



Record of the Assembly of the Academic Senate

University of California Academic Senate

**Offices of the Secretaries:
(North) 320 Stephens Hall, Berkeley
(South) 3130 Murphy Hall, Los Angeles
March 9, 1983**

Contents

	Page
Minutes of Meeting of May 6, 1982. . . .	1
Announcements by the President. David S. Saxon. . . .	1
Announcements by the Chairman. Robert E. Connick. . . .	3
Consent Calendar. . . .	4-5
Annual Reports, 1981-82	
Divisional Legislation	
Academic Legislation	
Reports of the Standing Committees	
Academic Council. . . .	5
Master of Business at Riverside	6
Academic Senate Review of Chancellors	7
University Committee on Educational Policy. . . .	7
Senate Regulation 761(A) and 761(B)	
Recommendations by Subject A Committee	
Recommendation of the Academic Council. . . .	
University Committee on Privilege and Tenure. . . .	
Faculty Code of Conduct	

Meeting

The Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday, March 9, 1983 at 10:10 a.m. in the California Room in The Faculty Center on the Los Angeles Campus, pursuant to call.

Present: Professors R. E. Connick, presiding; Sharon J. Reeder, Secretary (South); W. L. Bostick (I), Parliamentarian; and, representing a quorum, the 45 voting members of the Senate as shown in the Attendance Record on page 8. Present by Invitation: Daniel Silvia (D), Chairman, University Committee on Subject A; V. Auslander, Editor, NOTICE.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate on May 26, 1982 were approved with the corrections as printed on page 2 of the Notice of Meeting for March 9, 1983.

Announcements by the President: David S. Saxon

In his introductory remarks, President Saxon said how much he appreciated the chance to meet with the Assembly of the Academic Senate. He expressed his pleasure in the appointment of the fifteenth President of the University, David Gardner, but said he did not intend to discuss his own impending retirement. Instead, he wanted to discuss a number of “issues, problems, challenges, and insurmountable opportunities” facing the University of California.

He spoke first of all about the issues and challenges involved in the University's relations with the State of California, most of which are budgetary.

Salaries. The Governor's Budget for 1983-84 includes only 5% for cost of living adjustments. Further, funding for merits and promotions has been deleted. The University has made salaries its first priority among budget issues, and we will do whatever we must to restore or to find funding for merits and promotions.

Physical Plant. On all campuses there are major deficiencies. Yet the Governor's Budget for 1983-84 allows \$7 million for capital needs—the lowest amount ever. The University's actual needs are in the billions of dollars and we are trying to identify new sources of support.

Fees and Tuition. President Saxon said he does not want to cross the line between fees and tuition, but it will become increasingly difficult for the University to maintain programs of high quality and to meet its workload requirements unless additional funding is provided by the State.

Graduate Enrollment. There needs to be a commitment on the part of the State to provide support for graduate education as well as for undergraduate education in California. No such commitment now exists.

Health Care and Medical Coverage. Another problem is the rising and uncontrolled costs in health care. Steps are now being taken to moderate the escalating costs of health insurance provided to University employees.

Program Improvement. The State is unwilling to provide additional support or additionally faculty and teaching assistants, thus limiting the University's ability to improve program quality.

There is a similar list of problems and issues associated with the Federal

— -2- —

level:

Student aid is inadequate, especially for graduate education.

Research support, especially in the arts, humanities, and social sciences, remains a problem.

Indirect costs are a serious problem. The Federal government is proposing a 10% cut in NIH indirect cost reimbursement.

Age of retirement. The current move to make mandatory retirement at any age illegal is of particular concern to the University because it could jeopardize tenure and the quality of the institution.

Transfer of technical information to foreign countries. The potentiality of Federally-imposed restraints is still with us.

President Saxon briefly discussed other issues facing the University. There is still a serious shortage of faculty and student housing. Preparation of our entering students is a massive problem, one that ought to engage our attention as parents and teachers; there are many opportunities for us to make a contribution. Finally, he remarked that affirmative action remains a most pressing problem; progress has been made but it is small compared to the distance the University must go.

President Saxon made three observations about the list he had just discussed. First, all the issues and problems he mentioned are externally imposed and created. Many have to do with economic circumstances and with the consequences of rampant tax cutting. Others arise out of differing perceptions of what public policy ought to be; the controversy over mandatory retirement is an example. Second, these externally imposed issues and problems are all being addressed by the University in one way or another and with varying degrees of success. Some are addressed through continuing budget negotiations with the State of California. Others are being dealt with through selective cuts. There has also been an enormous amount of attention given to increasing revenues through student fees. Given the State's continuing difficulty in financing important public services like education, President Saxon said, serious consideration urgently needs to be given to raising taxes.

