



Notice of Meeting

Meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate

University of California

Manual of the Academic Senate

NOTE: Revisions to the *Manual of the Academic Senate* are printed in the Appendix, following the reports in this Notice, for insertion into your copy of the *Manual*.

Thursday, May 29, 1975 at 10:00 a.m.

Lipman Room, Barrows Hall, Berkeley Campus

Luncheon Recess at Noon

[Vol. XII, No. 2]

— 1 —

Order of Business

	PAGE
I. 1. Roll Call of Members	
2. Minutes of the Meeting of December 3, 1974	
II. Announcements by the President	
III. Other Announcements	
1. Chairman of the Assembly, Professor A. A. Maradudin	
IV. Special Orders	
1. Amendments to Divisional Grading Systems. R. A. Cockrell, Secretary (North)	
A. Davis Division	3
B. Santa Barbara Division	4
C. Los Angeles Division	6
V. Reports of Special Committees	
1. Long Range Educational Objectives and Academic Planning. R. T. Wedding, Chairman	8
VI. Reports of Standing Committees	
1. Academic Council. A. A. Maradudin, Chairman	
A. New "Engineer" Degree	61

	PAGE
B. Amendment to Riverside Division Grading Code	61
C. Officers of the Academic Senate, 1975-76	62
D. Meetings of the Assembly, 1975-76	62
E. Allocation of Divisional Representatives, 1975-76	62
F. Variances from Senate Regulations	62
G. Memorials to The Regents	62
H. Senate Participation in Academic Planning	64
2. Academic Freedom. S. Anderson, Chairman	
A. Practices and Reforms Essential for the Protection of Academic Freedom	70
B. Prior Restraint	71
C. The <i>Convenio</i> , University of California and University of Chile	72
3. Committees (Oral). R. N. Hamburger, Chairman	
VII. Petitions of Students	
VIII. Unfinished Business	
IX. University and Faculty Welfare	
X. New Business	
1. Second Roll Call	
[The Assembly may act finally on matters not included in the call to the meeting only by unanimous consent of the members present. (By-Law 166)]	

ROBERT A. COCKRELL, *Secretary (North)*
 BRUCE H. HERRICK, *Secretary (South)*
 May 14, 1975

Foreword

Members are asked to save this copy of the Notice and append it to the Minutes to maintain a complete record of proceedings of the Assembly of the Academic Senate.

Revisions to the *Manual of the Academic Senate* are printed in the Appendix to this Notice of Meeting. Members who do not wish to retain the copies are asked to return them to their Divisional Office of the Academic Senate.

Amendments to Divisional Grading Systems

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Senate Regulation 778, enacted November 17, 1970, provides in paragraph (B) that:

778(B). The grading system to be used by a Division and modification thereof must be reviewed by the University Committee on Educational Policy and be certified for consonance with the Code of the Academic Senate [see By-Law 144] by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction. These Committees report their findings to the Senate Assembly for information. Thereafter the proposed grading system becomes effective as provided by Divisional action unless the Assembly determines otherwise.

Accordingly, the Secretary submits for the information of the Assembly the recommendations of the Committees on Educational Policy and Rules and Jurisdiction concerning the proposed amendments to the grading systems of the Davis, Santa Barbara, and Los Angeles Divisions.

Respectfully submitted

R. A. COCKRELL, *Secretary (North)*

April 24, 1975

Davis Division

RECOMMENDATIONS: *University Committee on Educational Policy*

At its meeting of April 10, 1975 the University Committee on Educational Policy approved the Davis Division proposal amending A540(C), relating to the incomplete grade.

For the Committee

E. H. RABIN, Chairman

University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction:

The proposed changes in the grading code of the Davis Division have been reviewed by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and are considered to be in accord with the Code of the Academic Senate.

For the Committee

R. S. GERSTEIN, Chairman

Amendments to the Davis Division Grading System

On January 20, 1975, the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division adopted a change to the Davis Division Grading Code which would expedite the conversion process in removing "I" grades. The amendment to Davis Regulation A540(C) is as follows:

Present Wording	Amended Wording Recommended
<p>A540(C) The grade Incomplete shall be assigned only when the student's work is of passing quality but incomplete for good cause determined by the instructor. Subject to the provisions of Academic Senate Regulation 634, grade points and units for courses graded Incomplete shall not be counted in calculating a student's grade-point average. The student is entitled to replace this grade by a passing grade and to receive appropriate grade points and unit credit provided he satisfactorily completes the work of the course in a way specified by the instructor. In the event a student accumulates more than 16 units of Incomplete for which final grades have not been assigned, he shall be subject to probation or disqualification.</p>	<p>A540(C) The grade Incomplete shall be assigned only when the student's work is of passing quality but incomplete for good cause determined by the instructor. Subject to the provisions of Academic Senate Regulation 634, grade points and units for courses graded Incomplete shall not be counted in calculating a student's grade-point average. The student is entitled to replace this grade by a passing grade and to receive appropriate grade points and unit credit provided he satisfactorily completes the work of the course in a way specified by the instructor before the end of the third succeeding term of the student's academic residence. If a degree is conferred upon the student before the expiration of the time limit for conversion, the time limit for conversion for the graduated student shall be the end of the third regular term succeeding the term in which the Incomplete grade was assigned. In the event a student accumulates more than 16 units of Incomplete for which final grades have not been assigned, he shall be subject to probation or disqualification.</p>

Santa Barbara Division

Recommendations: *University Committee on Educational Policy*

At its meeting on April 10, 1975 the University Committee on Educational Policy recommended approval of the request for two amendments to the Santa Barbara Divisional Grading System. The first deals with the *Passed/No Record* option for the College of Creative Studies (By-Law A36) and the second amendment deals with the grade of Incomplete with respect to graduate courses (By-Law A20). However, with respect to the *Passed/No Record* proposal, UCEP recommended approval only as a three-year experiment, and subject to the condition that a minimum progress requirement be in force at least during the said three-year period.

For the Committee

E. H. RABIN, Chairman

University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction: These are substantive changes in the grading codes of the Santa Barbara Division. They are in accord with the Code of the Academic Senate in the judgment of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction.

For the Committee

R. S. GERSTEIN, Chairman

Amendments to the Santa Barbara Divisional Grading System

The following amendments to the Santa Barbara Divisional Grading System were approved for the Division by the Faculty Legislature at its meeting on January 23, 1975.

By-Law A36. The grading system in the College of Creative Studies is not an all or nothing system (as in all other *Passed* or *Not Passed* systems) but a sliding scale of units from 0-6. Grading in the College is in no sense punitive; it is merely a record of the student's progress toward the number of units required for graduation. To receive no units is to make no progress toward graduation and is equivalent to not having taken the course.

Present Wording	Amended Wording Recommended
A36. The work of each student in the College of Creative Studies shall be evaluated as follows:	A36. No change.
(A) Courses taken in the College are to be reported in terms of grades <i>Passed</i> or <i>Not Passed</i> . The grade <i>Passed</i> shall be strictly reserved for work of satisfactory quality. For each course in which he earns a grade of <i>Passed</i> the student shall receive from one to six units of credit, as determined by the instructor of the course. No credit shall be awarded for a grade of <i>Not Passed</i> .	(A) Courses taken.....in terms of <i>Passed</i> or <i>No Record</i> . The grade <i>Passed</i> shall be.....of the course. Courses for which the grade of <i>Passed</i> is inappropriate are removed from the student's record.
(B) Courses taken outside the College of Creative Studies shall be reported as provided in Regulation A20.	(B) No change.

By-Law A20. The rationale for the following amendment is that these courses are listed every quarter: 594 Special Topics, 595 Group Studies, 596 Directed Reading and Research, 597 Individual Study for Master's Comprehensive Examinations and Ph.D. Examinations, 598 Master's Thesis Research and Preparation, 599 Ph.D. Dissertation Preparation. The 594 offered by a department in the fall quarter may be completely different from the 594 offered in the winter quarter and, therefore, a student with an Incomplete grade in 594 in the fall should not be penalized for failing to remove it in the winter. Individualized courses should not be equated with those the content of which varies little from term to term.

Present Wording	Amended Wording Recommended
A20. (D) (1) The grade <i>Incomplete</i> (I) may be assigned when a student's work is of passing quality, but is incomplete. The student is entitled to have the grade of <i>Incomplete</i> replaced by a passing grade, as determined by the instructor concerned, and to receive unit credit and appropriate grade points upon satisfactory completion of the work of the course by the end of the next full quarter of the student's registration in a regular session in which the course is offered, or by the end of one calendar year from the date of receipt of the grade, whichever date occurs first. If the instructor is unavailable, the chairman of the department in which the course was offered is authorized to supervise the completion of the work and to make the appropriate grade change. The dean of the appropriate college or school has authority to extend the deadline for completion in the event of unusual circumstances that would clearly impose an unfair hardship on the student if the original deadline were maintained. If the work is not completed according to the deadline or authorized extension of it, the <i>Incomplete</i> shall automatically be changed to an F or NP as appropriate.	A20. (D) (1)... ... as appropriate. These deadlines do not apply to the following graduate courses: 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599. Incomplete grades in these courses must be replaced by a letter grade or S or U as appropriate by the end of the last quarter in which the student is registered prior to receipt of the master's or doctoral degree.

Los Angeles Division

Recommendations: *University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction:*

The proposed changes in the grading code of the Los Angeles Division have been reviewed by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and are considered to be in accord with the Code of the Academic Senate.

For the Committee

R. S. GERSTEIN, Chairman

University Committee on Educational Policy:

The amendment to Los Angeles Division Regulation A313 will be considered by the Committee on Educational Policy at its May meeting, and an oral report will be presented to the Assembly on May 29, 1975.

For the Committee
E. H. RABIN, Chairman

Amendment to the Los Angeles Division Grading System

At its meeting on March 3, 1975, the Legislative Assembly of the Los Angeles Division endorsed a change in Divisional Regulation A313. That decision was made because it is recognized that many of the faculty at UCLA employ reassessment under the rubric of "procedural error." In fact, the faculty wish to make *de jure* what they are currently doing *de facto*. It is felt that this is well accomplished by removing the prohibition against reassessment. The faculty believe that reassessment is a proper and reasonable basis for permitting change and, indeed, they would be making legal what is, in any event, widely practiced.

<i>Present Wording</i>	<i>Amended Wording Recommended</i>
<p>A313. <i>Correction of Grades.</i></p> <p>All grades, except I and IP are final when filed by an instructor in the end-of-term course report. However, the Registrar is authorized to change a final grade upon written request of an instructor, provided that a "clerical" or "procedural" error is the reason for the change. No change of grade may be made on the basis of reassessment of the quality of a student's work, reexamination, or, with the exception of the I and IP grades, the completion of additional work.</p>	<p>A313. <i>Correction of Grades.</i></p> <p>..... that a clerical or procedural error is the reason for the change. No change of grade may be made on the basis of reexamination or, with the exception of the I and IP grades, the completion of additional work</p>

Report of the Committee on Long Range Educational Objectives and Academic Planning

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

This special committee, authorized by the Assembly of the Academic Senate in June, 1972, was charged to: "(1) conduct a comprehensive survey, with the aid of duly constituted statewide and divisional Senate agencies, of all current academic programs, undergraduate and graduate, departmental and interdisciplinary, and of all program changes now in planning; (2) to develop a set or sets of long range educational objectives and long range academic plans for the attainment of these objectives."

