



▶ STATEMENT ON THE
STATE OF THE
UNIVERSITY'S BUDGET...3

○ ISSUE 1 | ○ VOLUME 5 | ○ 2008-2009



▶ UPDATE ON THE
ANESTHESIOLOGY
ISSUE.....8



▶ NEWS FROM THE
SENATE COUNCILS11

Academic *Senate*

FALL NEWSLETTER 2008

GREETINGS FROM THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

There is no doubt that we are experiencing hard times; the nation, the state of California, the University of California, and UCI have the challenge of delivering the same high-level services and producing the same first-rate output with far fewer resources. It is these times, even more so than bountiful periods that necessitate increased participation and collaboration by all members of the community. Our system of shared governance is uniquely situated to allow for this. Yet favorable outcomes require attention and vigilance on the part of senate members, and especially their willingness to participate in senate decision-making bodies, including department, school-wide, campus-wide, and UC-wide meetings, councils, and committees. The senate leadership values your input and hopes that you will let your voice be heard!

In this newsletter, I will report to you the current issues, debates and decisions of import to senate membership. It will provide you with the opportunity to become informed about important issues, direct you towards more information, and hopefully prompt you to actively engage in the work of the Senate by sharing your ideas with us, making yourself available for consultation, and submitting your name to the Committee on Committees for possible service.

Judith Stepan-Norris
Chair Elect of the Academic Senate
chaire@uci.edu

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN DEAN SEARCH AND DEAN REVIEW COMMITTEES

At its May 15, 2008 meeting, the UCI Representative Assembly strongly endorsed the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance's recommendations for dean search and review processes. Over the summer, the Senate leadership worked with Chancellor Drake and EVC & P Gottfredson to arrive at new guidelines for dean search and review. During fall quarter, the administration agreed to adhere to the following document in its dean search and review procedures:

November 26, 2008

Guiding Principles for Faculty Involvement in Dean Search and Dean Review Committees

University of California, Irvine

Authority for Dean Appointments and Reviews is addressed in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM):

APM 240-40: "The Chancellor has the authority to appoint a Dean or Provost..."

APM 240-10: "Criteria for appointment and evaluation of a Dean or Provost shall be developed by each Chancellor or designee."

I. SELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS FOR DEAN SEARCH AND DEAN REVIEW COMMITTEES

1. On behalf of the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVC/P) will request, from the executive committee or faculty chair of the school in question (in the case of academic deans), the names of a minimum of four faculty members from the School for service on a Dean search or review committee. In doing so, the executive committee or faculty chair will confirm that the following conditions hold true for each of its nominees:

- (a) Availability of the nominee to serve;
- (b) Willingness of the nominee to confirm that there is no conflict of interest with the search or review;
- (c) Willingness of the nominee to maintain confidentiality as is usual for personnel processes.

2. On behalf of the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost will request, from the Academic Senate Committee on Committees, the names of a minimum of four faculty members whom they recommend for service on the Dean search or review committee. In the instance of searches or reviews for the Dean of the Graduate Division or Dean of Undergraduate Education, the other set of 4 or more nominations will be provided by the Graduate Council or the Council on Educational Policy, respectively. In doing so, the Senate will confirm that the following conditions hold true for each of its nominees:

- (a) Availability of the nominee to serve;
- (b) Willingness of the nominee to confirm that there is no conflict of interest with the search or review;
- (c) Willingness of the nominee to maintain confidentiality as is usual for personnel processes.

3. The Chancellor or EVC/P will appoint the search or review committee. As a general practice, one-half of the committee members will be selected from faculty nominated through the above methods.
4. The Chancellor or EVC/P will consult with the Senate Chair prior to appointing chairs of Dean search or review committees. In general, chairs of review committees shall not be currently appointed deans.

II. DEAN SEARCH COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

1. The dean search committee will at the beginning convene a forum inviting faculty to discuss School priorities, School needs, and desired criteria for the next Dean.
2. The committee shall advise the Chancellor and EVC/P regarding the most appropriate manner for final candidates to be invited for interviews. Should the committee recommend confidentiality, it should seek additional faculty consultation that balances the desired need for confidentiality with broad input from faculty.
3. Faculty involved in this process will have the opportunity to provide written evaluations regarding the final candidates, and those evaluations shall be reviewed by the committee and the Chancellor and EVC/P.
 5. At the conclusion of the search process, the Chancellor and/or EVC/P will meet with the search committee in order to report on the outcome of their deliberations and negotiations.
 6. If for any reason the above procedures do not yield an acceptable dean, the Chancellor and/or EVC/P shall ask the committee to continue the search. Should a new committee for the dean search become necessary, the above procedures shall be initiated from the beginning.

