



Record of the Assembly

University of California Academic Senate

**Offices of the Secretaries:
(North) 320 Stephens Hall, Berkeley
(South) 3130 Murphy Hall, Los Angeles
December 3, 1980**

Contents

— 1 —

Announcements by the Chairman.	2
Announcements by the President.	4
University Planning Statement	5
Basic Skills and Remedial Education	
Undergraduate Teaching	
Faculty Compensation.	
Mandatory Retirement	
Collective Bargaining	
Fiscal Outlook	
Announcements by Representative of Student Body Presidents' Council.	6
Consent Calendar.	7
Annual Reports	8
Divisional Regulations	9
Davis Regulation A540(C)	10
Los Angeles Regulation A309(A)	
San Diego Regulations 500, 501, 505.	
Legislative Ruling 12.80	
Academic Council.	
By-Laws 50, 58, 80	
Appointment of At-Large Member, Committee on Committees	
Appointment of Faculty Member, Governor's Advisory	
Committee concerning Regental Appointments.	
Committee to Revise the Manual of the Academic Senate	
Standing Committees	

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools	11
Educational Policy	12
Privilege and Tenure	
Research. . . .	
Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes. . .	
Faculty Outreach and Affirmative Action	
Time and Effort Reporting. . .	15
Appendix. Annual Report of the University Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes	18

Meeting

The Assembly of the Academic Senate met at 10 a.m. Wednesday, December 3, 1980, in the California Room of the Faculty Center on the Los Angeles campus, pursuant to call.

Present: 39 voting members, as shown in the Attendance Record following the minutes.

Present by invitation: Professors V. A. Dearing, Secretary (South); W. O. Bostick, Parliamentarian; W. E. Broen, Jr., Chairman, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools; F. N. Spiess, Chairman, University Committee on Privilege and Tenure; M. D. Intriligator, 1979-80 Chairman, University Committee on Research; Brian McDonald, representative of the Student Body Presidents' Council; D. Landis, Interim Editor, NOTICE.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate on May 28, 1980 were approved as distributed.

Announcements by the Chairman: B. Aaron

Professor Aaron opened the meeting with an account of the state of the Senate and the principal problems it faces now and in the immediate future, substantially as follows:

The Senate machinery is, for the most part, working well, and the major committees are addressing problems of great importance and concern to the faculty and the University. Communications between these committees and their Divisional counterparts have improved. A particular effort is being made this year to enhance the effectiveness of the Statewide Committee on University and Faculty Welfare.

The operation of the Senate in the context of joint governance is, however, still less than satisfactory. Although there has been improvement in recent years in making Senate views known to Systemwide Administration before final decisions are reached, there remain many instances in which consultation with the Senate comes after the fact, or too late for substantial influence. This situation is to be deplored, but the blame may lie with the Senate as well as the Administration. Both are complex bureaucracies involved in prolonged consideration of issues by a variety of persons and committees. The time consumed in such examination may exceed action deadlines. The Senate has sought to solve this problem in two ways: by pressing Systemwide Administration

to provide longer lead times for preparing positions on issues; and by concentrating principal responsibility for preparing position statements in a single Statewide Senate committee.

Despite these efforts, Senate participation in governance in some instances is almost meaningless. I do not interpret this as a deliberate attempt by Administration to minimize the Senate's role; rather, since they do not always see eye-to-eye with the faculty, the Administration may believe it has the power and duty to act either without consultation with the Senate or in disregard of the Senate's expressed disapproval. This tension between faculty and Administration arises infrequently, but

— 3 —

some of it is inevitable, and may even be healthy. The concept of joint governance implies a measure of strain and disagreement, the eventual resolution of which can lead to constructive change. The sheer magnitude of our educational enterprise guarantees that new problems will emerge at the same time that existing ones are resolved. But the mutual respect and good will that currently exists between the Senate and the Administration bodes well for the future of joint governance of the University.

One development that could profoundly affect the present system of joint governance is the move on several campuses to select an employee organization as the exclusive bargaining representative for the faculty. The Berkeley faculty narrowly rejected a bid for exclusive representation by their Faculty Association. Rival organizations at UCLA were defeated by only a plurality of those voting, so a run-off election must be held between the Faculty Association and no representation. The outcome was similar at Santa Cruz, except that the Faculty Association, rather than no representation, received the highest number of votes.

Faculty are, of course, divided over the desirability of exclusive representation by an employee organization in respect of those matters specified in the Berman Act as appropriate subjects for bargaining. But there are two clear implications of the elections to date. The number of faculty eligible to vote, that did not, was high on all campuses (35% at Berkeley, 31% at Los Angeles, and 22% at Santa Cruz). Since the elections were well publicized and the faculty were well informed of all views, it can only be assumed that those who failed to vote were indifferent to the outcome. This widespread apathy, or irresponsibility, is deeply disturbing, considering the long-term significance of such an issue. Those who choose to disenfranchise themselves and regret the outcome of the voting will have only themselves to blame. The second implication is that a substantial portion of the faculty is dissatisfied with the present system of joint governance. It is impossible to measure the degree of dissatisfaction or to determine whether it is directed primarily at the Administration or at the Senate, or both. But without the confidence and active support of the faculty, joint governance becomes an impossibility. Such apathy and disenchantment among faculty presents a major challenge to the Administration and the Academic Senate to enhance their joint efforts to improve this system of governance before it is replaced by something else.