The committee has interpreted this charge in the way described in our Interim Report to the Assembly in May, 1974. In fulfillment of the charge we now present our Final Report to the Assembly and to the faculty of the University. Growing out of our study and embodied in the Report are a number of conclusions and recommendations concerned with the educational objectives of the University. These are presented for consideration by the Assembly in the following resolutions:

I.

That the Report entitled "Long Range Educational Objectives for the University of California, 1975-1985," identifies significant aspects of the changed general conditions that the University must face for the next

decade or longer as follows:

1. Slow enrollment growth to 1980 and stabilized enrollment thereafter;
2. Stringency of financial resources for higher education and for the University at both the state and federal levels;
3. A reduced number of academic career positions for recipients of doctoral degrees, combined with continued or intensifying demand for doctoral and professional-degree graduates in other types of careers; and
4. Continuing changes in student interests and in social trends, giving rise to new needs toward which the University's resources for teaching and research will from time to time need to be redirected.

II.

That the Report provides a general framework for further development of the academic contributions of the University of California and the nation, including:

— 9 —

1. Continuing emphasis on the highest quality of education in all aspects of the University;
2. Endorsement of the University's unique mission in the planned structure of California's system of public higher education;
3. Commitment to the concept of one University of California, in which the students and faculty at each campus may develop their own styles and special contributions and within the context of a single, great institution, with the opportunity to draw upon other resources in addition to those locally available and the expectation of intercampus cooperation where this would enhance academic performance;
4. Reliance on a focus toward selective excellence on each campus, so that each will contribute in its own special fashion to the totality of educational opportunities and achievements for the University; and
5. Strengthening of the faculty's role in the making of academic policy for the University and of the modes of operation of the Academic Senate as the faculty's main instrumentality.

III.

The Assembly refers the following questions to appropriate University groups as indicated below:

— 11 —

— 12 —

— 16 —

— 17 —

1. *Subject:* STRENGTHEN THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND ACADEMIC SENATE IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND ACADEMIC PLANNING FOR THE UNIVERSITY.

Summary Recommendation: Consider the desirability of and mechanisms for enhancing the participation of University administration and Academic Senate in educational policy and academic planning decisions which affect more than one campus or the system as a whole.

Report page: 23

Refer to: The President, Chancellors and the Academic Council for consideration, and action as they deem desirable, with the request that the President and the Academic Council reply to the Assembly at its May, 1976 meeting.

2. *Subject:* CONSIDER THE NEED FOR INTERCAMPUS COORDINATION IN THE UNIVERSITY.

Summary Recommendation: All responsible groups should consider the degree to which recommendations of this report concerning the possibilities for various types of coordination of the activities of the campuses within the University are appropriate, and if such coordination is considered to be necessary or desirable, how it can be accomplished.

Report pages: 29-31

Refer to: The President, Chancellors, University Committee on Educational Policy, Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, University Committee on Budget and Interdivisional Relations and the Divisions for consideration of the principle that means should be sought to achieve intercampus coordination of the University. Specific suggestions concerning mechanisms of coordination are mentioned below.

3. *Subject:* JOINT OR GROUP GRADUATE PROGRAMS.

Summary Recommendation: Consider whether any additions to or changes in Academic Senate Regulations are needed to permit development of graduate programs under the joint control of more than one group on more than one campus. If it is felt that new or altered legislation is necessary to permit broader use of such graduate programs in the University, such legislation should be submitted to the Assembly at an early meeting. If, on the other hand, it is concluded that no changes are needed or that broader use of such programs in the University is an unsatisfactory or undesirable way of operating graduate programs, this conclusion should be reported to the Assembly not later than the May, 1976 meeting.

Report page: 31

Refer to: Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and University Committee

— 10 —

on Educational Policy with the request that they report to the Assembly through the Academic Council.

4. *Subject:* EXTENDED USE OF ORGANIZED RESEARCH UNITS IN PROVISION OF FACULTY RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES.

Summary Recommendation: Consider ways in which the research facilities provided by organized research units in the University may be utilized on a broader scale to assist in extending research opportunities for faculty members whose campus facilities are inadequate.

Report pages: 31-32

Refer to: The President, Chancellors and Directors of organized research units.

5. *Subject:* INTRA-UNIVERSITY DISCIPLINARY CONFERENCE GROUPS.

Summary Recommendation: Establish a continuing series of conferences in which representatives of all departments or programs concerned with a single discipline from all campuses would meet to discuss the problems and role of that discipline within the University.

Report page: 32

Refer to: The President and the Academic Council, to consider the desirability of such conferences and to establish procedures for initiating and maintaining them.

6. *Subject:* IMPROVED LIBRARY SERVICES.

Summary Recommendation: Consider the need for and the nature of policies for operation of University libraries which place greater emphasis on utilization of library resources. Examples of areas in which better services might be obtained are: Improved information retrieval systems; reduction of delay in cataloguing and shelving books, longer opening hours; better coordination of acquisition and circulation both between University libraries and with outside institutions; and mechanization of library systems where possible.

Report page: 33

Refer to: The President, the University Librarians, and the University Library Committee with the request that they consider these recommendations and implement them where it seems possible or desirable.

7. *Subject:* POLICIES REGARDING COMPUTER ACQUISITION.

Summary Recommendation: Consider the roles both of large, central computing facilities networked throughout the University and of small, inexpensive, independent computers dedicated to specific or limited tasks to be certain that no policy regarding acquisition of central processing units results in more expensive or less efficient computing service than could be obtained through a more liberal policy.

Report page: 33

Refer to: The President and University Computer Committee for consideration and modification of policies as appropriate.

8. *Subject:* IMPROVED METHODS OF INTERCAMPUS TRANSFER OF STUDENTS AND FACULTY.

Summary Recommendation: Investigate and evaluate the desirability of and mechanisms for achieving improved utilization of the resources of the University through making intercampus transfer of students and faculty for short or long periods simple and easy. Consideration of this question should include means of safeguarding the rights of individuals and the provision of incentives commensurate with the additional service rendered the University by transferred faculty.

Report pages: 34-35

Refer to: President, Chancellors, University Committee on Educational policy, University Committee on Budget and Interdivisional Relations, and Divisions. UCEP and UCBIR are requested to report on this question to the Assembly through the Academic Council by the May, 1976 meeting.

9. *Subject:* GRADUATE ADMISSIONS STANDARDS.

Summary Recommendation: To consider whether the present standards and processes of admission of graduate students to the University are adequate and appropriate to the best development of graduate studies in the next decade.

Report pages: 41-42

Refer to: Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, Council of Graduate Deans and Divisional Graduate Councils for study and recommendations for any appropriate changes.

10. *Subject:* EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS.

Summary Recommendation: That administrators' performance be assessed systematically with the same care for client evaluation and peer judgment as is used in faculty reviews, and that these procedures of evaluation be made known throughout the University.

Report pages: 43-44

Refer to: The President and Chancellors.

11. *Subject:* PROGRAM EVALUATION.

Summary Recommendation: Consider the institution of a varied and flexible system for evaluation of programs of instruction in the University to provide continued assessment of the quality of these programs. The suggestions made in the report should be considered only as a starting point for consideration of these and other mechanisms.

Report pages: 44-45

Refer to: The President, Chancellors, University Committee on Educational Policy, Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and Divisions with the request that UCEP and CCGA report through the Academic Council by the May, 1976 meeting of the Assembly.

12. *Subject:* ADMISSIONS AND REDIRECTION PROCEDURES.

Summary Recommendation: Consider any needed improvements in the processes by which student applications are evaluated and admissions decisions are made in the University. This consideration should include evaluation of the possible utility of establishing a single point for receipt and initial processing of applications, of alterations in the procedures by which students are redirected to campuses other than that of their first choice, possible incentives for redirected students, and possible means of better informing student applicants of the individual characteristics of campuses both with respect to availability of certain programs at limited locations and of the standards applied in selection of students where program enrollments are limited.

Report pages: 45-47

Refer to: The President, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools with the request that BOARS report its conclusions and recommendations to the Assembly at the May, 1976 meeting.

13. *Subject:* TEMPORARY FACULTY APPOINTMENTS.

Summary Recommendation: That the University follow a policy of maintaining a small fraction of faculty appointments in a "temporary pool" which are assigned to campuses and filled only on a short-term basis as a means of preserving the ability of the University to respond to changing conditions and student need in departments and programs.

Report pages: 51-52

Refer to: The President, Chancellors and Divisions.

14. *Subject:* EARLY FACULTY RETIREMENT.

Summary Recommendation: Consider means of improving the ability of the University to maintain the needed infusion of young talent into the faculty through developing better and more attractive early retirement options.

Report page: 52

Refer to: The President and the Academic Council.

15. *Subject:* NOTIFICATION OF ADVICE BY ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES.

Summary Recommendation: That the Assembly and the Divisions consider, on the advice of appropriate committees, the desirability of instituting a requirement that committees charged with responsibility for advising the administration inform their parent bodies of the advice rendered to the extent permitted by the confidentiality of questions involved. Whether information so provided should be subject to approval by the parent body should also be considered.

Report pages: 49-50

Refer to: All University Committees charged with responsibility for advising the administration and to Divisions with the suggestion that it be further

— 13 —

referred to similar committees in each Division with the expectation that the committees will report to their parent bodies as soon as possible and before the end of the academic year, 1975-76.

16. *Subject:* DEVELOP LIST OF MINIMUM REQUIRED UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS FOR UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES.

Summary Recommendation: That the University Committee on Educational Policy, in conjunction with Divisional Committees on Educational Policy, identify the programs which are considered to be essential parts of the undergraduate offerings of a University of California campus. The resulting list should establish a minimum acceptable array of undergraduate programs which should be offered by any campus of the University.

Report pages: 25-26

Refer to: University Committee on Educational Policy and Divisional Committees on Educational Policy for consideration and development of a recommended list. The UCEP should report to the Academic Council the results of these deliberations during the academic year 1975-1976 so that this list can be used by campuses as a basis for their planning as early as possible.

17. *Subject:* POLICY ON JOINT ACQUISITION OF EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES.

Summary Recommendation: Investigate the possibilities and consider the utility of a policy which would require that large and expensive items of equipment or specialized facilities not be acquired until the potential of their utilization by the entire University has been considered.

Report pages: 32-33

Refer to: President and Chancellors for consideration and implementation as seems desirable.

18. *Subject:* AUTHORIZATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF "UNIVERSITY" DEPARTMENTS IN A LIMITED NUMBER OF DISCIPLINES.

Summary Recommendation: Consider the desirability of establishing within the University departments which may have responsibility for instruction on campuses other than the one where they are primarily located.