III. DEAN REVIEW COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

1. The dean review committee will send out a call to all faculty in the School for written evaluations of the strengths and weaknesses of the current dean, along with recommendations for improvements, and, if desired, an indication of whether the dean should be reappointed. These evaluations shall be reviewed by the committee and treated with strict confidentiality.
2. The committee shall evaluate the work of the dean during the review period, including the faculty statements and written input from the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) and the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) and other councils judged relevant, and prepare a report to the Chancellor and EVC/P that includes a recommendation regarding reappointment/non-reappointment, including the desired term of appointment. All materials shall be treated with strict confidence.
3. The Chancellor or EVC/P shall meet with the committee in order to learn of their recommendations. The Chancellor or EVC/P shall also meet with the committee to discuss the final outcome of the review.

IV. ANNUAL ASSESSMENT

At the end of each academic year, the Irvine Division of the Senate will compile, based on data received from the EVC & Provost's office, a report of the dean's searches and dean's reviews conducted during that year.

UC AND UCI BUDGET

The UC and UCI budget situation is in a state of flux, with new developments emerging as I compile this newsletter. You can follow new developments on the University of California website <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/article/19016> and the UC Regents website <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/>.

UCI Administration's Communications Regarding the 2008-09 First and Second Round Budget Reductions

UCI's decisions about reductions follow consultation with the campus Budget Workgroup. The group agreed to shield the graduate fellowship budget from cuts and the Office of the President stipulated that University Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnership programs (outreach) and University Student Aid Programs be protected from cuts. In the first round of cuts, UCI suffered a \$4 million reduction with the following distribution to campus units: the

reduction percentage for degree-granting units was 2.5%; the reduction percentage for academic support areas was 3.5%; and the reduction percentage for nonacademic areas was 4.5%.

At the time of the initial cuts, we were informed that additional cuts may become necessary as decisions at the State and Regents level were finalized. On November 13th, we received word of the second round of cuts based on an additional \$33.1 million cut to the University of California's budget (along with an additional reduction to enable the funding of the systemwide initiative to help defray the increase in health care costs for lower paid staff). This translated to an additional reduction of approximately \$4 million to UCI, leading to the second round of cuts distributed to schools and support units using the same principles applied to the first round of cuts. This brings the reductions to 3.7% for degree-granting units, 4.7% for academic support units and 5.7% for other support units. It is unclear whether or not a third round of cuts is forthcoming.

Currently the UC budget includes no funding for cost-of-living salary adjustments, for staff merits, or the second year of market adjustments for line faculty (see the response by The UC Committee on Faculty Welfare and its Task force on Investment and Retirement to these cuts below). Should the UC System determine to proceed with such salary adjustments, campuses will have to self-fund those costs. Finally, there might be additional University priorities the UC System will decide to promote that must be self-funded.

The reductions are necessary due to a variety of reasons.

- The Governor's January 2008 and May 2008 budgets proposed funding increases for UC while simultaneously proposing budget reductions that essentially erased the proposed increases, providing no resources for enrollment growth from the State.
- To honor the interest of students who worked hard to earn a place at UC, the UC System made the decision to offer admission in Fall 2008 to all undergraduate applicants who met the University's eligibility requirements.
- Increases to student fees were approved, but the associated revenue is insufficient to fund new needs.
- Each UC campus is being assessed a budget reduction to fund enrollment increases associated with enrollment growth at UC Merced and the PRIME programs in the health sciences.
- Each UC campus is expected to self-fund new needs associated with enrollment growth.
- Each UC campus is required to cut administrative spending by 10% and redirect the funds to nonadministrative needs.

As units incorporate cuts, they should be aware of the following points:

- Each instructional unit must meet its instructional obligations, continue to accommodate enrollment increases, and offer students a high-quality education.
- Based on the Student Intent to Register data we had on June 1, we are estimating that the 2008-09 Fall-Winter-Spring average for General Campus enrollments will be 24,600 compared to 24,500 in 2007-08. We expect that the Fall 2008 incoming freshman class will be 4,600 students compared to 4,900 in Fall 2007.
- Because enrollment growth was not funded, the positions anticipated for the second and subsequent years of faculty recruiting in the most recent faculty recruiting plan are frozen indefinitely.
- The Office of the President has stipulated that University Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnership programs (formerly known as outreach programs) and University Student Aid Programs should be protected from budget cuts. Based on campus priorities, the graduate fellowship budget will also be protected from budget cuts.
- The budget cuts are permanent cuts.
- The reductions are based on adjusted budgets, including most funds in the permanent budget, along with selected temporary fund allocations.