The most important problem for the faculty and the University is how to accommodate the new generation of high school graduates who will be seeking admission during the 1980s, and related issue of faculty time-use. The Academic Senate is pledged to continue its review of the quality of teaching, but is not yet prepared to agree to an automatic increase in teaching loads simply to increase the reported number of student-contact hours.

The Senate must resist the pressure to admit unqualified students to the University. The faculty is not equipped, and should not be asked to engage in massive remedial education of students who cannot meet our standards of admission or retention. It does, however, have an obligation to cooperate with other segments of higher and secondary education in an attempt to increase the pool of eligible high school graduates.

— 4 —

The Academic Senate is firmly enough established to withstand the inevitable stresses and strains that will occur during the 1980s, but it must guard against inflexibility and lack of imagination in dealing with problems

not previously encountered.

Announcements by the President: D. S. Saxon

President Saxon spoke substantially as follows:

University Planning Statement

The Planning Statement, currently being reviewed, focuses on seven substantive issues fundamental to the University's academic mission: basic academic skills, minority student access, enrollment, faculty vitality, undergraduate education, graduate and professional education, and research. I hope that there will be vigorous and thoughtful response to these issues from the Senate, including comment on whether they are the right issues to focus on, whether the assignments of responsibility are appropriate, and how the issues could be developed in greater detail.

Basic Skills and Remedial Education

I am aware of faculty unease about increasing University involvement in remedial education, but emphasize that the persistent decline in basic skills is a severe and widespread problem to which the University must respond. In the long range, the University can work with the schools and with present and future teachers in the schools to improve the quality of pre-college education. In the short range, it can offer remedial education to students who qualify for the University but who obviously need help when they enroll. Acceptance of this dual role is a part of our educational responsibility as long as the basic skills problem persists in its present form. The University is asking the State to assume its share of responsibility by providing funds for intensive instruction. Opportunity Funds have been allocated for basic skills programs on each campus. Addressing the basic skills problem is an indispensable first step towards increasing minority access, since the problem falls with an especially heavy hand on minority students. The ultimate answer to accommodating new kinds of students is finding ways to prepare them for University-level education. Once that is accomplished, the fundamental problem will have been resolved. The University cannot solve this problem alone, and in fact the CSUC and CC segments, as well as the California Round Table on Educational Opportunity, are jointly seeking solutions.

Undergraduate Teaching

The essential questions involved in undergraduate teaching are qualitative rather than quantitative, but the impact of information reduced to a numerical form, as in the Faculty Time-Use Survey, cannot be ignored. IRSB has been asked to respond to faculty concerns over the conclusions of the study, but I remind Senate members that the study was designed in close consultation with the Academic Senate. I have asked the Chancellors to look into the possible reasons for the decline, and to work with their Deans, department chairs, and the faculty on their campuses to increase scheduled class hours and restore a pattern of faculty instructional activities to at least the

— 5 —

average time levels in the 1977-78 survey. I have asked Vice President Swain to prepare Universitywide guidelines to be used in developing a faculty workload policy. I believe such policies are pragmatically important, and hope they can be in effect by the end of the 1980-81 year.

The Task Force on Teaching Evaluation contains evidence of the faculty's strong convictions about teaching. A program to enhance and enrich the University's commitment to teaching should include at least the following aspects: implementation of the Task Force's recommendations, augmentation of instructions to faculty merit and promotion committees to emphasize the importance of excellent teaching in the merit review process,

evaluation of the use of the University's instructional improvement funds, and a greater effort to encourage more interaction between faculty and students.

Faculty Compensation

I hope that The Regents' approval of my recommendation for a 9.5% faculty salary increase will permit the University to remain competitive with institutions of similar quality, and to take into account the continuing steep inflation rate. I also hope that the proposed increase will survive the legislative process, and intend that the University will make as persuasive a case as possible. I have a strong conviction that our faculty salaries should be above the median of our eight comparison institutions. I am pleased that, for the first time in a decade, we have regained our competitive edge with respect to salaries.

Mandatory Retirement

In responding to the resolution concerning mandatory retirement adopted by the Assembly last spring, let me state that these arguments on behalf of extending mandatory retirement to age 70 are not new, and that they were carefully considered in 1978 and 1979 while the present policy was being developed. The validity of the principal reason for its adoption—to allow faculty renewal in a period of limited resources—still stands. I have, however, urged the Chancellors to do all they can to meet the needs of retiring faculty, particularly those born between 1912 and 1915, with sensitive and individual attention, without diminishing the capacity to bring in young people.

