Proposal to Repeal Select Committees of the UCLA Academic Senate

BACKGROUND

Comprised of over 2000 non-emeriti faculty, the UCLA Academic Senate (Senate) is the primary vehicle for faculty participation in the shared governance of the university.¹ Service is an important element in the academic personnel process of promotion and tenure as well as the lifeblood of a vital university community. Traditionally the UCLA Senate has had many more committees than most other UC campuses. The large number of committees has made communication more difficult and reduced our efficacy in our interactions among committees and outside the Senate.

Senate faculty face an increasing number of demands on their time—as well as opportunities—in the realms of research, teaching, and service. The Senate competes with many other service priorities such as departmental/unit administration and scholarly societies. This situation creates on-going challenges to both fill the membership of dozens of committees, councils, and subcommittees as well as to create diverse and representative bodies. As a result, the current structure of standing committees reduces the Senate’s intended impact.

With increased recognition of the extra service burden experienced by women and BIPOC faculty, it is clear that service is both unequally valued and distributed unequally. If the Senate wishes to recruit our best faculty to serve on its committees, the Senate must provide meaningful, valuable, attractive and duly recognized service opportunities on all its committees and councils. The Senate’s governance efficacy derives not from the number of the committees it stands up, but rather from the fulfillment of its functions (advisory and authority). Gone are the days when a committee’s function consisted of occasional meetings with invited guests providing updates—where the committee offered neither consequential advisement nor flexed its designated authority.

This proposal allows the Senate to have comprehensive responses to complex matters. Clarifying responsibilities reduces “mission drift” and refocuses attention to work that is most meaningful. The realignment allows committees with genuine authority to have control over the whole range of their portfolios. From a governance perspective, the proposal streamlines communication within committees as well as with the Executive Board and the Legislative Assembly.

Recalibrating committees to match staff and faculty resources and core priorities is important and timely. It is a reality that the Senate office has three fewer staff positions than this time last year. The realignment also aims to focus above all on faculty service. By increasing the effectiveness of core

¹ In academic year 2019-20, UCLA had 3639 Senate members of whom 2384 were Non-Emeriti (including Senate titles without faculty appointments) and 1255 Emeriti members.
committees, service will be more meaningful, recognized, and enjoyable to a broader group of faculty. Currently, the Committee on Committees finds it difficult to fill all committees, particularly with both the requisite expertise and diversity. It is imperative to reduce the burden on Senate membership for service.

Executive Board Approval

At its meeting on January 21, 2021, the Executive Board reviewed the attached proposal titled “Valuing Faculty Service to the Academic Senate,” to realign Senate committees and councils.

After thoughtful discussion, the Executive Board unanimously approved the following motion:

1) “update the bylaws of a) the Faculty Welfare Committee to clearly include emeriti matters, b) the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Councils to clarify their roles regarding evaluation of teaching, University Extension courses and programs, and intercollegiate athletics, and c) the Council on Planning and Budget regarding development activities;

2) sunset the Committee on Emeriti Affairs, Committee on Teaching, Committee on Continuing and Community Education, Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, Committee on Development, and the Faculty Research Lectureship Committee;

3) create an ad hoc Awards Committee or standing Awards Committee; and

4) submit changes to the Legislative Assembly in 2020-21 effective September 1, 2021.”

PROPOSAL

1. Repeal the Divisional Bylaws for the Committee on Emeriti Affairs (CEA)

At many divisional UC Academic Senates, the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) is responsible for emeriti-related affairs. The FWC Chair is a member of the systemwide University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) that routinely advocates on matters important to emeriti including health benefits and pensions. The UCLA Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) “advises the Division and confers with administrative agencies on all matters involving faculty welfare, including but not limited to the level of salaries, salary determination methodology, benefits, insurance, retirement, housing and conditions of employment.” Its bylaws also dictate one member focused on emeriti issues. By strengthening the FWC bylaws to include clearly emeriti affairs, and expand its membership to include additional emeriti members, the FWC can leverage its advisory role more effectively. The Committee on Emeriti Affairs (CEA) is duplicative in function and purpose.

2. Repeal the Divisional Bylaws for the Committee on Teaching (COT)

The Graduate and Undergraduate Councils (Councils) have authority over academic matters including course approval, review of methods for assessment of teaching, and review of instruction in the context of program review. In practice, the Committee on Teaching (COT) functions primarily and at times almost exclusively as an awards review committee. \(^2\) Updating the Councils’ bylaws to include pedagogy

---

\(^2\) Faculty review of awards applications and associated administrative functions will remain intact in the Senate with a consolidated and more efficient organizational structure.
and evaluation will reflect more accurately their current purview. The COT is duplicative in function and purpose.