Report pages: 35-36

Refer to: The President, Chancellors, University Committee on Educational Policy. UCEP is requested to report its evaluation of this proposal through the Academic Council to the Assembly by the May, 1976 meeting.

19. *Subject:* STUDY MEANS OF FOSTERING AND SUPPORTING INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS.

Summary Recommendation: That a joint Academic Senate/administration committee be formed and charged with studying ways in which the ability of the University to carry out educational experimentation can be improved, both with respect to procedures for undertaking such experimentation and to means of providing support and incentives for development of innovative programs.

— 14 —

Report pages: 36-37

Refer to: The President and the Academic Council.

20. *Subject:* ESTABLISH A PERMANENT UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE WITH APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY SUPPORT.

Summary Recommendation: That the Academic Council consult with the President for the purpose of obtaining the necessary financial support to establish a permanent University Academic Senate office. This support should include a small staff and released-time positions sufficient to permit those concerned with University Academic Senate affairs to devote the time required by this service without personal hardship. If negotiations with the President are successful, the Council should develop a plan for establishment of such an office and submit it to the Assembly for approval.

Report pages: 37-38

Refer to: The Academic Council.

21. *Subject:* REVISION OF GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS.

Summary Recommendation: That the University Committee on Educational Policy consider the desirability of changes in the general graduation requirements or the provision of alternative routes to meeting graduation requirements and that specific recommendations concerning any needed changes be made to the Assembly when they have been developed.

Report pages 40-41

Refer to: University Committee on Educational Policy with the recommendation that they consult with other appropriate bodies and set up any needed group to study the question, keeping the Academic Council informed of progress during the study.

22. *Subject:* OFF-CAMPUS REPRESENTATION ON *AD HOC* PERSONNEL COMMITTEES.

Summary Recommendation: Consider the desirability of requiring that *ad hoc* committees charged with evaluation of certain types of personnel actions (e.g., appointment or promotion to tenure, or to Professor, merit raises to Professor Step VI and Overscale) include at least one individual from another campus of the University who is a representative of the discipline of the individual whose case is being considered.

Report page: 43

Refer to: The President, Chancellors and University Committee on Budget and Interdivisional Relations, with UC BIR requested to report through the Academic Council to the Assembly as soon as possible and not later than the May, 1976 meeting.

23. *Subject:* FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY REPRESENTATION.

Summary Recommendation: That consideration be given to means of increasing the use of faculty representatives in University negotiations with government and the public.

— 15 —

Report pages: 52-53

Refer to: The President and the Academic Council.

24. *Subject:* FACULTY REEDUCATION.

Summary Recommendation: That the University explore means of making available opportunities for faculty reeducation as one method of meeting the changing needs of instructional programs and maintaining University quality.

Report page: 54

Refer to: The President, Chancellors and departments.

25. *Subject:* USE OF FACULTY IN COURSES OUTSIDE PRIMARY DEPARTMENT.

Summary Recommendation: Extend the use of faculty members in the instruction of courses outside their primary discipline as a means of meeting temporary situations where teaching needs are not consonant with the availability of faculty.

Report pages: 54-55

Refer to: Chancellors, Divisions, and departments.

26. *Subject:* ACADEMIC SENATE INFORMATION SYSTEM.

Summary Recommendation: Consider the establishment of a computerized data file and retrieval system for the records of the Academic Senate. Such a file would include information regarding actions of committees and legislative bodies of the Senate for the entire University.

Report pages: 50-51

Refer to: Academic Council with the request that it consult as necessary and coordinate the establishment of such an information system if it seems desirable and can be funded.

27. *Subject:* SELECTIVE DEVELOPMENT OF EXCELLENCE IN CAMPUS PROGRAMS.

Summary Recommendation: Consider the desirability of and the means by which University campuses can design and develop arrays of instructional programs which will foster maximum possible program quality, provide students with necessary educational opportunities and assist in most effective utilization of resources by the University.

Report pages: 23-29

Refer to: The President, Chancellors, the University Committee on Educational Policy, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, the University Committee on Budget and Interdivisional Relations and all Divisions of the Academic Senate for consideration of the principle and initiation

of the process of planning such development of campuses if appropriate. University committees are requested to report back to the Assembly with their conclusions regarding the appropriateness of the principle and procedures for its implementation at an early meeting and in no case later than the May, 1976 meeting of the Assembly.

28. *Subject:* STUDY THE QUESTION OF CRITICAL MASS OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS.

Summary Recommendation: That the University Committee on Educational Policy or an appropriate subcommittee appointed by the UCEP in consultation with the University Committee on Committees and the Academic Council undertake a thorough and complete study of the factors which contribute to the attainment of the necessary "critical mass" of instructional programs at all levels. Questions which should be considered include the number of students required to support viable programs in various disciplinary areas, the number of faculty necessary for development of programs of the desired University quality, the necessary breadth of subdisciplinary coverage, the degree to which the required critical mass can be provided by programs in related areas and any other questions which bear on the relation of size to quality of programs at both graduate and undergraduate levels.

Report page: 25

Refer to: University Committee on Educational Policy with the request that it start this study as soon as possible and report to the Assembly at its May, 1976 meeting.

29. *Subject:* EXPERIMENTATION WITH UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS STANDARDS.

Summary Recommendation: That the University undertake experimentation designed to determine the validity of the present "a-f" requirements for undergraduate admission and to identify other procedures which can more accurately measure the placement of students in the upper 1/8th of California high school graduates and their potential to accomplish the undergraduate programs of the University.

Report pages: 38-41

Refer to: Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools and University Committee on Educational Policy with the request that they report the feasibility of such studies and the details of any proposed studies to the Assembly at the May, 1976 meeting.

30. *Subject:* FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS.

Summary Recommendation: Study the need for and most appropriate nature of unified standards and procedures for evaluation of University faculty members with respect to teaching, research, and University and public service. If it is concluded that more explicit codification of desirable procedures and standards is needed, the instructions to Appointment and Promotion committees and to Budget Committees should be altered to reflect any needed changes.

Report pages: 42-43

Refer to: The President and University Committee on Budget and Inter-divisional Relations with the request that UCBIR report through the Academic Council on any action taken to the May, 1976 meeting of the Assembly.

31. *Subject:* FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLANNING.

Summary Recommendation: That the Academic Council negotiate with the President to establish participation of members of the University Committee on Academic Planning (see No. IV; page 18) in the process of academic planning and decision making in the University in accordance with the

suggestion put forward in this report.

Report pages: 47-48

Refer to: The President and the Academic Council with the request that the Academic Council report the results of such negotiation to the Assembly at the earliest possible date.

32. *Subject:* PREFERENTIAL APPOINTMENT OF NEW FACULTY AT NON-TENURE LEVEL.

Summary Recommendation: That in making new faculty appointments the University adopt a policy which requires that new appointments will normally be at the non-tenure level, with the use of tenure level appointments only when it is established that there is a specific need best satisfied by bringing in tenure faculty.

Report page: 51

Refer to: The President, Chancellors and Divisions.

33. *Subject:* POST-REVIEW OF FACULTY PERSONNEL ACTIONS

Summary Recommendation: That the University Committee on Budget and Interdivisional Relations be directed to fulfill its charge as set forth in By-Law 94 (B) (2) to "... review standards and policies applied by Divisional Committees on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations..." by establishing a subcommittee charged with responsibility for conducting an annual post-audit of campus personnel actions with a report of its findings to be made to the Academic Senate through the Assembly as well as to the President.

One possible mechanism would be the addition to each campus budget committee of a member who would attend meetings, but not participate in the deliberations of the local committee. Collectively these members of the local committees would comprise the "post-review" subcommittee of UCBIR.

Report pages: 42-43

Refer to: University Committee on Budget and Interdivisional Relations for study of appropriate means of accomplishing this objective, including the need for additional membership of UCBIR, procedures to be followed in carrying out the post-review and any other matters which may facilitate this review. The UCBIR should report to the Assembly at the earliest possible meeting of the academic year 1975-1976 with suggested procedures and proposals for any necessary revision of the By-Laws of the Academic Senate to accomplish this objective.

— 18 —

IV.

That the Assembly adopt the following additions and changes in its By-Laws:

1. 91. *Academic Planning. (A) Membership.* This committee consists of two appointed members and five *ex officio* members. The two appointed members are selected from the membership of Divisional committees concerned with academic planning and are appointed for two year terms after consultation with the President. The senior of the two appointed members normally serves as Chairman. Membership also includes the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Academic Council and the Chairmen of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, the University Committee on Educational Policy and the University Committee on Budget and Interdivisional Relations or members of these committees designated by the respective chairmen.

(B) *Duties*. This committee:

- (1) Represents the Academic Senate in all matters of University academic planning and reports thereon to the Assembly through the Academic Council.
 - (2) The two appointed members and the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Academic Council are representatives of the Academic Senate on the University board charged with advising the President on matters of planning and budget allocation.
2. 80. *Academic Council*. (A) *Membership*. —the Committee on Educational Policy, and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, and the *Committee on Academic Planning*. In the absence—

Report pages: 47-49

— 19 —

Educational Objectives for the University of California 1975-1985

In accordance with our charge and the priorities implied in the title given our committee, we have concerned ourselves first with educational objectives for the University of California and secondarily with academic planning as a process which assists in some measure in attaining desired educational objectives. Our consideration of educational objectives for the University shows that they tend to fall into two groups. The most important objectives are the least specific, and the most difficult to attain. The more limited objectives which can be made the target of specific processes and be incorporated into academic plans, however, are not always as attractive or as uncontroversial as the broad ones. We feel that simply to state the grand objectives as we perceive them without providing guides to the paths which lead to them would be an abrogation of our responsibility and would make our endeavors somewhat sterile. This report will therefore be concerned primarily with specific educational objectives, some of which may appear to those who have not suffered through our process of appraisal and analysis to have little relation to the paramount educational objectives, but which we believe to be directed toward achieving them. If our recommendations on these specific objectives are to be understood as we see them, it seems desirable to state initially the broad context in which we believe appropriate educational objectives for the University must be appraised and in which our recommendations have been developed and evaluated. The paragraphs which follow summarize our view of this context. The first of these paragraphs expresses what we believe should be the ultimate objective of the University, the attainment of which must be a consideration in judging the suitability of any change in the programs, structure and practices of the University:

- *University Quality*. The University of California should maintain and improve its excellence as an institution of higher education. The educational and other services which the University provides to the people of the state and nation should be comparable with the finest available, circumscribed only by the resources that can be secured to maintain these services.
- *Resources*. When we live, as we do now, in a world of limited resources, choices between using them to support quality of education and providing amounts of educational services that are regarded as institutionally and socially desirable are ones which we must face at every level. The balance between these choices will strongly influence the future nature of the University.
- *Adaptability*. The next decade is likely to witness continued rapid social change and stabilization of enrollment demand from the traditional University student clientele for higher education. In these conditions the University will be able to maintain and improve quality only by adapting its structure, its programs and its

practices to the altered social and educational environment. The University must not stand firm on established custom *simply because* it has worked well.