Collective Bargaining

Despite the potential divisiveness of elections involving this issue, there has been no evidence of rancor or recriminations in the elections held so far. On the other hand, the number of votes on all three campuses—Berkeley, UCSC and UCLA—for new governance mechanisms clearly indicates dissatisfaction with something, though it is not clear what. I have an unbounded faith in the commitment and dedication of our faculty, and intend to work closely with them, whatever the final outcome of these elections. My personal conviction, though, is that collective bargaining is not the appropriate response to the dissatisfactions felt by many faculty. I am convinced that the costs would far exceed any potential gains.

Fiscal Outlook

The signs are not optimistic, since the State surplus is just about gone and the impact of Proposition 13 will fall heavily in 1981-82. Although I see no efforts to single out the University, or to treat it as a luxury, neither do I foresee great interest in shielding it. In the end, Sacramento is likely to ratchet everything down by 5 or 6%.

— 6 —

Two-thirds of the states in the nation are experiencing fiscal troubles, and it was not insignificant that the Governor mentioned this when we discussed the budget.

President Saxon opened the floor to questions, and responded to Professor Smith's query about the argument used to persuade The Regents to approve the faculty salary increase. He said that the argument was the following: In the past, when the economic environment was stable, the University's general excellence allowed it to attract equally excellent faculty without having to buy them away from other institutions. Now, however, in these times of runaway inflation and extraordinarily high housing costs, the University of California's general desirability is insufficient, all by itself, to attract such faculty. Therefore, if the University is to continue its excellence, it must have a salary scale which reflects these realities.

Professor McGuire inquired about the lack of bidders for the faculty home loan bonds that had gone on the market on December 2. President Saxon reported that there had been no bids offered, which reflected the fact that steeply rising interest rates had effectively destroyed the bond market. Whether that will change is unclear, but we will be making a second effort. Our problems, the President said, are complicated by the fact that the proceeds cannot be used until next July, and by the fact that if interest rates are too high the number of faculty who would be eligible under any circumstances would be greatly reduced.

Announcements by Representative of Student Body Presidents' Council: Brian McDonald, Chair, SBPC Committee on Academic Policy

Mr. McDonald spoke substantially as follows:

I hope that this decade will mark the beginning of increased cooperation between the Student Body Presidents' Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate, since it promises to be a period of rigorous challenges. Foremost among student concerns is the maintenance of the high quality of our faculty, since it is the faculty who make the University one of the premier academic institutions in the world. SBPC supports the annual upgrading of faculty salaries in order to remain competitive with other universities. Since the legislature will scrutinize any major budget increase now that Proposition 13 has nearly eroded away the surplus in the state treasury, a problem arises when the results of the latest Faculty Time-Use Survey show a significant decline in time devoted to instruction. The requested increase in salary may be interpreted as asking more pay for less work. Students are concerned about the results of the survey but hope to get more done by working directly with the Senate than by trying to influence the Senate through the budget. The implementation of the recommendations of the Task Force on Teaching Evaluation might convince legislators and students alike of the University's commitment to teaching. By according a greater role to teaching evaluation in the tenure process, we can ensure that teaching will become a more visible activity of our professors, and, we hope, one of higher quality as well. SBPC is pleased that President Saxon has recognized the time-use issue as an important one, and hopes that his \$500,000 fund for the "enhancement and enrichment" of undergraduate

— 7 —

education will be used wisely. They look forward to working with the Senate through increased student participation to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction.

In a time of dwindling resources, it is crucial to recognize that the University community—students, faculty, and Administration—must reconcile some of its differences and realize the common goals among its segments. I think we will find that the coming years will draw us more closely together in our dealings with Sacramento, and I sincerely hope that students will feel obligated to support the faculty and Administration because they feel that the faculty and Administration are listening to, and acting upon, the concerns of the students as well.

Consent Calendar

Professor Aaron invited acceptance of the items on the Consent Calendar.

Annual Reports

With the following comments and exceptions, the Annual Reports were received as printed in the Addendum to the Notice of Meeting.

Affirmative Action

Professor Polt commented that the report never seemed to deal with questions of bias and discrimination, but seemed solely concerned with numbers, as though inflation of certain numbers would help dispose of these problems. No member of the committee was present to respond.

Research

*Professor Etzler moved, and it was approved, that section 3.b. of this report (Level of Overhead Rates and policy on the Allocation and Use of Overhead Funds) be referred back to the University Committee on Research for further consideration.*¹

* Through a parliamentary oversight, this action was taken under the Consent Calendar, rather than as New Business.

Rules and Jurisdiction

Professor Pearce asked about the status of By-Law 188. Professor Aaron replied that he hoped there would be a report at the March meeting of the Assembly.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

In answer to a question from Professor Sellin regarding By-Law 104 (V.2. of the Annual Report, as printed in the Addendum), Professor Aaron promised to follow up on the resolution of this matter of jurisdiction.

Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes

The Annual Report of this committee was received and is appended to these minutes.

Divisional Regulations

Davis Regulation A540(C)

Professor Aaron reported the withdrawal of this item from the agenda.