Office of the President's Information for UC Employees about the Lack of 2008-09 Systemwide Salary Increases

As previously mentioned, Gov. Schwarzenegger and the Legislature recently adopted a state budget for the 2008-09 fiscal year that did not provide funding for increased student enrollments or inflationary increases in fixed costs such as utilities and health benefits. Additionally, given the immediate and near-term projections regarding the state economy, the state Department of Finance recently informed UC that the University will need to achieve considerable additional cuts in the 2008-09 year as a result of the final state budget. Cost savings in the Office of the President in Oakland are also included in the budget. (See <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/index.php> for details).

Although UC avoided deeper cuts than other entities, the final state budget for 2008-09 essentially means that UC received no increased funding for core costs, including employee compensation and benefits. By keeping the University's funding flat relative to last year, **the University will not be able to offer systemwide salary increases to employees, and the UC will need to defer progress on changes to the faculty salary scales for 2008-09** (wages for union-represented employees are subject to collective bargaining, and obligatory merit increases for faculty will follow UC policy).

Competitive pay and benefits for employees is one of the University's top priorities, as it is fundamental to rewarding UC's hardworking employees for their many contributions to the University, and it is critical to UC's ability to attract and retain quality personnel. Throughout the budget process, UC continually stressed to the legislature and the governor the importance of competitive salaries and benefits, and we are very disappointed this year's final budget does not provide funding for salary increases.

Fortunately, medical and retirement benefits for UC employees remain among the best in the country. As was just announced, the University has taken extra steps regarding 2009 employee medical insurance rates to help shield employees from escalating health-care costs. Not only is UC continuing to pay the vast majority of next year's premium increases, UC is applying a special one-time subsidy to defray employees' share of premium increases. UC is also continuing its salary-based approach to rates so lower-paid employees pay lower monthly premiums. The net result will be that many employees will see either decreases or only modest increases in their monthly premiums, for the exact same benefits as last year- no benefits are being cut. (Health insurance rates for union-represented employees are subject to collective bargaining).

The University values deeply the many contributions of its faculty and staff and their ongoing dedication to the University, especially during these difficult economic times, and UC will continue to impress upon state officials the critical importance of competitive salaries and benefits for all employees.

Additional Information

UC Budget information: <http://www.ucop.edu/news/budget/welcome.html>

UC Benefits: <http://atyourservice.ucop.edu>

UCI Budget Principles

<http://www.evc.uci.edu/budget/fy0607/UCI%20Budget%20Principles.pdf>

- UCI must continue to build the excellence of its academic and professional programs, accommodate enrollment increases, and offer students a high-quality education in an environment characterized by civility and diversity.
- UCI must continue to recruit and retain the highest-quality faculty and staff, maintaining an appropriate balance of staff capacity as new faculty hires occur.
- UCI must take into account the fundamental contributions of faculty, staff and support areas to its academic mission, and continue to make every effort to minimize layoffs as it develops budget plans.
- UCI must base strategic budgetary decisions on analysis, evaluation and appropriate consultation with campus constituencies.
- UCI must streamline organizational structures, processes and procedures to help reduce expenditures and mitigate workloads and delegate decisions to the lowest practical operational level.

- UCI must continue to seek new sources of revenue through fundraising, sponsored projects, public-private sponsorships and other sources.

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare and its Task force on Investment and Retirement adopted the following statement regarding the UC 2009-2010 budget:

TFIR Statement on the State of the University's Budget

November 5, 2008

There are two closely interrelated threats to the University that require immediate attention. First, it is absolutely essential that contributions to UCRP be restarted no later than July, 2009 and that these contributions be substantial. At the same time, the decline in competitiveness of total remuneration for faculty at the University of California represents a crisis of historic proportions. Failure to address this will take UC further down a path to mediocrity, and we fear that the damage to UC's excellence will be irreversible. Thus, we recommend that the Senate communicate to the President in the strongest possible terms the urgency of taking immediate steps to stave off continuing damage to the University.

We recognize that budget problems affect all of UC. However, continued decline in UC's competitiveness in recruitment and retention of the very best faculty guarantees that all other activities will be compromised, even if they are fully funded.