- *Teaching.* The function of the University is epitomized in the learning process. All the activities of the University are in some way related to learning, but the organized aspects of the process, especially classroom teaching, are most visible

— 20 —

both in the University and in the public eye. The University must strive to improve the quality of its teaching, even where it is now of high quality, and must also work to make it more efficient and more pertinent to the needs of its students.

- *Research.* The search for truth and knowledge must continue as a central objective of the institution and this search must not be constrained by prescribed limits other than those ethical and social restraints which govern all serious research. The fruits of this search constitute one of the most important services which the University can render to society. It is important, however, to recognize that in addition to serving society by educating its young, and by adding to the world's store of knowledge, the University must also be ready to contribute to the solution of problems plaguing mankind through the application of knowledge.

- *Public Service.* Aside from its educational and research functions, the University is able to supply varied resources for the public. Often it is possible to provide unique expertise or facilities for the benefit of society, and the capacity and willingness of the University to do so should be maintained.

- *Educational Opportunity.* The University has been among the leaders in opening its programs to those previously deprived of equal opportunity for higher education of the type offered by the University. We must continue to seek more and better ways to assist those students whose intellectual capacities are such that they can benefit from what the University provides, but who for reasons of finance, background or prior educational history would in the past have found attendance at the University impossible.

- *Role of the University in California Higher Education.* The functional differentiation of higher education in California is supported by academic principles, logic and history; it also has the force of law. The University of California should strive to fulfill its defined role as the primary state agency for research and as the state institution charged with the responsibility for providing higher education to a select group of undergraduate students, for graduate studies at the doctoral level and certain types of professional education. In doing so, it should continue to maintain coordination and cooperation with other segments of California higher education.

- *Academic Character of the University.* Although the University is a large enterprise requiring large budgets and many different kinds of human and physical resources, we believe it is important to recognize that it has a character significantly different from other large enterprises whether governmental, industrial or commercial: It is an academic institution. Because of this unique character, a special kind of knowledge, background and frame of mind are needed in decisions regarding the University. This need is frequently recognized in the choice of administrators from the ranks of the faculty. This is not, however, sufficient to insure that decisions regarding the University are made in a way which insures adequate consideration of the full range of academic expertise. For this reason we think it important that faculty be continuously and deeply involved in University operation at all levels.

— 21 —

- *University Autonomy.* The principle that the University should be free from political control must be preserved even to the point of sacrificing financial support should that support be for inappropriate purposes or should it require abandonment of University control of its objectives. At the same time, the University must be open to the public and its representatives and prepared to justify its decisions in open forum.

These statements express convictions held by members of this committee, and they should be understood to have conditioned our view of which educational objectives are appropriate for the University. They also shape our view of the appropriate processes and procedures through which these objectives might be reached.

In the remainder of this report we set forth objectives both more limited and more specific than those listed above. We also include in some cases suggestions about structural and procedural changes which may help in attaining both the limited and general objectives. Although most of our proposals will have some impact on all aspects of the University, for convenience we have categorized them as (1) proposals concerned with the structure and organization of the University designed to maintain and enhance its quality (2) proposals regarding improved procedures and practices in the University, and (3) matters which most directly concern the faculty individually and as organized into the Academic Senate. With regard to the last category we have felt that it is especially appropriate for a group comprised of and representing faculty to examine most carefully the role of faculty in the University. Most documents dealing with the future of the University state something to the effect that the faculty *is* the University and that success of the institution depends on the faculty. We believe this to be true, but because this committee is a creature of the faculty we consider that we are obligated to examine more deeply and critically the way in which the faculty can and should contribute to the educational objectives of the University.

Structural and Organizational Changes for Maintaining and Improving the Quality of the University

The development of the University of California into the first of the multi-campus state university systems was not wholly haphazard, but neither did it reflect a closely planned, logical and rational expansion from the original campus at Berkeley to the present nine-campus structure.

Campuses were added to the system in response to and their locations determined by a combination of opportunities, needs and influences. Clearly, however, the precipitous growth of the University in the 1960's and the attendant projection of enrollment figures for established, developing and new campuses were consonant with a rapid influx of students, demographic estimates for the state and an expectation of uninterrupted availability of fiscal resources on a commensurate scale. On this basis, the more or less explicit adoption of a model of nine general campuses patterned roughly on Berkeley both in scope of academic offerings and quality of education was not unreasonable. On the contrary, it appeared to be well warranted within the context of the University's traditional enrollment-driven formula of fund acquisition and allocation. New faculty recruited in impressive numbers certainly

— 22 —

were attracted to the University's several campuses by prospects of simultaneous quantitative and qualitative growth. They had every reason to plan academic programs and their own academic future accordingly.

We need hardly point out that the conditions of the 1960's no longer obtain, that they have not obtained for some years now, and are not likely to obtain in the foreseeable future. The earlier long-term projections of high population and economic growth on which these plans were predicated did not materialize, and the projections of the University's future enrollment have been correspondingly reduced (see Appendix 2). Because of the uncertain nature of predictions concerning the behavior of people and because of the possibility that other age groups may become significant factors in University enrollment, we interpret the projections of Appendix 2 only as a general indication that the University undergraduate enrollment is likely to become static within the next decade. Thus, within the time frame of our report, the University will have a smaller student and resources base than was earlier expected. It operates within more stringent constraints. These are regrettable facts. To bemoan them as bitter blows that some unkind fate has dealt us and to persist in the belief that they are of a temporary nature and will soon pass and be replaced by a condition of normalcy, the mental image of which

we have preserved from the 1960's, is deleterious to our morale and destructive of the best utilization of the talents and resources at our disposal for the purpose of providing high quality education.

Under prevailing circumstances the rationality of the University's current nine-campus structure must certainly be reexamined and adaptations consistent with high quality education considered. It is not inconceivable that some aspects of the desired educational objectives for the University could best be achieved by reducing the number of campuses. This would permit the remaining ones to reach larger size, and through a pooling of talent from other campuses and concentration of resources, to attain all-around excellence. Although we see potential educational benefits from a deletion of some campuses, we conclude that this option should not be seriously considered. The reasons for rejecting this alternative are many, but a few should be mentioned: (a) It is far from certain that increased campus size alone — such as would be obtained by reducing the number of campuses — would provide an easier or better route to enhancing the quality of the total system; (b) The principle that a campus should be placed near the center of the population served by it is one which has a long history in California. Its justification, that thus it may serve the greatest number of eligible students, is an appropriate response to the second of two sometimes conflicting tenets of higher education in California. These tenets can be stated as a desire that higher education in California should be at least as good as that anywhere else and on the other hand that everyone who can benefit from it may have the opportunity to do so; (c) The diversity and flexibility offered by nine campuses of varying size and emphasis adds strength to the system as a whole; (d) The fact that nine campuses *do* exist, that they have their own physical plants, their own faculties and their own clientele of both students and community adherents is a very strong reason to decide that the best way to achieve optimum quality in the system is to make optimum use of existing talent and resources *in situ*.

— 23 —

1. *One University or nine?* The belief that all existing campuses should be maintained has consequences for the choice of desirable actions in a number of areas, and many of the recommendations which follow reflect this belief. Selection of this option does, however, have one important consequence which should be explicitly stated and discussed here. If the University system were to be reduced to four or five campuses with large enrollments and the resulting potential to provide full services of the type which are now available at Berkeley and Los Angeles, there would be much to recommend the continuation of the process of decentralization of the University which has been underway for the past 10-12 years. For most operating purposes the delegations of authority and responsibility which have been made to campus administrations and Divisional Senates were necessary and have proven to be successful. However, if the University is to attain the maximum level of quality during the next decade we believe it will be necessary to insure that procedures of planning and priority control are directed toward operation of the University *as a system*. We believe that control over some campus decisions, where they affect other campuses or the entire system, is necessary if optimum development of the University as a whole is to take place. Because no one campus is capable of providing the full span of academic programs or meeting the needs for services for which the University is responsible, it falls to the University administration and to the University Academic Senate to monitor the span of academic programs for gaps, unnecessary duplications and indications of weaknesses or areas of academic inefficiency.

The balance of campus autonomy against the needs of the whole University is a matter of great delicacy and one which must be a constant concern of the faculty as well as the administration at all levels. It is our conviction, however, that the balance has now tipped too far toward independence of the campuses with the result that the University tends too much to operate as a loose federation of independent campuses governed by a group of chancellors. In this situation the needs of the individual campus are unlikely to be subordinate to the needs of the entire institution. We do not propose a return to the days when only the President was an effective decision maker in the University, but rather we

suggest that the President's Office should in the future exert more leadership over the educational policy and academic aspects of the University than has been the case in the recent past. Such a change should not extend a tighter bureaucratic control over campus operating decisions which do not affect the rest of the system nor should it permit a central bureaucracy to set academic policies. Since many important aspects of University educational policy are delegated to the Academic Senate, a corresponding strengthening of the coordinating role of the University Academic Senate will also be required.

2. *Selective Excellence in the University and on Each Campus.* During the 1950's and early 1960's, academic plans for the Davis, Riverside and Santa Barbara campuses were broadened, and entirely new campuses were initiated at Irvine, San Diego, and Santa Cruz. Some differences of style and design were encouraged, but all of these campuses — those whose academic mandate was broadened and those newly established — were to be “general campuses”. They had high target ceilings

— 24 —

of eventual enrollment which changed from time to time, but were in the range from 15,000 to 27,500 students. They had the expectation of a wide span of academic programs at each location, including the development of doctoral programs in the major disciplines as rapidly as possible and some representation of professional schools. The University's San Francisco campus, it was decided, would remain a specialized “health sciences” campus — the only exception to the general campus concept.

There are three possible methods of adjusting the University's multi-campus structure to presently projected trends of modest growth in enrollment and resources: (a) reduce the number of general campuses to that which would permit all the remaining ones to grow to the Berkeley/Los Angeles size, with the general structures and features of these campuses; (b) accept the fact that the six smaller general campuses will not grow to the size of Berkeley and Los Angeles, and expect that they will have a wide sampling of programs, each of which is smaller than its counterparts on the large campuses; and (c) adopt a scheme of selective development of campuses so that each will have some programs that are distinctive in characteristics and as strong academically as the best in the system, but limit the number and configuration of programs on every campus.

We have rejected the first of these alternatives — reducing the number of campuses — for the reasons indicated above.

The second alternative — accepting targets of moderate enrollment size for the newer campuses while anticipating a wide breadth of program commitments on these campuses — would be the most natural and comfortable one to pursue in the University tradition. It would reinforce the benefits of administrative decentralization and localized decision making on each campus and would give the greatest scope to grass-roots initiatives in the design and operation of academic programs. If there were prospects of sufficient funding to permit a generous standard of academic budgeting and a relatively high cost per enrolled student in many fields on many campuses, this would be the easiest way for the University to operate.