Los Angeles Regulation A309(A)

Professor Archer reported UCEP approval of this regulation.

— 8 —

She moved, and it was approved, without dissent, that this regulation be accepted as printed in the Notice of Meeting.

San Diego Regulations 500, 501 and 505

There was considerable discussion about the implications and use of the “W” grade referred to in all three regulations. The primary concern centered around the ninth week withdrawal.

Professor Zeitlin moved that the section that dealt with the ninth week limitation (G, 1) be referred back to UCEP.

1. Through a parliamentary oversight, this action was taken under the Consent Calendar, rather than as New Business.

Professor Carpenter moved a substitute motion to refer Regulations 500 and 501 in their entirety back to UCEP.

Professor Polt inquired whether it was legitimate to suggest that UCEP also consider the situation at the other campus where the “W” grade was used, and Professor Archer responded that Regulation 505 would have to be included in such an amendment to the substitute motion, since it also dealt with the “W” grade.

The substitute motion was approved.

Professor Aaron opened the floor to proposals to refer back Regulation 505 as well, with the implicit understanding that it reflected on the use of the “W” grade on campuses other than San Diego.

Professor Pearce moved, and it was approved unanimously that the use of the grade “W” associated with whatever time limitations existed, be studied by UCEP.

After the luncheon recess Professor Aaron reported that he had had a request to reinstate the Davis Regulation A540(C) on the Consent Calendar. He recognized Professor Archer, who reviewed UCEP's consideration of this regulation and stated that the only substantive change was in the inclusion of the word “Unsatisfactory” near the end of the regulation. She would yield to the request from Davis that the Assembly consider and vote on the regulation at this point.

Professor Cello moved that the proposed amendment, as printed in the Notice of Meeting, be approved. The motion was carried unanimously.

Legislative Ruling 12.80. Privilege and Tenure - Hearings

In response to a request of the Berkeley Privilege and Tenure Committee, Professor Trow stated that the change in wording appears to preclude the Senate committee from investigating a grievance, apart from this current exception, on its own initiative. Berkeley has previously interpreted these rules as allowing them to take up such matters on their own initiative.

Professor Trow proposed that, in place of the sentence,

— 9 —

“Extension of the hearing rights of non-Senate academic personnel beyond this point is outside Senate jurisdiction.”

the following be substituted:

No non-Senate member of the faculty has a right to initiate a grievance beyond this point. But this does not preclude Senate committees from taking such grievances on their own initiative when the committees view the issues as bearing on vital Senate interests.

Parliamentarian Bostick questioned whether this was not outside Academic Senate jurisdiction by virtue of The Regents. Professor Trow responded that it had not been checked for conformity, but that Professor Abrams (Berkeley P & T) felt there was ambiguity in the wording. Professor Spiess regretted that the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction was not represented, but reported that they had reviewed the history of this matter and had received legal advice before preparing the wording.

Professor Spiess moved that the ruling be returned for further investigation,

after which

Professor Trow withdrew his motion from the floor, and the Spiess motion was carried unanimously.

Professor Archer then moved that the Assembly approve the remainder of the text of LR 12.80.

Parliamentarian Bostick ruled that one part of the text could not be extracted and the balance adopted. The whole text would have to be returned.

Professor Archer withdrew her motion.

Academic Council

Professor Aaron presented the report of the Academic Council. The items in Part 1 are reported for ratification by the Assembly, having been given interim approval by the Academic Council.

By-Laws 50, 58, 80. Appointment of Vice Chairman, Academic Council and Assembly of the Academic Senate

Professor Aaron defined the changes in these By-Laws as correcting an oversight in not previously having named the Vice Chairman of the Assembly, Vice Chairman of the Academic Council as well.

Professor Wedding moved to approve the amended wording as printed in the text, and the motion carried unanimously.

Appointment of At-Large Member - Committee on Committees

Professor Aaron threw open the floor to nominations other than Academic Council's

— 10 —

recommendation of W. R. Frazer. No other names were placed in nomination and

the motion to appoint this nominee was unanimously approved.

Appointment of Faculty Member - Governor's Advisory Committee concerning Regental Appointments

This was an informational item requiring no approval.

Committee to Revise the Manual of the Academic Senate

This was also an informational item only.

Standing Committees

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools

Professor Broen, Chairman, spoke on his committee's report (Addendum to the Notice of Meeting, page 30). One of BOARS' responsibilities is to report information on students admitted to the University. He referred the members to two sheets distributed at the meeting: Tables 1 and 2, Summary of Admission, Registration and Cumulative Performance at End of Academic Year 1978-79 for New Fall 1978 Freshmen, and New Fall 1978 Advanced Standing; and Freshman Admissions, 1979-80 Academic Year. The first sheet represented the most recent data available on scholastic performance, but he offered to provide more detailed information

to Divisional Senate offices. His request for total-year data was a new kind of request for Systemwide Administration, and there were problems in getting the kind of detail requested for advanced standing students. However, the admissions and enrollment data for freshmen were the most important, in part because they provide comparisons across the time period when freshman admissions under the new eligibility index went into effect. Professor Broen noted that the drop in percentage in underrepresented minorities focused on the American Indian group, where the primary reason was a decline in applicants. This could be associated with a change in the application form calling for tribal affiliation, he said.