3. **Repeal the Divisional Bylaws for the Committee on Continuing and Community Education (CCCE)**

The Graduate and Undergraduate Councils (Councils) have authority over academic matters such as approval of all courses and evaluation of all programs including University Extension (Extension). Indeed, current Committee on Continuing and Community Education (CCCE) bylaws specify, “Detailed oversight of the Extension courses and programs will not be the focus of CCCE. As provided in Senate bylaws, monitoring Extension’s management, programs, and instructors is best accomplished by the Senate Program Review Process and the delegation of course approvals to the relevant departments and programs. Extension courses and programs that convey degree credit at UCLA, such as the XL series, fall under the jurisdiction of the Graduate or Undergraduate Councils and are subject to their approval and oversight.” CCCE bylaws do indicate its advisory role with regard to non-degree-seeking students and related certificate programs. In practice, CCCE has not engaged in this role. By integrating these aspects of CCEE bylaws into those of the Councils, the Senate will close any loopholes or “grey areas” with regard to its authority over all curricular and academic matters including those housed in Extension. Consequently, CCCE is duplicative in purpose and function.

4. **Repeal the Divisional Bylaws for the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC)**

The Graduate and Undergraduate Councils (Councils) have authority over, and make policy for, all academic matters including admissions, degree progress, and student academic performance. Currently, the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC) has an advisory role to the Councils for a small subpopulation of students. Updating the bylaws of the Councils to clarify their responsibility for the oversight of, and development of policy recommendations on academic matters involving, intercollegiate athletics will decrease duplication of effort and integrate overlapping policy areas. As a result, the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC) is duplicative in function and purpose.

5. **Repeal the Divisional Bylaws for the Committee on Development (COD)**

The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) has a key role in advising on campus allocation of fiscal resources. Per its bylaws, “The Council, after appropriate consultation, makes recommendations based on established Senate policy to the Chancellor and Senate agencies concerning the allocation of educational resources, academic priorities, and the planning and budgetary process.” At a time when the campus has diversified its funding streams due to reduced state support, incorporating the evaluation of “any development activities by the Division and its agencies” into the realm of CPB oversight will allow the Senate to more holistically and knowledgeably participate in shared governance. As CPB has the following text in its bylaws, “appoints such standing and ad hoc committees as are needed to discharge its duties” the Council would create a standing subcommittee or ad hoc committee on development, as it deems most appropriate. This update to CPB bylaws renders the Committee on Development (COD) as duplicative in function and purpose.

---

3 COD Bylaws
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6. **Repeal the Divisional Bylaws for the Faculty Research Lectureship Committee**

The Senate disburses approximately $1 million annually in competitive research and travel grants to over 300 faculty, and administers 41 other awards proffered to 11 Senate faculty, four Non-Senate faculty, 23 students, and one staff recipient.

Currently, six committees (Council on Research’s Faculty Grants Program Committee, Committee on Teaching, Faculty Research Lectureship Committee, Graduate Council, the Undergraduate Council’s Honors, Awards and Prizes Committee, and the Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion) are involved in selecting award and grant recipients. In three out of six of these committees, the application review and selection processes is a significant portion of the committee charge.

The Senate would rather not constrain valuable faculty time in a yearlong commitment to a seasonal activity (primarily Winter quarter). Currently, the Committee on Committees annually appoints seven members to the Faculty Research Lectureship Committee (FRLC) whose sole function is to select the award recipients. Despite three-year terms, FRLC members operate during a brief window to review a handful of applications. Instead, the Senate will create either a standing Awards Committee or draw an *ad hoc* awards workgroup from the membership of current committees and councils. As a result, the Faculty Research Lectureship Committee’s purpose will be defunct.

**Motions**

Motion 1: “Repeal Divisional Bylaw 80.6 on University Emeriti and Pre-Retirement Relations. (Commonly known as Committee on Emeriti Affairs.)”

Motion 2: “Repeal Divisional Bylaw 67.3 on the Committee on Teaching.”

Motion 3: “Repeal Divisional Bylaw 67.5 on the Committee on Continuing and Community Education.”

Motion 4: “Repeal Divisional Bylaw 67.6 on the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee.”

Motion 5: “Repeal Divisional Bylaw 75.4 on University Development. (Commonly known as the Committee on Development.)”

Motion 6: “Repeal Divisional Bylaw 80.3 on the Faculty Research Lectureship Committee.”