But, under realistic assumptions as to future resources, we cannot expect that either the State operating budget or Federal research funding will be generous enough to sustain this approach at a high level of academic quality. Furthermore, even with generous funding, most fields do not lend themselves well to designing relatively small programs of graduate education and research that can be expected to attain recognizably high quality. We are, therefore, apprehensive that failure to trim the span of program offerings of *all* campuses, will insure that most programs on the small campuses would never grow strong enough to match comparable ones at competing universities and at the Berkeley and Los

Angeles campuses. We believe that the faculty and administration must join in a cooperative process of planning the future of the University as one academic entity. This implies a policy of selective emphasis in academic programs on each campus. It is clear that neither Berkeley nor Los Angeles, as large and diverse as each has become, has attempted to develop an overall program commitment in all possible areas even under the conditions of general expansion which prevailed in the period from the 1950's to 1970. We believe that patterns of selective excellence and intercampus cooperation

— 25 —

should be developed for the University which will require that all campuses, including Berkeley and Los Angeles, assess their programs in the light not only of their role on the campus, but also of their contribution to the overall offerings of the University. The history of the University provides many examples of successful dovetailing of instructional and other programs between campuses, leading to the conclusion that this process can be extended and focused in adapting the University to the conditions which face it in the next decade.

The first problem is to determine a conceptual basis for the selective pattern which each campus will pursue. We believe that academic considerations should govern these choices in the University of California, although other ways have been used in American higher education to vary the design pattern of colleges and universities: According to the social composition of the student body (age, sex, social class, religion, race, and ethnic status); according to level of program (whether all degree levels or only one); according to campus location and amenity (urban or rural, lavish or simple); or, according to features of the calendar and schedule of work (work-study programs, modular or other special scheduling). While some of these approaches may be adaptable to the University, most seem inappropriate as a basis for campus definition of campus academic roles in this system.

We recognize that the process of finding an appropriate pattern of academic emphasis on each campus will very largely be determined by the way in which its faculty and administration work together in defining the academic role of that campus within the University. However, the campuses will need to fit together as one University system and this will require development of an institutional program in which the roles of all the campuses are fitted into a coherent overall set of University academic commitments. Construction and implementation of such a program will strongly depend on the ability of University Academic Senate and University administration to coordinate and regulate the process. If one accepts, as this committee does, that in the context of the University of California, an adequate range of basic undergraduate program offerings is necessary as a service to students in the geographic area from which each campus draws a good part of its enrollment, then the first step in designing the campus pattern would be identification of the essential range of undergraduate programs. Another need is to estimate the minimum size of faculty and related resources necessary to provide prospects of a sustainable high quality of graduate instruction and research in each field which is to offer graduate programs. This issue of "critical mass" has been widely debated. The committee cannot propose a uniform quantitative standard for it, as the apparent minimum size differs from field to field and also depends on what are regarded as the boundaries of each discipline.

The importance of understanding the nature and dimensions of the "critical mass" for programs of various types and in various disciplines, and the present lack of definite information on this subject leads us to recommend that the problem of minimal required size for programs of University quality should be the subject of a study either by the University Committee on Educational Policy or a special Academic Senate committee appointed for this purpose.

— 26 —

The list entitled "B.A. Degrees Offered on Three or More U. C. Campuses" (Appendix 3) shows forty-one majors leading to the B.A. degree, excluding all professional degrees (these are marked with (*) in the listing). This list probably is not the smallest set of degrees that could be offered to undergraduates on a U. C. campus and still permit reasonable breadth and basic balance. This question should be considered by Committees on Educational Policy. Furthermore, this number of B.A. degrees should not be taken to reflect the smallest number of academic departments or units that a campus might have: that is a question of academic administrative organization as well as a question of discipline coverage and balance.

One means available to a campus to design its pattern of selective excellence thus would begin with a list of "basic" B.A. degrees and then, from the available and the attractable talents and research facilities, draw a list of the prime areas of doctoral offerings for that campus. Each advanced program offered by a campus without any necessity for cooperative intercampus sharing would need to meet certain criteria such as: (1) membership in a cluster of related doctoral and other advanced programs, in which there would be some significant indications of interdependence as to research facilities (libraries and laboratories), sharing of course and seminar offerings to a circulating body of graduate students; (2) size of affiliated faculty and graduate enrollment sufficient to meet critical mass standards of viability; (3) the ability to affiliate some faculty in "neighboring" departments with the program, to add strength to it and to provide wider faculty involvement in the offering of graduate education; (4) reputation for sound scholarship already achieved, or in short-term prospect according to external evaluators; and (5) indication that the advanced degree offering meets broad criteria of regional and national need and service. Of these criteria, the first is the one that most clearly assists in developing a focus of selective excellence on a campus, as a likely cluster would be in a general area such as "biological sciences" or "letters."

In addition to considerations such as these, those who are designing patterns of selective excellence for the campuses should bear in mind the possibilities offered by programs in the graduate professions and programs offering comprehensive master's degrees. Programs of these types, which have not been given heavy emphasis in the University, may be particularly useful in integrating and adding strength to campuses offering a truncated range of Ph.D. programs.

Faculty in departments not offering free-standing advanced degree programs according to this definition would have several options. First, some might be able to involve themselves effectively in the prime areas of graduate instruction and research that are independently offered on the campus. In fact, judicious choice of faculty in non-doctoral fields might facilitate this form of constructive affiliation. Second, these faculty might become involved in joint degree programs with other campuses. Third, some might decide that they would prefer to seek transfer to some other campus offering a different mix of academic duties and opportunities than that present on the campus in question.

Transition problems of achieving a strong pattern of selectivity would be severe, because some degree programs and academic activities would very probably need

— 27 —

to be disestablished at some campuses. Conversion should take place over an extended period. Realignments of library collections, major laboratory equipment, and (so far as possible, on a voluntary basis) faculty and graduate students would be necessary. These adjustments would not be at all easy to manage, and it is doubtful whether they would be worth the pain if one could expect a sufficiently generous level of funding to underwrite quality education and scholarly attainment in all areas throughout the University. In our view, however, it is unlikely that resources will be sufficient for this. We therefore recommend that the University embark on this difficult course of adjustment in the

interest of preserving and enhancing the quality of education it can offer.

In undertaking this process, the initiative for campus design must lie with each campus. Each must assess its own strengths and propose a pattern of selective development compatible with these and with the campus' own vision of its broad objectives. Responsibility for reviewing and suggesting any revisions of the profile of each campus necessary to fit them into an integrated pattern of University development lies with the University administration and the instrumentalities of the University Academic Senate. This process of proposal and review may need repetition before the campus plan can be finally approved, and there must be constant consideration and revision of the objectives and emphases of each campus if the pattern is to remain a suitable one.

We believe that a number of measures can reduce the trauma of adjustment and increase the speed. Shifts in personnel and programs required to achieve specialization could be planned to take place gradually, within the flexibility provided by normal attrition; but the speed of the adjustment could be accelerated by inter-campus transfers of faculty and other personnel where these are feasible and advantageous to the individuals and both campuses concerned, and funding provisions should be made to facilitate such transfers.

The time scale for accomplishment of the needed adjustments should be spelled out on each campus for the benefit of both students and faculty. The disadvantages of requiring undergraduate instruction in areas which may not have complete graduate programs should be met by establishing inter-campus or regional joint programs in which faculty in these areas can participate. Perhaps even more effective, would be to recruit faculty for areas not covered by graduate programs whose research interests tend toward areas where graduate instruction is strong so that they can not only participate in this activity but also strengthen the programs through contribution of a related expertise.

This committee has neither the information, the ability nor the inclination to propose specific types of selective emphasis for individual campuses, but it may be useful to sketch briefly what we consider to be reasons that certain academic fields may tend to cluster together and support one another on a specialized campus. Two fields may need to be present at the same physical location because:

- a. Students concentrating in one field depend on the other for an essential tool background. Examples: Physics students need mathematics, medieval history students need Latin.
- b. The two fields are facets of the same domain of study and scholars need each other as collaborators and critics. Examples: philosophy, political science and economics; biology and chemistry; physics and mathematics.
- c. A third field is a hybrid of the first two and needs to be present with them for theory, methodology or essential facilities (library, laboratories, etc.). Examples: Many areas of engineering in their dependence on physical sciences; agriculture in its dependence on biology; and such interdisciplinary fields as biophysics, biochemistry, etc.

— 28 —

This list is far from exhaustive, and it does not take notice of the requirement for critical mass within a given field. The discussion does suggest, however, that the benefits of clustering can be achieved even when the number of elements in the cluster is small. The selectivity need not be applied only to broad disciplines, but can perhaps most advantageously be used in building strength in only limited aspects of specific disciplines.

More for purposes of illustrating the range of possibilities of campus specialization than as a guide to planning for specific campuses within the University, some cluster designs which could result in specialized institutions with substantial commitments to research and graduate education in a limited

number of fields can be mentioned:

- a. *Specialization Combined with Breadth* —Here we have in mind a campus with strength in each of the general disciplinary areas: Natural Sciences, Social Science and the Humanities/ Fine Arts and Performing Arts complex, but limited to small clusters of mutually supportive disciplines in each of these areas. This model is probably better suited to providing a desirable breadth of undergraduate coverage than some of the others, and could, in different realizations, be suitable for more than one campus.
- b. *Physical Science and Technology* —This is essentially the model of the California Institute of Technology. Although this is perhaps the best known model of the specialized campus, the high cost and lack of breadth at the undergraduate level could present an obstacle to its direct applicability within the University of California system.
- c. *Health Professions and Sciences* —This is essentially the model of the present San Francisco campus. It is doubtful if any other campus should choose this route because of the very high costs and limited service.
- d. *Agricultural and Biological Sciences* —This is probably a viable option if the necessary strength in related areas is available.
- e. *Action Professions and Social Sciences* —A primary emphasis on professional training in such areas as law, public administration, urban planning, business administration coupled with doctoral programs in the relevant social sciences plus those parts of mathematics and engineering which are essential.
- f. *History and Humane Letters* —There is a mutual dependence on great library resources with similar research methods and scholarly values. This could be combined with professional programs in related areas and perhaps with scholarly aspects of the fine arts.

— 29 —

All of the possibilities mentioned are quite conventional and exist in some form in present institutions. More problematical, but perhaps more rewarding would be to design campus commitments around kinds of studies that are not, at this time, fully stabilized in their academic attributes. Examples are: (1) ecological systems; (2) communication—the technology and professions relevant to communication media; (3) urban design; (4) international developments; (5) the technology of energy and/or food; (6) the social and biological aspects of changing populations; (7) experimentation and innovation in education.

In order further to clarify the image of the University which we have in mind, we conclude by summarizing a few guiding principles which we suggest should be applied in the development of selective excellence in the University: (1) Every advanced degree program offered on every campus should be comparable with the best of such programs. It is not expected that every campus will provide a complete spectrum of advanced degree programs, but the University as a whole should do so. With respect to individual campuses, however, quality rather than breadth should be the primary consideration in the selection of programs. (2) Breadth should be available at the undergraduate level. In concrete terms it should be possible for a student to select a program on any campus which will provide undergraduate preparation acceptable for entry into any graduate program offered in the system. (3) A uniform standard of excellence should be applied to all faculty members on a campus. All professors should be expected to maintain their involvement in creative scholarship, research or expression as appropriate to the discipline involved, and working conditions should be established which are consistent with this expectation.