The Senate has consistently voiced strong support for the resumption of contributions to UCRP in order preserve this critical retirement benefit. At the same time, existing Senate policy places top priority on restoring the competitiveness of UC faculty salary scales and the closing of the gap between average salaries at UC and its competitors. These policies were adopted before the depths of the state's budget crisis and the nation's financial crisis were known. Against this background, we believe that the four proposals below are necessary steps to preserve UC's excellence.

***First**, it is imperative that employer contributions to the University's pension plan be fully funded. The budget cannot be used as an excuse not to restore the health of UCRP. Employer contributions to UCRP must begin on 7/1/09 in order to maintain UCRP's funding status. A failure to fund contributions and preserve funding status puts the entire plan at risk, as the problem will otherwise become insurmountable.*

No contributions have gone to UCRP for eighteen years. Each year, employees earn additional service credit, which adds more than \$1 Billion to UCRP's actuarial liability. Pension plans, including UCRP, set investment policy to ride out market volatility, including the sharp decline in markets we have seen in the last year. However, no pension plan can continue to accrue additional obligations year after year without compensating contributions approximating the normal cost of the plan (approximately 17% of covered compensation in the case of UCRP). Had we been funding UCRP appropriately over the last several years, we would have been contributing an amount close to the plan's normal cost. As a result of the decline in markets, we need to increase contributions to somewhat more than normal cost, a modest increase over what we should have been contributing all along. The required contributions represent a huge shock to the University budget primarily because contributions have been zero, not because of the recent market decline. However, the market decline makes it absolutely clear that we cannot continue business as usual, accruing additional liabilities without funding them with employer contributions. If employer contributions are restarted, the bulk of the funds will come from federal grants, clinical enterprises, and endowment income; only about one-third will come from state funds. Failing to restart contributions means that the University, and implicitly the State, accrue the liability for the service credit related to these other fund sources. Further deferring employer contributions exposes the University and the State to enormous risk because the federal granting agencies could potentially refuse to fund large catch-up contributions if they become needed to cover past liabilities.

***Second**, the resumption of employee contributions to UCRP must be deferred until the University brings salaries to market levels. Faculty and staff salaries remain highly uncompetitive. Imposing employee contributions without offsetting salary increases would further erode UC's competitiveness, making it harder to recruit and retain the best faculty and staff.*

Among the faculty, some who were recently recruited or retained have salaries close to competitive levels, while others are very far behind market. Step IX, the *top* of the regular full Professor Scale, remains below the *average* full Professor

salary at the Comparison 8 institutions. Imposing employee contributions would further reduce total remuneration of employees.

Redirecting the current DC plan contributions (for employees coordinated with Social Security, 2% of covered compensation up to the Social Security wage base and 4% above the base) into UCRP would not reduce take-home pay, but it does represent a substantial reduction in total remuneration because the funds will no longer accrue to the employee's benefit. Any employee contribution over and above redirecting the DC contribution to UCRP would result in both a reduction in total remuneration and a reduction in take-home pay. In the current fiscal year, faculty and unrepresented staff are receiving essentially no salary increases, while our competitors will raise salaries (in the case of faculty, the Comparison 8 average will likely rise about 4%), our competitive position in total remuneration is already taking a big hit, and restarting employee contributions would make this hit substantially bigger. Most of UC's union contracts are up for renegotiation, or will require reopening in order to restart employee contributions; while salaries remain seriously uncompetitive, the prospect that unions will agree to employee contributions is remote. Thus, the University should defer the restart of employee contributions until there have been substantial salary increases to bring our salaries and benefits to competitive levels.

Third, it is absolutely essential that what was to have been (in 2008-2009) year 2 of the faculty salary plan be carried out in 2009-10. It remains the policy of the Academic Senate that there is no higher priority than paying competitive salaries. We can no longer expect to recruit the best faculty, even with off-scale salaries, given the salary trajectory that job candidates would rationally project for a career at UC. The risk is high that we will become feeder campuses for better funded institutions as established faculty are picked off. The implications for the quality of the education we provide, at the undergraduate and graduate levels, are clear and dire.

Fourth, the critical objectives regarding UCRP and faculty compensation must be approached within the context of the University's overall financial situation. It is essential that the University and State agree on a realistic mission for UC that the State is willing and able to fund.

