Report of the Representative to the Assembly of the Academic Senate
October 11, 2006

TO: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The meeting began with a consultation with the President, Bob Dynes. President Dynes had earlier circulated a written report outlining: 1. university efforts to build public support for UC in the general public and within the state and federal government; 2. the importance of health education for the state of California; 3. personnel issues including, primarily, benefits to faculty and staff; 4. long-range planning activities at the UC; and 5. recent developments at the National Labs. President Dynes elaborated on some of the issues in his oral remarks and responded to questions. He indicated that he sees the education of international students as of paramount importance and also closely linked to “distance education.” In response to concerns raised by UCSC, Dynes differentiated between compensation and salaries, noted that the resumption of individual contributions to the retirement fund is intended to provide “a soft landing,” and stated that he planned to have UC salaries be competitive with the “comparison eight institutions” by 2010-2011. President Dynes also promised to supply via e-mail more information about the division of state dollars into salary dollars and dollars for benefits, and information on how the salary dollars are divided into merit and other funds. Following President Dynes’ remarks, Chair Oakley named six issues that will be pressing this year. They are: 1. salary scales; 2. non-resident tuition for graduate students; 3. the funding and solvency of the health care system; 4. the system of slotted the pay of campus administrators according to the size and complexity of the administered unit, a system proposed last year by a Regent and opposed by both the Senate and the UC Office of the President (UCOP); 5. the choice of continuing system-wide Senate leadership; and b. the functioning of the national labs.

The Assembly engaged in a lengthy discussion of a motion to endorse a statement crafted by the Academic Council concerning under what conditions research funding sources might be restricted by the Regents. The motion carried to endorse the following statement: “The Academic Council instructs the Chair of Council to advise the President that grave issues of academic freedom would be raised if The Regents were to deviate from the principle that no unit of the University, whether by faculty vote or administrative decision, has the authority to prevent a faculty member from accepting external research funding based solely on the source of the funds. Policies such as the faculty code of conduct are already in place on all campuses to uphold the highest standards and integrity of research. The Academic Council believes that Regental intervention of the basis of assumptions about the moral or political standing of the donor is unwarranted.”

Assembly then turned to the issue of the national laboratories. Discussion was devoted to how the Academic Senate/faculty of the University of California can be more engaged in the new Los Alamos Limited Liability Corporation. Specific topics included: (1) recommendations on review protocols for Senate oversight of the labs; (2) Advising on the dispersal of UC’s share of fee monies from lab management; (3) establishment of a
joint Senate, administration and laboratory committee to promote faculty-lab interactions; (4) joint collaborations between the Senate and the labs on personnel review issues at the labs; and (5) mechanisms for input on major lab-related policy issues. A statement with a sequence of recommendations was unanimously approved by the Assembly for transmission to the President: the full statement can be found at: http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/oct2006/faculty.lab.relations.10.06.pdf

During the new business period, Assembly returned to the question of any restrictions on funding. Assembly passed two resolutions. The first decried funding arrangements that give an illusion of academic freedom but are, in fact, suppressing academic freedom. The second affirmed that Assembly was convinced by empirical evidence that the tobacco industry has engaged in funding arrangements that give the illusion of supporting academic freedom but that, in fact, suppress academic freedom.

Respectfully Submitted;

Quentin Williams, Vice Chair