A third observation is that the University of California is still at the top. One measure of the University's excellence is its membership in the Association of American Universities, which limits its membership to 50 of the most outstanding institutions in the country. Berkeley, UCLA, and San Diego are all members. Another measure is the national survey released by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, which rated as excellent a number of programs not only at the Los Angeles and Berkeley campuses but also at the Davis and San Diego campuses; clearly the smaller campuses are achieving excellence also. Another measure of the University's quality is the presence of six of our campuses among the top forty institutions leading in Guggenheim Fellowships awarded to faculty over the past seventeen years. President Saxon concluded that despite the problems he had described, the University has a lot to be proud of. Proud—but not satisfied. Our continuing commitment to and search for excellence is essential.

As a final and an internal issue, President Saxon discussed the education of our students. There is one area, he said, in which the University is wanting; we are not doing a good enough job of giving our students a truly liberal education. The University has not confronted the question of what it means to be a liberally educated person in a technological society. He was dismayed that so many faculty as well as students could not differentiate between sense and nonsense when it comes to questions connected with science and technology. Further, our scientists and engineers need to know much more than they do about the humanities and the

— -3- —

social sciences. He was also concerned that there seems to be so little knowledge of other countries and other cultures. Foreign language development has been neglected, he said, and foreign languages need to be re-emphasized at all levels of schooling. Difficult as it is to evaluate what students need to know for life in our complicated and technological society, no one else can do it for us. It is a task for the University of California as an institution of learning and for us as individuals. We need to develop a curriculum that addresses these issues and that provides our students with the kind of education they must have for these complex times.

Announcements by the Chairman: Robert E. Connick

Professor Connick proceeded to inform the Assembly on the activities of various committees of the Academic Senate, in particular, the faculty committee on the selection of the president. This committee was chaired by Professor Ralph Turner who is also the Vice Chairman of the Assembly of the Academic Senate and the Academic Council. The faculty committee had a representative from each campus who was chosen by the divisional Committee on Committees in consultation with the divisional chairs. The committee's job was to screen all nominations and applications and to provide The Regents search committee a short list of candidates thought to be serious contenders for the position. The faculty committee feels that it had every opportunity to consult with The Regents and is very pleased with The Regents final choice of David Gardner as the next president of the University of California.

Concerning the budget, Professor Connick stated that the University Committee on Planning and Budget has been heavily involved with this matter. An ad hoc committee was appointed by the Academic Council to consult with the administration until the 1983-84 budget is completed. The Governor's budget for 1983-84 has eliminated funding in the amount of \$17 million for merits and promotions. The Academic Council supports President Saxon's belief that merits and promotions for faculty and staff are absolutely essential. Sources for funding merits and promotions are being sought with the possibility of having to impose selective program reductions in yet undesignated areas. This will be initiated through consultation with Universitywide committees but the final consideration will be at the campus level. Also in connection with program reductions, the administration has drawn up a proposed policy on faculty displacement occurring as a result of program reductions. This is still under consideration through committees of the Academic Senate. Although there is a great deal of criticism of the proposal, a policy will eventually materialize.

Additionally, in response to budget cuts, procedures have been developed for Universitywide review of selected programs. Reviews so far have been done on Engineering, Law and Foreign Languages. Small committees are asked to answer certain questions such as, what would you do if you had a sizeable budget cut in this area. These are extremely difficult questions to answer. Reviews in the humanities and education are scheduled for the very near future.

Professor Connick said that another item of concern which came before the Assembly previously, is that of the question of credit for remedial work. This issue will be discussed later in the meeting. Professor Connick gave a brief background on this issue, stating that the Intersegmental Committee, which is made up of representatives of the Academic Senate of the three segments of public higher education in California (the University of California (UC), the California State University and Colleges (CSU), and the California Community Colleges (CCC), has completed, published and distributed its *Statement on Competencies in English and Mathematics Expected of Entering Freshman*. He said that one of the complaints that surfaced during the preparation of the English and mathematics statements, was that remedial work done at the University of California was given credit toward the baccalaureate degree whereas remedial work done at the community

— -4- —

colleges was not given transfer credit toward the baccalaureate degree - an obvious inconsistency. The Intersegmental Committee believes that in a very general and broad way credit toward a baccalaureate degree should not be given for remedial work. The Assembly of the Academic Senate approved the Intersegmental Committee's report in principal at its December 2, 1982 meeting. The question of remedial work in the University was taken up by the Committee on Subject A, the University Committee on Educational Policy and the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, and their recommendations will be considered later in this meeting.