Numerous proposals for new professional schools and other programs are under consideration, and the benefit to the state from expansion of UC's mission seems beyond debate. However, an expanded mission cannot be contemplated when UC is underfunded at its current size and scope. The Academic Senate recommends against any expansion of UC's mission until adequate funding levels are restored for existing programs.

In recessions prior to 2000, the University was able to absorb significant reductions in state funding for a period of two or three years, and was able to recover when the State subsequently provided catch-up funding to bring the University back to its long-term State support path. However, the meager funding increases since the end of the 2000-2001 recession have left the University well short of the funding needed to support an excellent research university providing excellent instruction to the number of students eligible to attend UC under the Master Plan. More details on the effects of funding shortfalls can be found in The Cuts Report transmitted by the Academic Council to President Dynes in April, 2008. Either we need more money, or we need to be a smaller institution than the one envisaged under the Master Plan.

In this context, the following are examples of steps needing urgent consideration:

1. Freezing all but a very limited number of essential hires.
2. Reducing admissions to the 2007-08 level, since the State did not fund the additional students admitted in 2008-09 and is unlikely to fund additional students in 2009-10.
3. Freezing state funding of the start-up costs of new professional programs such as medical schools and law schools.
4. Using the savings generated from the above steps to fund the employer contribution on behalf of state-funded employees, allowing the collection of contributions from external funding agencies, the medical centers, and endowment earnings on behalf of the employees whose salaries they support.

Finally, the Senate strongly opposes a policy of wait-and-see.

The actions we have outlined cannot wait for the usual budget cycle in which difficult decisions await the May revise and prolonged negotiations over a likely budget stalemate extend into the summer of 2009. Consideration of these actions must be part of the discussion as early as the presentation of a 2009-2010 budget at the November Regents meeting.

The Regents approved and adopted a new policy on rehiring UC retirees in response to a San Francisco Chronicle report on the rehire of a retired police chief at UCB, who was allowed to retire and continue working with no break in service. This policy does not apply to faculty members who retire from faculty appointments and are subsequently recalled for academic duties (under APM 200-22). It does apply to retired faculty members who are rehired into staff or senior management positions while remaining in retiree status. The policy was subsequently routed through UC committees for review and comment. No substantive issues arose with the policy itself during the review process, but UCI committees registered concern that the Regents adopted the policy without prior Senate consultation.

APPROVAL OF UCI ENDOWED CHAIRS

The UCI Senate approved three new endowed chairs in the Henry Samueli School of Engineering: Emulex Endowed Chair in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, the Edwards Life Science Endowed Professor and the Endowed Chair for Center for Diversity in Engineering Education.

LAW SCHOOL UPDATE

The Law School is progressing on schedule and with much promise. It currently has 19 faculty members and administration personnel. Prior to opening admissions, the School received an onslaught of inquiries from prospective students.

UCI COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES

Anesthesiology Issue

In September, local newspapers reported that a government investigation revealed that some UCI anesthesiologists were filling out their reports on surgical procedures before the procedures were completed, and that UCI's "deemed status" had been withdrawn. Academic Senate leadership met with the Chancellor to help resolve the issue and worked with Vice Chancellor Bailey to communicate the facts of the situation to the campus community. The Academic Senate distributed the following letter from Vice Chancellor Bailey to its members.

27 September 2008

Dear Colleagues,

I am writing to provide additional information indicating how we have responded to the recently described problems regarding sloppy and unacceptable record-keeping practices by some clinicians in our Department of Anesthesiology.

Over the past 2 years UC Irvine Health Affairs has been particularly proactive in improving its services. Well before we received notification about problematic practices in the anesthesia department from the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), we had taken extensive measures to correct them. Specifically, we had hired a new chair of the Department of Anesthesiology (Zeev Kain, M.D., former Executive Vice Chair of the department at Yale University), and hired six new faculty members. We had purchased almost 4\$ million worth of new anesthesia equipment, and had purchased and were in the process of implementing an anesthesiology information management system that renders hand-

written anesthesia reports obsolete. In addition, new department policies and procedures, including a stringent compliance plan with a “zero-tolerance” policy, have been implemented. Since receipt of the CMS report, we have engaged in the meetings and corrective efforts listed below in the timeline.

The involvement of the California Department of Public Health in this process deserves some explanation. First, all hospitals in the state operate under licensure from the Department of Public Health. Hospitals that are accredited by The Joint Commission (such as UC Irvine Medical Center) are “deemed” to meet all of Medicare’s Conditions of Participation (COP). When a hospital fails to be compliant with any of the COP, it loses this “deemed” status under CMS and functions under the respective state Department of Public Health until CMS accepts a corrective action plan and performs an unannounced onsite validation survey. During the interim period, the hospital continues to operate and bill as usual.