These principles are put forth as guidelines rather than as rigid requirements. In following sections we attempt to resolve some of the conflicts which they may present, both with respect to one another, and with respect to constraints in the system.

3. *Intercampus Coordination* —Successful development of the existing nine-campus University to quality levels which fulfill the criterion of being comparable with the finest available will require extensive and perhaps unprecedented utilization of the strengths of some units to bolster and supplement those of others. As was indicated in the discussion of campus specialization, it is only by carefully designed intercalation of the distinctive features of the specialized campus with the breadth available in the entire University that smaller campuses can be brought to a requisite level of quality with the resource base justified by their size. An outstanding program or department is likely to be as costly on a small campus as on a large one and commitment of resources to the development of such outstanding units from a limited campus budget must mean that resources are withheld from some other activities with the result that these activities must be abandoned on that campus, or must be accomplished in a more efficient and less expensive way utilizing the great strengths available in the entire system. The sections which follow suggest some ways in which intercampus coordination can provide the essentials to make possible development of specialized campuses.

- a. **Intercampus instructional cooperation.** The use of existing faculty

— 30 —

and courses on one campus for the instruction of undergraduate or graduate students on other campuses is theoretically possible now, but is little practiced. Several options are available for this sort of coordination; students from one campus may attend classes or tutorials on another, instructors from one campus may teach courses on another, and dissertation committees can include representatives from other campuses. All of these procedures seem reasonable and workable, and the choice among them should probably be conditioned by the attributes of an individual case. In any case the campus which is being served should reimburse the serving campus for the equivalent student or faculty workload plus the additional travel costs. It is easy to visualize situations in which the costs of providing courses for limited numbers of students or courses which are required only at infrequent intervals would be very significantly less than the cost of maintaining an on-campus capability to provide these courses. We believe that this mechanism is generally applicable and while perhaps most adaptable to campuses in geographic proximity, service from opposite ends of the state is not precluded. Arrangements of this sort could be made on an *ad hoc* basis as needed, or could be institutionalized for extended periods where one campus has no intention of developing the capability to handle particular courses. There is no need to look on such arrangements as being either necessarily one way or only between large and small campuses. Where the specialization of different campuses is complementary, there could be a two-way provision of instructional assistance in areas not stressed on one campus or the other. The necessary help is probably as likely to be found on a small campus as on a large one, and perhaps the additional work load provided in this way would be more beneficial for a smaller campus than for a large one, making such arrangements both more helpful and more desirable.

A related mechanism which seems to us to offer some attraction is the more liberal use of intercampus transfers of faculty. In this case an individual could be transferred to another campus for a quarter or longer to provide instruction either in an area not otherwise offered, or as a temporary replacement in case of leave, illness, etc. This could also provide a greater range of instructional capability and a welcome broadening of intercampus contacts and knowledge. It could be made sufficiently attractive to induce individuals to uproot themselves in a variety

of ways; supplemental stipends could be provided, somewhat lower teaching loads could permit time for research or creative work, credit toward sabbatical leave could accrue faster for temporary appointments on other campuses, policy could be changed to permit stipends in addition to normal salaries for some types of intercampus instructional efforts.

Another means of achieving maximal use of the instructional resources of the University would make use of the advancing technology of communication. Closed circuit television transmission between campuses is now possible and has been used in some isolated instances. If broad-band communication circuits between campuses were available, instruction through this medium might become a useful means of integrating campus instructional strengths, which could be used either as a supplement to faculty or student movement between campuses or as a means of presenting entire courses on more than one campus simultaneously. If this procedure

— 31 —

is to be used, it will be necessary to design procedures which will safeguard both the rights of faculty members and the resources of the campuses involved.

- b. **Joint or group graduate programs and research opportunities.** If only a limited array of disciplines is to be given the opportunity for full development on a campus, the problem of maintaining standards of excellence for faculty in disciplines essential for undergraduate programs and for breadth instruction of graduate students in other programs becomes a matter of great importance. Present faculty appointment and advancement standards include the requirement of excellence in research and creative work. Indeed, the instructions to *ad hoc* committees admonish them to require evidence of continued and effective engagement in creative activity of high quality and significance. It is our conviction that this standard must continue to apply to all faculty, including those holding appointments in an area not included in the array of graduate programs offered on a campus. For many disciplines the graduate program has played an essential role in providing the framework for scholarly achievement. On the one hand the graduate student apprenticeship system provides intellectual stimulation and in some cases research assistance; while on the other, the obligation to direct graduate student research provides an instructional justification for the budgeting of research facilities and for part of the research component in faculty work load. Where campus emphasis makes it impossible for some faculty to direct the research of graduate students it must remain the obligation of the University to provide the time and facilities needed for the individual to fulfill the requirement of research and creative activity. The group program or joint graduate program has a long and respected history in the University, particularly on the northern campuses, and a revival and adaptation of such programs may assist with some of the problems of retaining and recruiting faculty for specialized campuses by providing means to enable participation in graduate instruction where other arrangements are not available.

The needs of disciplines differ so greatly that it would be impossible for us to attempt even a general outline of how such programs might work, but it is our opinion that a desire to make them work, especially on the part of the faculty membership and Academic Senate committees, is the primary ingredient required. It appears to us that no additional enabling legislation by the Assembly is required to permit programs of this type to be developed, but we ask appropriate committees of the University Academic Senate to examine the question and propose any facilitating procedures or legislation which may be required.

- c. **Organized research units in faculty research.** Organized research units in the University may offer a particularly useful way of enabling faculty members who have need of facilities not

replicable on all campuses to continue productive research in their discipline even though their campus has chosen not to devote large amounts of resources to that particular area. A part-time affiliation with an ORU could be a means of making available the necessary equipment or facilities as well as providing the necessary level of interaction with individuals working in related areas. This type of arrangement already exists in the University,

— 32 —

but many are unaware of the possibilities which it offers. Consideration should be given to wider dissemination of the existence and nature of the programs of ORU's in the University to assist in developing such arrangements. It would also be beneficial to consider further the development of ways in which ORU's can participate in graduate education programs of the University.

- d. **Intra-University Disciplinary Conference Groups.** One of the major impediments to operation of the University as a single institution is, in our opinion, a mutual lack of understanding of the nature and aspirations of the campuses. Such understanding must grow out of contact between individuals at the level of departments or programs which share common interests not deriving from their campus locations. Much of the strength of an academic institution results from the interplay of ideas and the commonality of interests shared by colleagues in the same discipline. On a campus this develops through daily contact and familiarity, but in a multi-campus university there is little opportunity to foster these strengthening ties across campus boundaries. As a step in the direction of developing a desirable improvement in understanding and cooperation between campuses, we recommend that mechanisms be established to support periodic meetings of representatives of departments which share a common discipline throughout the University.

These disciplinary conferences should meet with agendas carefully prepared to focus on the instructional and research problems of the discipline in the University of California, and at least in the initial meetings, on identifying the characteristics and desires of individual programs on each campus. From these conferences should come not only better understanding, but eventually agreement about the ways in which each group can fill its unique disciplinary role within the University and about the means by which the groups can be mutually supportive.

Conferences such as we suggest would be expensive both of time and money. The success of some isolated examples of this type of conference in the past, our recognition of the fact that academic loyalties to the discipline are stronger than those to the institution in which it is practiced, and our observation of the pervasive ignorance regarding the same discipline on other campuses of the University all lead us to believe that the costs would be minimal in terms of better coordination, cooperation and acceptance of the concept of a single University of California. We suggest that the funds now spent on the All-University Faculty Conferences could fruitfully be rededicated to support of a continuing series of conferences such as we propose.

- e. **Cooperative acquisition and utilization of facilities.** In certain scientific fields the cost of equipment has become so great that only the federal government or large foundations are capable of the required financing, and in these cases (examples are the National Accelerator Laboratory in Weston, Illinois, Stanford Linear Accelerator, and various radio telescope installations) use of the facilities is shared among those who need and are competent to use them independent of their individual institutional affiliation. While there is no question that major new national facilities such as those cited could only be handled in this manner

— 33 —

the potential advantages of extending this principle to less expensive and non-scientific

facilities within the University of California are worth considering.

Many of the University's facilities have been acquired and are used on a similar basis now. Prominent, although somewhat atypical, examples are libraries and computer systems. Since both of these are presently the subject of intensive study and reorganization, we will not discuss them in any depth, but will express only a few impressions and opinions regarding each of these two continuing University problems.

With respect to libraries, we consider that the current moves toward integrating the operation of the University libraries are tending in the right direction and assume that they will have some success within a relatively short time, perhaps even attaining the desirable goal of establishing an authority responsible for coordination between individual units as has already been done in the case of computers. The policy of library acquisitions on a specialized campus may need to be adjusted to place greatest emphasis in academic program areas approved for that campus, thus providing the essential collection depth for those areas selected for emphasis. Beyond endorsing better coordination, joint use and rationalized expansion of libraries, we would like further to indicate that we believe the major problem facing libraries in the period covered by this report will be improving the services of the libraries of the University and that the acquisition of new holdings by individual campuses may need to be restricted in some measure if adequate services are to be maintained. A particularly promising way to improve the utility of the libraries is the use of electronic data processing techniques for library services and especially for improved methods of information retrieval as is now developing in certain limited fields. We hope that development and installation of such systems in the University will be done with the needs of all campuses in mind.

Creation of the position of Executive Director of Computing for the University is an important step forward. A move in the direction of networking the University computers for optimal interaction is already apparent and should provide greater utilization and flexibility in operation of the present system as well as setting the stage for service to the entire University from a new generation of very large computers which probably will arrive in a few years. While we applaud these initiatives, we would like to sound a caution as well. The present surge of technological development of computer hardware is far from spent, and it seems probable that relatively inexpensive mini- or even micro-computers will be capable of handling much of the computational and data processing needs of the University in coming years. A policy of networking large computers should not preclude or interfere with the use of such machines in areas where they can provide the most efficient and inexpensive form of data handling. It is also important to point out that cost reductions in central processing units are not being matched by a decline in the costs of peripherals required for access to CPU's and that thus costs of centralized units will diminish faster than that of campus equipment required for access.

Libraries and computers already exist, and while some changes in modes of operation are feasible and to be hoped for, it probably will not be possible to attain maximum joint use of these particular facilities because of their historically separate

— 34 —

origins. For this reason the best hope for obtaining maximum University utilization of expensive facilities probably lies in facilities which are still to be acquired to meet future needs. We recommend a general policy which would require that the acquisition of any new large facility or item of equipment—defined in our thinking as costing more than 1 million 1975 dollars—not be acquired by the University, regardless of the source of its funding, until the possibilities of establishing it for multi-campus use have been carefully considered.