The Intersegmental Committee is in the process of trying to draw up expectations with respect to courses in the natural sciences, which will also come before the Assembly for approval.

Professor Connick proceeded with his announcements stating that the University Committee on Faculty Welfare, which is an important committee of the Senate, has been very active this year under the chairmanship of Professor Julius Margolis. He said there has been concern about a variety of issues but in particular the health benefits program. UCFW has been working closely with the administration. In addition, the committee is heavily involved with faculty housing which presents an enormous problem.

Professor Connick said that the last item he wished to mention was that of the uncapping of the mandatory retirement age. There is legislation pending at the present time both at the federal and state levels proposing to remove any restriction on mandatory retirement, i.e. an organization could not require anyone to retire because of his/her age. Professor Connick stated that the University is often asked what the faculty's position is on this issue. He proposed a straw vote be taken to get some idea of what the faculty members present think. Some discussion ensued and a question was asked - is the University permitted to hire people over age 70 if it chooses to? Professor Connick responded that the University does presently rehire people after age 70 on a selective bases. Professor Connick then proposed the question - if a law were passed uncapping the retirement age for everyone, would you support an exception which would allow the University to impose a mandatory retirement age of 70? The majority Assembly members supported an exception by the University to mandatory retirement; 8 were opposed to a University exception to mandatory retirement.

Concerning the controversial item of the new president's salary and how it would affect the University's already tight budget, Professor Connick requested President Saxon to respond to this question. President Saxon stated that he was not consulted on this matter. Information was gathered and presented to The Regents which stated that the president's salary for the University of California was substantially below the salary for other institutions. The Regents voted with no objection to the \$150,000 per year salary for president-elect David Gardner. President Saxon said he commends The Regents for being up front and believes that they behaved in a rational and sensible way. If need be, The Regents can justify with complete authority their actions to the legislature. President Saxon added that how the president's salary will affect the University budget is a difficult question, however, to answer.

The meeting recessed for lunch at 11:45 a.m. and reconvened at 1:00 p.m.

Consent Calendar

Annual Reports, 1981-82

Professor Connick made a motion to accept the Annual Reports of the 1981-82 Standing Committees of the Academic Senate as printed on pages 3 through 38 to the Notice of Meeting. The Assembly unanimously approved the motion.

— -5- —

Santa Barbara Regulation A20(C)(1)

Professor Connick stated that it was brought to his attention that the Santa Barbara Regulation A20(C)(1) is not a variance to Senate Regulation 780(C)(1) as erroneously stated in the Notice of Meeting.

Academic Senate Legislation 476(A)(4)

Professor Alder pointed out an error on page 43 of the Notice of Meeting under Regulation 476(A)(4) which should state “. . . applicant presents at least 84 (or 56 semester) units acceptable for advanced standing credit.

.. ”. Professor Smelser of the Berkeley Division agreed with this change.

With the above corrections, the legislative items on the Consent Calendar printed on pages 39 through 45 of the Notice of Meeting were received by the Assembly.

Reports of the Standing Committees

Academic Council

The chair was turned over to Professor Ralph Turner in order that Professor Connick could present the Academic Council reports.

Master of Business at Riverside

Approval of this degree by the Academic Council on November 17, 1982 is reported to the Assembly for informational purposes only.

Academic Senate Review of Chancellors

Professor Connick gave a brief background description of the procedure for the Academic Senate Review of Chancellors and called attention to the high degree of confidentiality of the report which is only seen by the President. He reported that the Academic Council proposes a method of feedback regarding the President's reaction to the chancellor's review after a suitable time (six months). Professor Connick moved that the recommendation of the Academic Council for changes in the procedures be approved. He stated that although this is a lesser order of rule than a bylaw, it does have the effect of governorship on the body. The change in the procedures would apply to those reviews of chancellors now underway. Discussion ensued. Professor J. McGuire (I) stated that he agreed with the changes in the procedures but asked if there is a way for the committee to pass on information each year as to how the committee went about its work. Professor Connick responded that this is an excellent idea which could be accomplished by asking the chairman of each review committee to write up a description upon completion of its review as to what would be useful for the next review committee. The procedures as presently written do not make it permissible for a new committee to see the review done on a chancellor in the past.

