on 01/14/13 |

Updated 11/19/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Mtg. Date</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
<th>Action Required w/ Response Deadline</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Smoke-Free Policy Proposal</td>
<td>Brought forward from last year</td>
<td>Monthly updates when available</td>
<td>Michelle Garfinkel and Bruce Blumberg will represent CFW on Chancellor’s committee which will work on implementation plan for UCI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Chancellor’s advisory Committee on the Status of Staff (CACSS – Diversity Subcommittee)</td>
<td>Brought forward from last year</td>
<td>Monthly updates when available</td>
<td>New Chancellor’s Advisory Committee. Gwen Kuhns Black, a CFW Consultant, is a member and will provide CFW w/ information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Campus Diversity Roundtable</td>
<td>Brought forward from last year</td>
<td>Monthly updates when available</td>
<td>Grace Tonner will represent CFW and will have the opportunity to report at CFW’s monthly meetings. Gwen Kuhns Black may also report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. UCI Abroad Proposal</td>
<td>11/09/12</td>
<td>11/27/12</td>
<td>Subcom on AF</td>
<td>Review and Comment by December 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNIVERSITYWIDE SENATE ISSUES UNDER REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Mtg. Date</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
<th>Action Required w/ Response Deadline</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. UC Review of “Rebenching” Report</td>
<td>09/13/12</td>
<td>10/30/12</td>
<td>Subcom. on FW</td>
<td>Review and Comment by November 6.</td>
<td>Memo sent 11/05/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. UC Review of Open Access Policy</td>
<td>09/13/12</td>
<td>11/27/12</td>
<td>Subcom. on AF</td>
<td>Review and Comment by December 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. UC Review of Proposed Revision to APM 700, Leaves of Absence</td>
<td>09/17/12</td>
<td>11/27/12</td>
<td>Subcom on FW</td>
<td>Review and Comment by December 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. UC Review of Negotiated Salary Plan</td>
<td>09/27/12</td>
<td>10/30/12</td>
<td>Subcom on FW</td>
<td>Review and Comment by November 6.</td>
<td>Memo sent 11/05/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER BUSINESS THAT REQUIRES ACTION**

None