We believe that the benefits of such a procedure could be very substantial, especially for small campuses which may lack the critical mass required to properly use such facilities. We intend this category to include not only specialized scientific equipment but also specialized instructional and other research facilities not now available. Although a number of examples of each category occur to us, we eschew listing these because of the implication which such a list carries that nothing else is to be included. We would rather prefer that *every* large and/or expensive piece of equipment or facility be carefully examined to see whether it could best be used on a multi-campus or system-wide basis rather than being restricted to a single campus. This examination might best be facilitated if such large and expensive items were required to be the subject of what might be called a “multi-campus impact report” before their acquisition or approval of a grant proposal for their funding. Such a report should be reviewed by appropriate campus and Divisional Committees as well as the administrative groups concerned prior to approval of the item.

Because most funding for facilities of the type we are discussing will come from outside the University, and because proposals for such funding usually originate from one or a few faculty members, we think it important to note that the role of originator and advocate of these proposals is never an easy one and that the wider contributions which will be made to the University if our proposal is followed should be recognized by giving greater administrative assistance and support to the faculty entrepreneurs who initiate and pursue funding for these facilities.

The methods of operating such multi-campus facilities are potentially so diverse that we decline to suggest specific procedures. However, as evidence that suitable procedures can be found we point to the successful operation of high energy physics facilities with operational management delegated to an administrative entity at a single geographic location but with policy control the responsibility of a “users group.”

- f. **Intercampus transfer of students and faculty.** Large numbers of students currently transfer from one campus of the University to another. Our studies of the patterns of student transfer indicate that for many students the right of transfer to another campus has been used as a means of obtaining entry to their first choice campus after having been redirected at the time of their initial entry into the University. There remains, however, a substantial stream of intercampus transfers which probably occurs because the students have discerned advantages offered by another campus not apparent to them at the beginning of their University careers. It is our view that transfers between campuses should be facilitated to the greatest degree compatible with normal operation of the campuses. Students wishing to transfer to another campus should be refused only if their objectives at

— 35 —

the new campus are in conflict with the ability of that campus to accept them. In addition to such permanent transfers between campuses, we consider that the existing mechanisms for temporary transfer to other campuses for the purpose of obtaining courses not available at the home campus or for the use of facilities not provided at all campuses should be made easier and used much more extensively than has been the case in the past. We have been concerned to learn that temporary transfers for such purposes now encounter considerable difficulties and readily become snarled in bureaucratic red tape both on the campuses and in University Hall.

We also note that in some fields it has been a practice to include on graduate student committees faculty members from campuses other than the one on which the student is working. We feel that this practice should be encouraged as a means of insuring that the most

appropriate faculty talents are utilized in the educational process and as an additional way of broadening acquaintance and understanding among the campuses.

In addition to the types of intercampus transfer of faculty mentioned before which are intended to make full use of teaching talents in a system comprised of some comprehensive and some specialized campuses, we feel that provision for temporary (or perhaps in some cases, permanent) exchange of faculty between campuses is a necessary condition for optimal utilization of the resources of the University. We recognize that a precondition for such an easier movement of faculty among the campuses is establishment of the principle—recently brought into question by an opinion from the University Counsel—that tenure within the University lies with the system rather than with the individual campuses. One way of making this principle workable and palatable is to insure that appraisal of individual faculty for appointment and promotion is carried out according to standards common to all campuses, and we discuss this problem below. It is also clear that successful implementation of a policy designed to facilitate movement of faculty among campuses will require safeguards for the rights of individuals and the exercise of great care so that dislocations are minimized and changes are not made for arbitrary or trivial reasons.

- g. **University Departments.** In considering means of most efficiently using the resources of a large educational institution such as the University it becomes apparent that one of the most difficult problems is that posed by a few disciplinary areas which have only minimal needs for graduate level instruction, but that encompass subject matter in which courses are widely needed for undergraduate programs. While a complete and definitive solution has not appeared, we wish to propose one mechanism which may have utility in certain examples of this type of problem.

In appropriate cases, we suggest one solution may be the establishment of what we call “University departments.” As the name implies, the intention is to make a single departmental unit responsible for instruction in certain disciplines throughout the entire University. The structure of such a department could be flexible; it could be established only on one campus, or if critical mass can be maintained, on more than one campus. In either case the department would be a single administrative

— 36 —

unit with a single budget. The department would administer graduate or professional degree programs in its area at one or more locations and would undertake instruction of undergraduate or graduate courses in its discipline on any campus of the University which required those courses. The department would be reimbursed for faculty work-load and traveling expense by the campus on which the courses were taught.

While we recognize that the number of disciplines suitable for a University department is limited, we consider that for that limited number such an arrangement offers substantial advantages. Where the potential for placement of advanced degree holders is severely limited and the level of interest of undergraduate students in a particular study is not high, it makes considerable sense to limit the full range of undergraduate and graduate course offerings to one or a few campuses. At the same time, a small number of courses may be needed on all campuses to provide background or breadth for students in other, more active programs. The University department can amass the necessary human and physical resources to support high quality programs with the necessary depth at limited locations, while at the same time meeting the need for service at other locations. Thus the University department can obtain support from

the entire system and at the same time make it possible for some of the campuses to maintain a complete range of course offerings at much less expense than would be involved in supporting a small and probably inadequate department in that particular subject on their own campus.

- h. **Innovative Programs.** Recent years have seen numerous attempts at instructional innovation in the University. Most of these have been short-lived, and perhaps in most cases justifiably so. However, one reason for the early demise of instructional programs not cut to the standard pattern is the fact that they usually do not have a reliable source of funding or an administrative unit which supports and encourages them. If useful innovation in University teaching programs is to be fostered as a means of adapting to the changing needs of students and society, we believe it will be necessary to institutionalize experimentation to the extent of providing an identifiable budget and competent administrative and staff support for experimental programs. To this end we suggest an independent office should be established in University Hall responsible for coordination of educational experimentation. Funds for innovative programs should be channeled through this office, and it should be made responsible for stimulating programs of this type and assisting them to obtain budget support from the legislature or from other sources. One needed service would be assistance in preparation of grant proposals for support of experimental programs. This office should coordinate with campus officials charged with similar responsibilities. Both the University and campus offices should have the responsibility not only of assisting those who wish to develop new types of teaching programs to do so by helping to obtain funding, but should also be prepared to provide assistance in carrying proposals through Academic Senate review and approval. They should also assist in collecting the data necessary to justify the continuation of experimental programs or their conversion to regular programs. In this connection, the Academic Senate should develop a program of regular monitoring of experimental programs designed to detect signs

— 37 —

of irremediable weakness of the program and unrealized opportunities as well as the identification of successful experiments which should be made permanent. Permanent support of successful experiments should be through regular department budgets rather than to have them remain the responsibility of offices charged with innovation.

The degree to which this proposal is vague and unstructured is a reflection of our uncertainty regarding the most suitable mechanisms to give additional support and guidance to educational experimentation in the University. More certain, however, is our conviction that without organized support and help for those concerned with innovation, desirable changes in our teaching programs will come more slowly than will be needed in the next decade. We therefore request that the question of support for innovative programs be assigned for study to a joint administration/Senate committee with the request for recommendations as to needed structure and procedure to assure continuing strength in instructional experimentation.

4. *Educational policies for the University.* Many of the proposals made in this section of our report dealing with structural and organizational changes directed toward the quality of the University are effectively suggestions for administrative alterations and they assume the ability of a stronger University administration to coordinate and implement them. Changes of this type, however, will have little effect unless the educational policies of the University are also adapted and controlled so as to permit and encourage the proposed changes. If shifts in educational policy are to be accomplished, it seems to us necessary that the role of the University Academic Senate be strengthened in the same way and for the same reasons that a stronger University administration is required. If the University is to operate as a single institution to the degree necessary to make possible changes like those we propose,

a more even application of more uniform educational principles and standards will be needed and this can best be facilitated by strengthening the coordinating role of the University Academic Senate.

The Assembly of the Academic Senate and the Academic Council, being the primary forums where campus representatives consider questions of academic policy for the entire institution, are of course crucial to development of any stronger policies in this area. In the years since the organization of a single Senate in the University these bodies have been somewhat variable in their responses to questions of University *versus* Divisional priority regarding academic policies and standards, in those responses reflecting both the changing tenor of the times and the varying composition of the groups. We believe that the net effect of the legislative and judgmental actions of these bodies has been an important factor enabling the University to resist the centrifugal forces which have been at work during this period. We see no particular need to suggest changes in the organization or composition of either the Assembly or the Academic Council (with one exception which is noted later) and we are confident that if the faculty generally become convinced of the desirability of moves toward more uniform standards and policies, the Assembly and the Council will faithfully reflect those convictions.

It is, however, true that the time commitment required on the part of University

— 38 —

Academic Senate leadership is already in excess of that which can reasonably be expected to represent a faculty member's fair share of "University service." The increased importance of the University Senate we see in the years ahead will add further time burdens to those involved. We therefore suggest that the University should move toward developing a permanent University Academic Senate apparatus with a small continuing staff and released-time positions available to permit elected officials sufficient time to cope with the increased responsibilities of their positions. The budget of a permanent Academic Senate office should also include provision for staff support to be allocated to faculty members whose Senate duties, either *ex officio* or as a result of special assignments, require substantial time commitment. While University service is reasonably considered part of the "normal" duties of a faculty member, there are many Senate assignments which require such a heavy allocation of time that many of those best qualified to perform them will refuse if no help in the form of staff assistance can be provided.

In some respects more important than legislative and executive groups such as the Assembly and the Council are the University committees charged directly with consideration of and concern for academic policy matters. Those of us who have participated in the work of committees such as the University Committee on Educational Policy, the Coordinating Council for Graduate Affairs and the University Committee on Budget and Interdivisional Relations have been impressed with the way in which the representatives of nine diverse campuses can approach problems of the entire system thoughtfully and carefully and with the ability of such committees to transcend the concerns of individual campuses and give primacy to the best interests of the University as a whole. However, there are also occasions when advice from Senate committees is slow, equivocal and represents a weak compromise of conflicting interests. There is urgent need for the administration to structure its operation so that meaningful Senate consultation is possible, but even more important is the need for those faculty members who participate in University Senate deliberations to view themselves as representatives of the entire faculty and to feel obligated to render advice designed to help the *University* achieve its primary objective—to attain the highest possible quality as an institution of higher education.

Procedures and Practices of University Operation

While the manner in which an institution is organized has the effect of establishing boundary conditions for its operation, even more important in determining the character of the institution are the specific procedures by which its mission is accomplished. In the sections which follow we discuss several aspects of procedure within the University which we feel have a special relation to the standards by which the University establishes its academic excellence.