On September 16 we received verbal acceptance of our corrective action plan from CMS and now await our onsite validation survey. We are confident that this survey will result in our recovering our “deemed” status.

The timeline below shows the sequence of events and the extensive action taken by the medical center and school of medicine administration to address the problems.

This case of a complaint and the subsequent corrective set of actions illustrates that the medical center and the school of medicine are coordinating well with each other and have become much more skilled at self-regulation, monitoring, and corrective action than they were in the past.

We are proud that the programs of the clinical departments are of high quality. This is evidenced by such external indicators as the September 25 recognition of UC Irvine Medical Center as one of only 26 adult hospitals (out of 1,220 participating hospitals nationwide) recognized by The Leapfrog Group as one of the nation’s safest and highest-quality hospitals. We are the only UC hospital to receive this honor. In addition, US News & World Report recognized UC Irvine Medical Center as among the top 3% of hospitals in the nation, and some of our programs (e.g., Geriatrics, Gynecology, Urology) were singled out as being among the very best in the nation. The Joint Commission reaccredited us in 2007 and also this year awarded us reaccreditation for our Stroke program and accreditation for our Heart Failure program. This year we also were awarded recertification as a “Magnet” (best nursing) hospital. Indeed, this is what an academic medical center should be and what is needed for a College of Health Sciences that is about to open (in February 2009) a cutting-edge, high-technology University hospital.

I thank the faculty for their support and encouragement and look forward to continued open communications.

Very truly yours,

David N. Bailey, M.D.
Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs

ATTACHMENT:

SEQUENCE OF EVENTS RELATED TO CMS SURVEY OF ANESTHESIOLOGY

August 20-Afternoon-UCIMC administration receives Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) Survey results and cover letter indicating deemed status was being revoked pending receipt of acceptable corrective action plan and passing a re-survey of the facility.

August 21-Meeting with Chair of Department of Anesthesiology and key department members regarding survey results and response.

August 22-Chair of Department of Anesthesiology requests that the President of the Medical Staff investigate physicians named in CMS Survey as having pre-filled out anesthesia reports.

August 22-Governing Body has telephonic meeting with Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs, UC Irvine Medical Center Chief Medical Officer, UC Irvine Medical Center CEO and UC Irvine Chief Health Sciences Counsel regarding CMS Survey results.

August 25-President of the Medical Staff appoints an ad hoc committee to investigate action of the physicians named in the CMS Survey.

August 25-Faculty meeting of the department of Anesthesiology to go over the CMS report and corrective plan

August 26-New anesthesiology information management system goes on line (acquired April 15) .

August 27-UC Irvine Medical Center Plan of Corrective Action/Response to survey results is sent to CMS and California Department of Health Services.

September 8-Meeting of UC Irvine Medical Center Medical Executive Committee.

September 10-Meeting of UC Irvine Medical Executive Committee Performance Improvement Committee

September 11-Meeting of Medical Staff Governing Body Advisory Committee and Governing Body.

September 12-Receipt of Public Records Act Request from Orange County Register, requesting copies of the CMS survey/response and accompanying letters.

September 15-Medical Executive Committee meets

September 15-Meeting of Medical Staff Governing Body Advisory Committee with Governing Body.

September 16 – CMS verbally accepts our corrective action plan and indicates that it will perform a revalidation survey in the near future

September 22-faculty meeting of the department of Anesthesiology to go over Policies & Procedures Manual (developed over the past 2 months)

September 25- Follow up faculty meeting of the Department of Anesthesiology to go over Policies & Procedures Manual

September 25- Article in Orange County Register

September 26- Article in Los Angeles Times

Anticipate a resurvey at any time, beginning in mid-October

College of Health Sciences Budget Issues

Developments in the College of Health Sciences (CoHS) regarding new measures to address the budget deficit have stirred considerable concerns among faculty members about CoHS leadership. Academic Senate Chair Heckhausen appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on CoHS (consisting of the Senate Chair, Senate Chair Elect, Chair of Committee on Planning and Budget, Senate Chair of CoHS Faculty Executive Committee, and Senate Chair Elect of CoHS Faculty Executive Committee) to work with the medical school faculty and campus and CoHS administration to help resolve these issues. The UCI administration has been working with CoHS administration, the CoHS Executive Committee, CoHS faculty, and the Ad Hoc Committee on CoHS on its plans for deficit reduction, and over the next month expects to arrive at a new direction for budgetary development. The CoHS Representative Assembly recently voted to postpone its November 21st meeting to December 15th, when it will discuss the changes. We expect decisions regarding the

budgetary and leadership issues to be made by mid-December. The Ad Hoc Committee on CoHS will keep UCI faculty informed about new developments.