The “take rate”—those admitted who enrolled—remained constant. Fall 1979 data on admissions indicate a drop in the percentage of applicants who were admitted, but the drop was compensated for by an increase in the number of applications by 8.9%. The increase in admissions and enrollment were due to the increase in the number of applicants.

University Committee on Educational Policy

Professor Archer, Chair, reported that her committee had spent the bulk of its time studying the material presented in the Faculty Time-Use Survey, at the request of Professor Aaron. Its conclusions were to be presented to the Academic Council. She also said that UCEP would meet the next day in the first Picturephone conference to be held by a Senate committee, and that she would be happy to report on this in the future.

University Committee on Privilege and Tenure

Professor Spiess, Chairman, referred to the Revision to By-Law 113, as printed in the call. He said UCP&T had been concerned about two problems:

— 11 —

1) The possibility of heavy overloads on Divisional Privilege and Tenure committees, with large number of hearings on some campuses. It was hoped that this revision would provide the framework where local membership could be broadened into panels to deal with the increased workload. 2) When By-Law 113 was revised, it addressed two classes of problems—disciplinary and grievance. It did not address early termination which has nothing to do with discipline or grievance, and the amended wording was intended to correct that omission.

Professor Spiess moved acceptance of the amended wording, and the motion passed unanimously.

University Committee on Research

Professor Intriligator, Chairman of the 1979-80 UCOR, summarized UCOR's Annual Report (Addendum, page 53), and informed members of an additional \$.25 million that had been allocated to the Academic Senate members beside the \$1.5 million from the Opportunity Fund. He saw this as the committee's major accomplishment of the year. Referring to comments on the committee's Annual Report made in the morning session when he was not present, and the referral of section 3.b. of the report back to the committee, Professor Intriligator said that, in response to a request by the Academic Council, UCOR has been investigating how the overhead funds are being used. He spoke briefly on the historical uses of the Opportunity Fund and noted that before the allocation of \$1.5 million, only small support was ever given the Senate. The new allocation represented a new step in funding, and he was not sure The Regents had much more to give. Professor Aaron reiterated that the matter has been specifically referred to Professor Webb, UCOR's current chairman, who is scheduled to respond at the January Academic Council meeting. He looked to the committee to draft a proposal for Council consideration. Professor Intriligator stressed that the University is in a good position in having at least a 45% return, since some universities have none at all. He added that the \$1.80 return generated by \$1

invested in seed money played a role in The Regents' allocation of \$1.5 million.

Professor Intriligator then listed other issues of priority for this year's committee: comparing policies on handling of and greater use of media in publicizing research results. In answer to a question from Professor Stephens about the increase in the overhead rate, Professor Intriligator reported that preliminary projections show an increase from the current 31% rate to a rate in the mid-40s in 1981. UCOR will look at the effects of this. HEW had once proposed separate rates for individual campuses, but he thought this was an unlikely development, except perhaps at the UCSF campus. Professor Cello complimented the committee on its efforts of the past year, stating that it is seldom that the Academic Senate can see such direct rewards. He wished to express the sentiments of the Davis Campus in appreciation of the \$1.5 million allocation. Professor Aaron added that he was certain those were the sentiments of all. He said President Saxon had also been persuaded to inform the Chancellors that these were not discretionary funds but were to be used exclusively for research.

— 12 —

University Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes

Professor Aaron, referring to a letter from Secretary (North) Chernin, reported that this item had been withdrawn from the agenda.

Faculty Outreach and Affirmative Action: B. Aaron

Professor Aaron spoke substantially as follows:

The Assembly is frequently criticised for not offering its members the opportunity to discuss matters of general and often vital interest. In response to that criticism, the two final items were placed on the agenda to solicit members' comments.

In respect of faculty outreach and affirmative action, the draft University Planning Statement, 1980, under consideration by the campus administrations and committees of the Academic Senate sets forth certain "principles and policies" that have aroused some concern among the faculty. These include the following:

"The University believes it is in the best interests of the State of California that all races and ethnic groups successfully complete college-preparatory programs and qualify for postsecondary education in approximately the same proportion...

"The University's more immediate objective is to achieve an ethnic mix in its eligibility pool and its student body that parallels the ethnic mix of high school graduates.... It will also increase its efforts to provide expanded access for minority students by working with the community colleges to bolster the transfer function...

"Because of the central role faculty members play in the educational life of the University, effective outreach and campus support programs require the substantive participation of the faculty...

"The Universitywide Academic Senate will consider how it can restate admission criteria in ways that recognize all the factors pointing to the likelihood of successful and timely completion of a University degree program. These factors include grades, test scores, instruction, recommendations, and achievement in courses beyond A-F requirements."