When put to vote, the Assembly approved the changes in the procedures for the *Academic Senate Review of Chancellors* as printed on pages 46 and 47 of the Notice of Meeting.

— -6- —

University Committee on Educational Policy

Senate Regulation 761(A) and 761(B)

Professor Connick resumed the chair and introduced Kurt Kreith, Chairman of the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), to present UCEP's report and recommendations on Senate Regulation 761(A) and 761(B).

Professor Kreith stated that he would like to present the recommendations made by UCEP in two parts and moved for adoption by the Assembly of Senate Regulation 761(A) as presented in the Notice of Meeting, pages 50 and 51 including the introductory sentence “No student shall be given baccalaureate credit for remedial work.”

Professor Connick then requested Professor Ralph Turner, to present the Academic Council's recommendation and amendment to SR761(A) as proposed by UCEP. Professor Turner stated that the Council proposed the additional sentence in the introduction of SR761: "Workload credit—credit not applicable for graduation—should be given.", noting that the issue over which this debate crystallized to a considerable degree was the unwillingness of the State legislature to fund courses which are not counted for graduation credit. The UCEP agreed to this action. An **effective date of Fall, 1984** was also included in the Council's recommendation because in all fairness students and faculty need time to prepare to meet the imposed new requirements. Discussion ensued. Concern was expressed regarding the financial implications of workload credit as opposed to baccalaureate credit. It was agreed that credit for remedial work toward graduation should not be given but it was pointed out that giving workload credit would mean that a student might have to stay in school longer to complete his/her degree.

When put to a vote, the Assembly approved the amendment by the Academic Council to the recommendation to SR761(A) proposed by UCEP as printed on page 56 of the Notice of Meeting and then approved the amended motion.

Professor Kreith then continued UCEP's report to the Assembly printed on pages 48-51 of the Notice of Meeting, concluding with a recommendation that SR761(B) as printed on page 51 of the Notice of Meeting be accepted by the Assembly.

Professor Connick introduced Professor Daniel Silvia, Chairman of the University Committee on Subject A. Professor Silvia reported at length the position of UCSA on the question of remedial work as written in Subject A's report printed in the Notice of Meeting on pages 52-55. He said, in addition, a telephone poll which was taken over the past weekend resulted in the Committee on Subject A's objection to the Academic Council's version of SR761(B) as being obscure, vague and representing an unequitable disparity between mathematics and English.

Professor Connick then requested Professor Ralph Turner to present the report from the Academic Council. Professor Turner stated that the Academic Council asked the chairs of UCEP, UCSA and Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) to come up with a recommendation which would define the level of English performance that the University deemed necessary as an entrance requirement for entering Freshmen. It is the Council's conclusion, however, that the ad hoc committee failed to do that. The recommendations proposed by UCEP and UCSA justify the low standards that we all deplore and are setting even lower standards than we have now. Professor Turner expressed that these are not the standards to announce for the University of California. The Council felt that remedial courses could not be denied credit until remedial is defined. At this point it was felt that the issue of English as a second language

— -7- —

should be held in abeyance. Without risking damage to the present standards for the University of California, Professor Turner said that the Academic Council proposes acceptance of the substitute motion for SR761(B) printed on page 56.

A lengthy discussion then took place. Questions arose such as defining the Subject A requirement; would there have to be a reduction at the graduate program level as a result of the State not funding credit for remedial work; what would the potential impact be on the Freshman English program and, finally, was the University of California, in approving any Senate Regulation for credit in courses, establishing standards which would be a message to high school students.

Professor Turner responded to statements made by the Assembly stating that the cost figures running around are pure speculation, and that restructuring and changing whole programs is an exaggeration. The California Community Colleges, the California State University System and the University of California are engaged in a cooperative effort to arrive at a spelled out definition of remedial work for high school students. Various points

were addressed by a number of speakers, including Professors Loomis and Zender (D); Professor McGuire (I); Professors Kipling, Newton and Redheffer (LA); Professors Mellichamp and Millett(SB), and Professor Euben (SC) among others.

The previous question was moved, seconded and approved.

The Assembly then approved the substitute motion of the Academic Council for Senate Regulation 761(B) as printed on page 56 of the Notice of Meeting.