Hospital Update

The new university hospital was completed on budget and on time, and is scheduled to open in February.

Affiliation with the Children's Hospital of Orange County (CHOC)

Children's Hospital of Orange County and UC Irvine Healthcare and UC Irvine School of Medicine are proposing a strategic affiliation to better serve the children and families of Orange County and beyond.

In late September, the CHOC Board of Directors approved the affiliation. The Department of Pediatrics supported the affiliation also. The major administrative conclusion of the agreement was attained in the Regents decision during their last meeting in November. Some issues regarding faculty research opportunities and work environment (especially nursing) are still under negotiation.

NEWS FROM THE COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES

Council on Faculty Welfare

The Council on Faculty Welfare (CFW) will be following up on several issues that were started during the 2007-08 academic year.

- The Council will be conducting an analysis of faculty salary data provided by the Administration. This is the same data used by Academic Personnel in its analysis of equity issues and is available on the UCI web at <http://www.ap.uci.edu/Equity/index.html>. The Council will look forward to sharing its conclusions with the Cabinet and Administration when the analysis has been completed.
- The Council is continuing its discussion of the UCI Emeriti Association's Proposal for a Senate Committee on Ethics. A CFW subcommittee will be investigating how to strengthen ethics oversight at UCI.

Three new issues for the Council's consideration include: 1) the resumption of UC and employee contributions to the UC Retirement Plan (UCRP), 2) UC pension investments and UC voting at stock holder meetings on matters such as CEO executive pay, and 3) how to encourage faculty service on Senate committees.

Senate members are also encouraged to forward issues related to faculty welfare, academic freedom, affirmative action and diversity, and emeriti affairs to the Council for review.

Graduate Council

All-Campus Orientation Program

Graduate Council is considering a proposal from Graduate Division to create an all-campus orientation program for the incoming graduate student class of 2009. This new program would not replace the current orientation model which has relied upon each academic unit to provide departmental and campus orientation information to their own students. Instead, the one-day event would provide all graduate students with a common orientation to campus-wide resources, allow them to be welcomed by campus leadership, and build connections with other new graduate students from all disciplines.

Review of the Time to Degree Policy and Doctoral 2A Status

Doctoral 2A is the UC systemwide designation for doctoral students who are more than nine quarters post-Advancement to Candidacy. Each UC campus receives a budget based on student headcount, which does not include students in this category. Thus, while Doctoral 2A students continue to utilize University resources and faculty advising, the campus does not receive funding from the Office of the President to support such activities. This reduced funding ultimately

affects all students, including those within normative time to degree. Students with Doctoral 2A status not only create a financial burden for the University; their status usually renders them ineligible for TAs and nearly all fellowships, as well.

However, in some circumstances, a Ph.D. candidate may need to be enrolled for more than nine quarters after Advancement to Candidacy, for example, to complete necessary, significant research in remote archives or field sites. Therefore, Graduate Council has requested that each program review its Time to Degree in policy and in practice, to ensure that none of its students making normative progress is inadvertently penalized by being categorized in unqualified Doctoral 2A status.

Council on Research, Computing and Libraries

The Council on Research, Computing, and Libraries (CORCL) has approved a Research and Travel Budget for Academic Year 2008-2009. CORCL members restated their strong support for bringing conferences to campus by agreeing to set aside \$13,000.00 in matching funds after hearing that the program had been discontinued by the Office of Research. CORCL allocated Research and Travel funds to Schools and is happy to report that all schools received an overall increase in support for Research and Travel, although support increases still remain slightly below the pace of FTE growth.

Council on Student Experience

Members of the Council on Student Experience (CSE) recently received reports from De Gallow, the director of the Teaching, Learning and Technology Center (TLTC), and Rudi Berkelhamer, the Associate Dean for the Division of Undergraduate Education (DUE). TLTC sponsored a two-day teaching assistant training session with discipline specific instruction: 30 departments participated and 300 new T.A.s attended. DUE reported that WASC, the accreditation service, is asking that every UCI department provide mission and assessment of mission statements. DUE will help departments craft these statements. In the coming weeks, CSE will be discussing issues related to academic honesty, procedures related to student grievances, and the UC Systemwide Accountability Report.