A number of faculty members believe that these and other statements in the University Planning Statement are likely to create expectations that cannot be fulfilled—to "keep the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope" of many students who may have the intellectual capacity but lack the necessary training to enable them to meet the University's standards of admission and retention. There is a limit to what the University

Administration and the faculty can accomplish in this area. Achievement of the successful completion of college-preparatory programs and qualification for postsecondary education by all races and ethnic

— 13 —

groups in approximately the same proportion is unlikely in the foreseeable future, not because any race or ethnic group has a greater inherent capacity than any other for higher education, but because of other economic, social, and cultural factors having disparate effects on the groups concerned. The statement that the University's immediate objective is to achieve an ethnic mix in its eligibility pool and student body that parallels the ethnic mix of high school graduates has been construed by some to imply a willingness to establish racial and ethnic quotas, which have been declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court.

Although there is general agreement throughout the University community that the quality and quantity of transfer students from the community colleges should be enhanced, the noticeable lack of interest in this objective on the part of the administrative officers of the community colleges presents a substantial impediment to its achievement. The Academic Senate has initiated a joint consideration of this problem with representatives of the faculties of CSUC and CCC, and will strive with them to improve the present situation; but our desires and hopes should not blur our understanding of the realities.

The University Planning Statement speaks of the “substantive participation of the faculty” in outreach and campus support programs. It should be understood what this proposed commitment does and does not involve. According to the statistical surveys of faculty time-use, the average faculty member already spends over 60 hours per week on teaching, research, and other professional activities. All of these activities are important; none can be substantially increased without adversely affecting the others, nor should the faculty spend a significant amount of time on purely remedial education. What, then, is it appropriate for the faculty to do? They should concentrate their outreach efforts on demonstration projects which serve as models for other segments of higher education to emulate and to multiply. Their job is to teach the teachers in those projects, so that they and others will be better able to prepare their students for education at a higher level; their ultimate objective should be to increase the pool of high school graduates eligible for admission to the University and equipped to meet its standards of academic performance.

This subject cannot be exhausted in today's discussion, and because of its importance, it will be on the agenda of the March Assembly meeting as well. On that occasion, Dr. Gerald Kissler, Assistant Director of Planning at UCLA, will speak on the topic, “Trends Affecting Undergraduate Education in the University of California.” Professor Aaron then invited preliminary discussion.

Professor Kivelson expressed agreement with most of Professor Aaron's comments, but not necessarily with the University Plan statements. He regretted the lack of limitation on the access and remediation commitments, stressing that this was what faculty feared, not knowing what fraction of their time and energy would have to be committed. Professor Aaron thought that the Senate response was crucial here; and noted that the original Plan was withdrawn partly as a result of faculty comment. He said faculty members who felt strongly should convey their

— 14 —

feelings to their local committees, so that their comments could be funneled up to UCP&B. Professor Binder thought Professor Aaron had articulated Senate feelings very well and asked how members would help him get that statement to people revising the Plan. Professor Aaron replied that his points were part of a large group of comments filtering in to UCP&B, which committee was preparing a report for the Council. He said that when the Academic Council addressed the matter, Professor Binder (CCGA Chairman) could raise such issues as he felt were not strongly enough addressed. He doubted, however, that everyone felt the same way, and invited other responses. Professor Trow asked that he circulate his remarks—that they might be useful as a point of departure, and Professor Aaron promised to make them available to the Divisional chairs, as well as to the

editor of NOTICE.

Professor Millett said that one of the reasons for difficulty of response may be the variations among departments. For example, he said, bringing more students into the math department will not upgrade high school teaching of math because business and industry hire the best mathematicians available. Many faculty feel the problem and the cost is greater than they've been led to realize, he said.

Professor Aaron responded that with respect to improving the quality of teachers and meeting the needs of incoming students, the questions were mainly who was going to do it and how, and what would be the effect on the level of University standards. The faculty is solidly behind not allowing our standards to be eaten away so that students who are not equipped to stay may stay, but some moves have to be made. Professor McGuire expressed a desire to know more about the problem, about demonstration courses, whether students would take college preparatory courses in the first place, how we got them to do this, and how we got them away from vocational courses. Professor Cello noted that the Senate might have to change some of its views if, for example, remedial courses were to be taught by community college professors on UC campuses, and Professor Aaron reported that this would be discussed at the joint meeting with CSUC and CC representatives. Professor Sellin brought up the related internal problem of faculty welfare, and whether some of these actions would draw more people into the system who were part-time, and who were without tenure rights and retirement benefits. He believed there were already more people in research and teaching missions who were not Senate members than who were, and he drew a parallel between union members and faculty facing problems that involved the very structure and existence of the Academic Senate.