University Committee on Privilege and Tenure

Faculty Code of Conduct

Professor Nash was unable to attend the meeting of the Assembly. Professor Richard M. Abrams, Chairman of the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure, moved for adoption of the proposed changes in the Faculty Code of Conduct which were designed to implement policies on non-discrimination as they apply to handicapped students and faculty. He noted that this matter was brought before the Assembly on May 26, 1982 and referred back to the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure for study. Professor Abrams stated that “**knowing violation**” is included in the proposed change for the purpose of precluding the possibility of the faculty being entrapped in cases which are ambiguous or unclear. Although there is a general agreement as to what constitutes a handicapped person and what steps should be taken to remedy discrimination against handicapped persons, the Academic Senate wants to make sure a faculty person is not victimized. It is a protection measure. Professor Abrams informed the Assembly that there are detailed guidelines which the University of California follows for equal opportunity for handicapped students. However, there are times when some matters fall into a grey area.

It was moved, seconded and approved to accept the changes in Appendix V, Part II, Sections A-3, A-4, A-5, D-3 and D-4 of Faculty Code of Conduct as they are printed in the Notice of Meeting, page 57.

Following a second roll call, there being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Attest:

Sharon J. Reeder, Secretary (South)

— -8- —

Attendance Record

Names of Members	Dates of Meetings 1982-83	
	Mar. 9	May 25
PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY		
D. S. Saxon	*	
OFFICERS		
R. E. Connick (B) Chm	*	
R. H. Turner (LA) VChm	*	
EX OFFICIO		
Committee Chairs		

Names of Members	Dates of Meetings 1982-83	
	Mar. 9	May 25
M. Morello-Frosch (SC) UCAP		
K. Moldave (I) CCGA	*	
K. Kreith (D) UCEP	*	
C. M. Newton (LA) VChm UCEP	*	
R. E. Goodman (B) UCPB	*	
H. L. Alder (D) BOARS	*	
J. Margolis (I) UCFW	*	
Chairs of Divisions		
N. J. Smelser (B)	*	
T. L. Allen (D)	*	
M. C. Caserio (I)	*	
M. L. Schwartz (LA)	*	
M. O. Woodburne (R)	*	
S. A. Chodorow (SD)	*	
J. A. Starkweather (SF)		
K. C. Millett (SB)	*	
D. McElrath (SC)	*	

SECRETARY NORTH: M. Chernin (B)

*SECRETARY SOUTH: S. Reeder (LA) **

*PARLIAMENTARIAN: W. L. Bostick (I) **

DIVISIONAL REPRESENTATIVES		
Names of Members	Mar. 9	May 25
Berkeley		
N. Bartlett		
W. M. Brinner	*	
G. F. Chew	1	
O. R. Collins	*	
J. W. Garbarino	*	
G. C. Pimentel	2	
J. H. R. Polt	*	

1. A Alternate: J. D. Snapper for G. F. Chew
2. A Alternate: G. Leitman for G. C. Pimentel

DIVISIONAL REPRESENTATIVES		
Names of Members	Mar. 9	May 25
Davis		
C. Bruch	*	
R. L. Hunter	*	
R. S. Loomis	*	
D. R. Nielsen		
K. F. Zender	*	
Irvine		
E. Greenberger	*	
J. W. McGuire	*	
Los Angeles		
J. Cauble		
J. N. Entrikin	3	
K. Forster	4	
T. W. Gamelin	*	
C. Heth		
B. L. Johnson		
A. Kipling	*	
R. Redheffer	*	
L. Snowiss	*	
Riverside		
R. Mankau	*	
J. L. Stanley	*	
San Diego		
D. W. Anderson	*	
A. Wagner		
H. O. Wheeler	*	
San Francisco		
J. C. Craig	*	
J. A. Motto	*	
N. L. Petrakis		

3. A Alternate: M. E. Baur for J. N. Entrikin
4. A Alternate: D. M. Thomas for K. Forster

DIVISIONAL REPRESENTATIVES		
Names of Members	Mar. 9	May 25
Santa Barbara		
C. V. Harris	*	
W. Marks	*	
D. Mellichamp	*	
Santa Cruz		
J. P. Euben	*	

A = Alternate

J. D. Snapper for G. F. Chew
G. Leitman for G. C. Pimentel
M.E. Baur for J. N. Entrikin
D. M. Thomas for K. Forster