Council on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools

The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS) heard from Acting Director of Admissions, Brent Yunek, who reported that UCI will no longer receive extra funds from the Office of the President when UCI enrollment results in higher than projected targets. Currently there are approximately 1,100 students enrolled (all levels) for which OP money will not be given this year. The Office of Admissions continues to work on methods for streamlining the application review process. Under a new admissions policy passed by CUARS members, admission of freshman applicants to the School of Arts will consider supplemental criteria which demonstrate exceptional achievement in the areas of Visual and Performing Arts. These applicants would still be required to pass auditions or other application processes required by the School of the Arts.

Council on Planning and Budget

The UC President's Draft Accountability Framework is a first step in establishing an annual report that tracks the University's progress in meeting key goals. The accountability framework is expected to assist divisions in providing evidence-based, data-driven reports each year. The framework is already available online in a public draft form that will be finalized in early 2009; it will become a template for future reports to help assess institutional quality.

CPB is in the process of reviewing indicators in any section of the framework related to academic planning and budgeting. The review focuses on areas that may not have been addressed, or were addressed inadequately; areas where additional analyses might need to be done to clarify issues or address the root of a problem; or new qualitative and/or quantitative data that can illuminate various areas. This is a critical opportunity for the Senate to help set a baseline for the report.

CPB notes that there is currently no metric that reveals the extent of accumulated funding disparities among the campuses. For instance, endowment per student should be adjusted to reflect "endowment per student normalized by campus age" - i.e. divided by number of years since campus inception. Another crucial area for greater transparency is campus-by-campus data on net State funds per enrollment, excluding nonresident tuition, a portion of federal indirect cost

reimbursement, overhead on State agreements, application fees, and miscellaneous fees. CPB requests that UCOP help campuses track net State funds per enrollment, adjusted by State fund allocations budgeted to health sciences and Multicampus Research Units (since campuses operate MRUs for the benefit of all faculty, University-wide), and also adjusted by State funds budgeted to agricultural field stations which are historically line-item funded.

Council on Educational Policy

CEP continues to emphasize writing and is holding an external program review of upper-division and lower-division writing in March, 2009. We have a Chair for the review, namely Andrea A. Lunsford, Department of English, Stanford University. CEP reviewed the Freshman Integrated Program (FIP), approving it for two more years, and is seeking further information on how well students learn to write, especially as compared to other courses. In its response to the report on the academic program review of the School of Biological Sciences, CEP discussed at length ways of improving writing among upper-division students.

Soon to come is an evaluation of teaching in the Summer Sessions, and presentation of material on learning outcomes to the Western Association of School and Colleges. CEP is currently in the process of defining learning outcomes for the General Education Categories. We strongly believe that assessment should be largely aimed not at evaluation, but at discovering how to improve education.

Council on Academic Personnel

The Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on the Dean's Delegated Merit (DDM) Process has been completed. It endorsed the process, and made a few suggestions for improving it. It then went to the EVCP and consultation with the deans. Final action in November continued the DDM process beyond the three-year trial period and added a provision that, for schools and programs that have been in existence for less than 5 years, the first review action following a dean delegated appointment will be reviewed by CAP (in other words, for these units, the first review will not be a dean delegated merit action).

After a three-year trial period, and as originally planned, a review of the Deans' Delegated Appointment process is currently commencing, with the review committee to be composed of three members selected by the Academic Senate and two members appointed by the EVCP.

Board on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors & Financial Aids

In an attempt to increase the yield of high-achieving transfer students to UCI to 100 in 2009/2010, the Board on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Financial Aid voted to offer Regents' Scholarships to all transfer students admitted under the new (pilot) Transfer Honors Enrollment Guarantee Program. The pilot is still under review by the Academic Senate.

RELOCATION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE

The Academic Senate Office is moving to the third floor of Berkeley Place South to allow for an early start of construction on the UCI Law School Library. The Academic Senate office will be closed on December 18-19, 2008. As of December 22, 2008, the Academic Senate's main office will be located at Suite 3700 Berkeley Place South. The contact information for Senate Staff should remain unchanged except for the room number. Conference Room numbers for meeting locations will be updated on the Senate website on December 18th: www.senate.uci.edu. Please note the change of location for your Council and/or Committee meetings. Information related to the Divisional Senate Assembly Meetings will be updated in the near future.