Professor Nash stated that the recent statistics of California public school performance are grim, but that he has yet to see adequate response to this, or concern. He also wondered whether anyone had ever conceived of the University contracting as the pool of prepared students contracts. Professor Amato brought up the fact that this is an interdisciplinary problem and that it eventually requires focusing on the family level of perception of education. Professor Kivelson also wondered whether part of the problem might be that the University had already dipped below the upper 12½% of the pool. Professor Broen reported that the latest estimate of the level reached, taken in 1975, was closer to 14.8%, and that that figure was undoubtedly low. At this

— 15 —

point Professor Aaron concluded the debate, reminding the members that these questions would be addressed more extensively at the March meeting, and would be enhanced by Dr. Kissler's presentation. He urged that all members discuss these problems with their colleagues, so the faculty would be better informed.

Time and Effort Reporting: B. Aaron

Professor Aaron spoke substantially as follows:

The faculty is united in its opposition to the Office of Management and Budget's Circular A21, which governs accountability on federally-sponsored research in universities. This does not signify a rejection of the notion of accountability; there is a consensus that the time and effort reports now required are meaningless and a waste of time. As early as 1968, a Task Force comprised of representatives from the Bureau of the Budget, General Accounting Office, Department of Defense, National Science Foundation, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare came to the same conclusion. The major vices of A21 were detailed in the 1979 report by David Mears, the Coordinator of Projects and Grants for Systemwide Administration. He said, to summarize, in part:

As a result of A21, research will have to be cost accounted like a factory product, and efforts of researchers will have to be documented with an accounting equivalent of factory time clocks. The current political environment which is dominated by thoughts of fraud, abuse, and waste, is especially receptive to the Catch 22 resulting from the imposition of commercial cost accounting standards on noncommercial University

institutions. Federal audits report that financial accounting at universities is below commercial standards, yet these reports don't explain that universities have adequate and competent mission accounting systems. The differences between mission and commercial costs accounting are called "deficiencies," and are labelled as unallowable or questioned. Both DHEW Audit Agency and the GAO tarnish their reports with hints that these may indicate fraud, abuse, and waste. The audit reports ignore 1) the fact that at least 99% of the accounting is responsible and adequate, and 2) that there is a very small percent of error in any accounting operation. Rather, the DHEW Audit Agency magnifies the minor "deficiencies" and raises doubts about the responsibility of educational institutions. When universities object to being viewed as factories and explain that research is a creative intellectual, not a mechanical assembly process, and they can demonstrate adequate accountability in mission accounting terms, their objections are misunderstood as objections to any accountability at all. The result is that federal ears have become deaf.

— 16 —

Some recent developments, as reported by John Walsh in the November 7, 1980 issue of *Science*, offer a glimmer of hope. He states that the OMB has bent a bit on the provisions of new federal accounting rules, and that the new method of reporting provides for a three-state "multiple certification" to document faculty salary costs: individual faculty members would certify only the time spent on "direct activity" related to a research grant; department chairmen would certify percentages of activity relevant to indirect cost categories; and the university president would certify that faculty were not being compensated with federal funds for activities not specified under grants. John Lordan, chief of the financial section of OMB, noted that a "university at large must be willing" to undertake the multiple certification alternatives, not simply the individual researcher.

Apparently, what is now being offered is a choice between two offensive requirements, one of which is probably less onerous than the other. The Senate ought to consider whether a consensus could be reached in favor of an election between the two, or whether it should join forces with the faculties of other universities and continue the fight for a more appropriate system to ensure accountability for the expenditure of federal funds.

Professor Aaron then called for discussion.

Professor Trow pointed out that the situation may alter after January 20, and that, rather than choose between evils, it might be appropriate in the short term to take a position with our allies about the inappropriateness of the present form. Professor Hamburger brought to the attention of the Assembly two articles in *Science* which Professor Goodman (who had had to leave) had wanted them to note: that of October 10, 1980, by Saunders Mac Lane—"Total Reporting for Scientific Work," pp. 158-163; and that of November 28, 1980, by A. Bartlett Giamatti—"Science and the University," pp. 984-987.

There was tentative agreement among some members that, were the Senate forced to make a choice, the newer plan would be preferred. Professor Cello mentioned that the Senate had not had much input into the University's response, and that many of his faculty suspected too early capitulation by the Administration. He would also advise joining with allies such as Professor Serge Lang at Yale, rather than sitting back to see what happens. Professor Aaron reported that the Administration was challenged with this possibility of early capitulation at a Council meeting, and that President Saxon had thought that was not the case—that they had done all they could do. President Saxon takes strong exception to OMB A21, Professor Aaron noted, but there are people in every Administration responsible for financial accounting who want things neatly pinned down and whose training is in strict accountability.

No new business was brought to the floor.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Attest:

Vinton A. Dearing
Secretary (South)

For reasons of economy, Professor M. Chernin, Secretary (North), did not attend the meeting.

— 17 —

Attendance Record

Names of Members	Dates of Meetings 1980-81		
	Dec 3	Mar 11	May 27
President of the University			
D. S. Saxon	*		
Officers			
B. Aaron (LA), Chm	*		
O. A. Johnson (R), VChm	*		
Ex Officio			
1. Committee Chairmen			
C. P. Nash (D), UCAP	*		
A. Binder (I), CCGA	*		
S. E. Archer (SF), UCEP	*		
H. Toliver (I), VChm UCEP			
F. E. Balderston (B), UCPB			
2. Chairmen of Divisions			
M. A. Trow (B)	*		
R. M. Cello (D)	*		
J. W. McGuire (I)	*		
D. Kivelson (LA)	*		
R. T. Wedding (R)	*		
J. F. Gilbert (SD)			
L. E. Glass (SF)			
R. F. Sawyer (SB)			
M. B. Smith (SC)	*		
<i>Berkeley</i>			
W. S. Anderson	*		
R. E. Connick (F)			
F. H. Carpenter	*		

Names of Members	Dates of Meetings 1980-81		
	Dec 3	Mar 11	May 27
S. H. Madin	*		
G. C. Pimentel (W, Sp)			
J. H. R. Polt	*		
A. W. Searcy	*		
J. R. Whinnery	*		
<i>Davis</i>			
M. E. Etzler	*		
B. A. Horwitz			
W. K. Musker	*		
B. S. Schweigert			
C. F. Wall	*		
<i>Irvine</i>			
R. R. Hubert	*		
K. Moldave	2		
<i>Los Angeles</i>			
N. G. Alexopoulos			
S. Amato	*		
A. R. Barr	*		
J. A. Berliner	*		
F. Masciandaro			
B. O. Phinney			
V. Rust	*		
P. Sellin	*		
M. Zeitlin	*		
<i>Riverside</i>			
R. Hanna	3		
I. W. Sherman	*		
<i>San Diego</i>			
M. Goodman	*		

-
2. A Alternate
G. C. Stephens for K. Moldave
3. A Alternate
M. O. Woodburne for R. Hanna

Names of Members	Dates of Meetings 1980-81		
	Dec 3	Mar 11	May 27
R. N. Hamburger	*		
R. H. Pearce	*		
<i>San Francisco</i>			
G. M. Grodsky			
M. D. Jendresen	*		
M. Siperstein	*		
<i>Santa Barbara</i>			
U. R. Mahlendorf	*		
K. C. Millett	*		
R. M. Norris	*		
<i>Santa Cruz</i>			
J. F. Bunnett (F, W)			
D. C. McElrath (Sp)			

A —Alternate

G. C. Stephens for K. Moldave
M. O. Woodburne for R. Hanna

Appendix: University Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors, and Prizes Annual Report, 1979-80

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Committee continued to review and approve where indicated the policies and procedures in awarding honors on the various campuses. Most campuses are now in conformity with Senate Regulation 640. The two remaining campuses are working on completing their formulation of revision of their by-laws.

Monitoring the actual numbers of awarded honors campus by campus will continue to be a necessary function of appropriate campus committees, as well as the Universitywide Committee.

Programs for Talented Students

This year the Committee was particularly concerned in reviewing campus programs for talented students. Most campuses do have (at least on the books) various programs including special seminars, independent studies, undergraduate research programs, independent majors, senior theses and the like. There are also provisions for very able undergraduates to enroll in graduate courses. Yet, there was a general consensus that these programs are neither widely known nor effectively utilized. There generally appears to be too limited interest or involvement on the part of administration or faculty.

Increased interest, however, is apparently emerging. UCLA has recently developed an Honors College; the College of Creative Studies continues at Santa Barbara.

Since competition for talented students will very likely increase among the major colleges and universities, the Committee is of the opinion that each campus needs to promote, implement, and publicize available programs, and develop new ones as indicated.

A first step might be greater concern and activities for students who receive Regents' Scholarships. Several campuses (Berkeley, Santa Barbara) now have arrangements for special advising, or even a special facility for meetings of honor students to which the Regents'

— 19 —

Scholars are invited. The Committee recommended once more that the “token” honorarium of \$100.00 be increased to \$250.00. And more than this, the Committee recommends that more educational benefits (special advisors, tutorials, independent studies, special honors programs, and the like) be considered for Regents' Scholars. Greater social-intellectual contacts also should be encouraged with other very able students and interested faculty.

The Future of Scholarship Support

The Committee was concerned about the future of scholarship support, especially from state revenues. The understandable emphasis on the support of the financially needy and the concern about enrollments could jeopardize the recruitment and retention of the very talented. Efforts should, therefore, be made to continue the present mix of merit-need in student support programs. Should it become necessary to reduce scholarship funds, support for the most able (as in the Regents' Scholarship Program) should be emphasized and continued.

In his meeting with the Academic Council, the Chairman pointed to the need for closer liaison between the Committee and the administrators who are responsible for the allocation of funds for scholarships. Vice President Swain indicated his interest in learning the Committee's views and recommendations.

Respectfully submitted

J. S. Dewald (I)

Y. S. Kim (SF)

P. J. McCarthy (SB)

J. R. Murdoch (LA)

H. G. Nerjes (D)

T. O. Pelzel (R)

J. O. Sawyer (B)

K. R. Wilson (SD)

M. M. Levin (SC), Chairman

November 25, 1980