1. *Standards for Undergraduate Student Admission.* In the course of this committee's work extended consideration was given to the problem of student selection, both from the standpoint of what fraction of California high school graduates should be considered admissible as undergraduates to the University and the related question of how that fraction should be selected. In the University

— 39 —

and the community, and even within the committee, we found opinions which pressed for the acceptance of a smaller fraction of the range of student ability or for an increase in the percentage of students admissible to the University, even to the full limit of open enrollment without any restriction. In addition to gathering opinions on this subject, we have attempted to evaluate such data as are available relating the admissibility or non-admissibility of students on entrance into the University with their subsequent performance as University students. A decision on this question requires consideration of such factors as the desired nature of the institution (restricted vs. open enrollments and the consequences of either on the programs and quality of the University), estimation of the accuracy of various methods of evaluating University level educational performance, and the probable political and economic consequences of substantial alterations in the restrictions now laid on University enrollment by the Master Plan for Higher Education in California. In the end this committee has unanimously decided that with respect to the fractional admissibility of California high school graduates, the *status quo* appears to be the preferable choice. We recommend, therefore, that for the period projected in this report, the University should continue to admit as freshmen only those students who are believed to have qualifications which place them among the upper 12.5% of California high school graduates. We feel there is nothing magical about 12.5%, and a shift to 10% or to 15% would not, we believe, greatly alter the nature of the University or substantially affect the quality of the education it offers. Such changes might, however, have a significant impact on the relations of the University with the people of California and with other segments of California higher education and these impacts should be carefully assessed before any shift in the admissible fraction is made.

With respect to the standards now used to select those who are believed to be included in the admissible fraction, we consider, together with many others familiar with the situation, that they leave a great deal to be desired. Without attempting extensively to evaluate the present procedures and explicate the reasoning which leads to the conclusion, we recommend that during the period of our report the University undertake serious and well-designed studies to evaluate the validity of various standards for the admission of students. These studies could make use of the presently authorized special admission group supplemented as required for specific, approved experiments and should include sufficient numbers of students so that the statistical significance of the correlation of various standards with subsequent achievement in the University and, where possible, after graduation can be determined. Academic Senate coordination and review of the process of experimentation should be assigned to appropriate University committees such as the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools and the University Committee on Educational Policy.

During this process of experimentation it should be possible to identify methods of evaluating the potential of students to benefit from the educational experience offered by the University more

appropriate than the ones now used. When such more accurate and equitable procedures are developed, they should be used as the basis of admission for all students for an additional experimental period long

— 40 —

enough to determine their impact on the fraction of California students actually enrolling in the University. The data thus obtained would provide a basis for negotiating any required changes in the relationship of University admission standards to other segments of California higher education. It is our view that once procedures with the desired characteristics are determined, the fraction of ineligible students admitted could be reduced.

Standards of academic eligibility are only part of the more general issue of access to the University by students who are regarded as qualified to benefit by attendance. Prospective students also need to be well informed about the course requirements for University admission, and students otherwise qualified may often need assistance in overcoming financial obstacles to attendance. In this regard, the policies of the Federal government, the state and the University concerning financial aid and concerning tuition and fees, have a very definite bearing on both the quality and the number of students that the University can attract. We recognize also the need for continuing outreach efforts so that the University can make its opportunities known to all parts of the community.

2. *Baccalaureate Graduation Requirement.* The Academic Senate in the University of California has historically had the role of acting as guardian of the University's academic quality by setting the graduation requirements. In general these requirements have tended to specify the completion of a certain number of units or courses with a specified overall average grade. In practice, deans and executive committees are delegated the responsibility of enforcing the requirements, and the variation in the stringency of enforcement between departments, schools or colleges and campuses has at times been quite large. In addition, recent years have seen a very considerable erosion of grading standards in the University, as in higher education generally. The result has been a decline in the proportion of students who leave the University before completion of their programs due to grade deficiencies, although this decline is somewhat masked by the larger proportion of undergraduates who leave the University while still in good standing.

The obvious remedy is to move toward re-establishing the higher standards of yesteryear, and some tendencies in this direction are to be found. We have not, however, been able to devise any procedure other than exhortation which seems likely to add impetus to this movement and we hereby exhort the faculty individually and collectively to examine their grading practices in the light of the question of whether all students who receive passing grades are ones who will become appropriate graduates of an institution of the quality to which the University aspires.

Since we are skeptical of the results of such exhortations, we propose that the question of graduation requirements be made the subject of a study by the Academic Senate and that the task of undertaking such a study with the objective of recommending any changes in Assembly or Division By-Laws and Regulations necessary to accomplish the establishment of graduation requirements appropriate to a university of the first quality be assigned to the University Committee on Educational Policy.

While we have no specific proposals to make, we suggest that consideration

— 41 —

should be given to the possibility of using comprehensive examinations (including possible use of external standardized examinations), undergraduate theses, senior tutorial courses or other forms of overall evaluation where they are appropriate in place of or in addition to the present graduation requirements.

3. *Standards and Objectives for Doctoral Education and the Graduate Professions.* Doctoral education, the offering of graduate degrees in such major professions as medicine, dentistry, nursing, and law, and the conduct of research and creative scholarship in deep conjunction with advanced instruction—these are elements of the special mission of the University of California in the state's system of higher education. Throughout this report we have emphasized the faculty's aspirations for the University's quality, independence, and unity as an institution, and we offer proposals concerning structure, administration, and policies that are directed toward the achievement of these broad objectives. Policy standards for graduate education cannot, however, be dealt with in terms of broad historic commitments, as is done with the standards of eligibility for admission and standards of graduation for the University's undergraduate programs.

In the prime areas of graduate education, the University has obligations both to the State of California and to the Nation as a whole, and indeed its international reputation is produced from its achievements in its active graduate education and research. The long-range regional and national need for highly educated specialists must be considered when new degree programs are initiated: Major commitments to graduate education are costly, and the expectations of future social needs must therefore enter into the decision. Students who enter these programs spend several important years of their lives in advanced training and the National and State agencies that provide the all-important financial support also expect—and have a right to expect of the University of California—that these graduate programs will be of high quality. From the institutional viewpoint, high quality is important because it is possible to learn about and to contribute to the frontier of each discipline only if students and scholars are working at a high state of excellence and originality, and because programs of high quality reinforce each other. From the State's point of view the new doctorates and professionals who come through University programs need to have potentialities for outstanding contributions to their field if the State is to be well served. In addition, University programs of the highest quality can be expected to attract federal and foundation funding, whereas programs of dubious merit can not.

In certain of the graduate professions, such as medicine and law, where application demands from within California are extremely intense, it seems reasonable to give some preference to California-resident applicants. In most graduate professions and in academic programs leading to the doctorate, however, we believe that the wiser course is to accept the outstanding applicants without special preference to those having California residency at the time of application, and we also believe that the Graduate Dean and Graduate Council on each campus should adhere to high standards of quality and educational effectiveness in judging whether departments should be permitted to expand their graduate enrollments in this period.

— 42 —

These considerations do not add up to a prescription for graduate admission or program enrollment, but they may serve to indicate what are the enduring and important objectives and priorities.

4. *Faculty Evaluation.* The University of California system of peer assessment of faculty members for appointment, promotion and merit raises is a complex, extended and demanding way of attempting to insure the quality of the University through stringent evaluation of the quality of its faculty. While many perceive shortcomings or problems with the system, most recognize in it a serious and largely successful effort to bring the best possible expertise to the evaluation of the teaching, research or creative accomplishment and University and public service activities of the faculty.

With regard to the evaluation of teaching, the recent surge of interest in providing evaluations of the teaching competence of faculty has resulted in the availability of much more data than had previously been obtainable. Most of these data are in the form of evaluations of the performance of an instructor

in a particular course, delivered in the heat of term's end and without the benefit of thoughtful consideration either of the specific course or of the more general characteristics of the individual as a teacher. Data of this type, particularly when provided in sufficient numbers and over a sufficient period of time to give confidence to the resultant evaluation, are valuable and we hope that they will continue to be provided in a careful and detailed way. We note, however, that the availability of such data has tended to reduce the interest of departments in obtaining or of students in providing mature, thoughtful and considered overall evaluations of the teaching performance of a faculty member seen from the vantage of a graduate who has had an opportunity to assess the learning experience of the University against subsequent utilization of his knowledge. There has also been a marked diminution in evaluations of teaching performance by qualified colleagues. We hope that budget committees and administrators will continue to expect and require these types of teaching evaluation in addition to the more numerical summaries obtained during the presentation of a course.

With respect to other desirable attributes of faculty members, the type of information available is much more diverse and more distinctively related to the characteristics of a given discipline. For this reason it is difficult to suggest detailed ways in which the evaluation of quality can be maintained or improved. We do feel that all those responsible for the evaluation process, from the department through the various committees to the Chancellor and President's Office, should exert all possible effort to evaluate performance in terms of quality rather than simply measuring quantity. In most cases the best means of obtaining objective confirmation of departmental assessment of quality is through consultation with distinguished individuals working directly in the faculty member's field. Such consultation must be resorted to judiciously to avoid rejection by busy individuals of requests for evaluation, but outside letters should uniformly be required in the case of promotions and merit raises to the upper levels of the full professorial rank. In addition to outside evaluations often provided by departments, *ad hoc* promotion

— 43 —

committees should feel obligated to obtain additional evidence when they have any doubts about the validity of that provided.

The comments above are obvious and redundant for most of the University; we have ventured into such redundancy because it is clear that practices throughout the University are not uniform and it seems desirable to state a necessary minimum level of expectation to be applied in the entire University if the process of faculty evaluation is to result in improved quality of the University.

This leads to a last point concerning faculty evaluation. It is clear to us that substantial differences exist in the standards which must be met for faculty promotion not only between campuses, but in different areas of the same campus. The differing nature of various disciplines makes comparisons difficult, but most readers of this document will be aware of differing standards applied in similar or closely related areas. If the University is to be operated as a single institution, these differences must be reduced to the greatest extent possible. The final authority for appointment and promotion rests with the Chancellors, the President and The Regents. However, the primary basis for their decisions is provided by the faculty and the Academic Senate and it is here that the greatest possibilities for reduction in the variation of standards lies. While we do urge all those concerned at this level to attempt seriously the application of comparable standards throughout the University, we recognize that in many cases the standards applied in one location are unknown to those at another. We therefore suggest that the University Committee on Budget and Interdivisional Relations be charged with the responsibility of carrying out, either itself or perhaps best through a subcommittee, an annual post-audit of personnel actions in the University with reports to the Academic Council and to Divisional budget committees on any gross divergences

in the application of standards which are found as a result.

An additional possibility for helping bring about unification of the standards applied on all campuses is to extend and perhaps institutionalize the present occasional practice of using faculty members from other campuses on *ad hoc* promotion committees. This device is now used primarily where there are insufficient numbers of individuals qualified in a particular subdiscipline on the campus where a promotion is proposed. However, beneficial effects in both standardization of the criteria used for promotion and in better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of other campuses could accrue from regular use of off-campus representation on these committees.

It may be necessary to underline the importance of the attempt to attain uniform standards by pointing out that the major objections now raised to intercampus programs and transfers of faculty stem from what are believed to be significant existing differences between campuses in this respect.

5. *Evaluation of Administrators.* The complex and demanding system of faculty evaluation with its requirement for frequent, detailed and extended examination of the quality and performance of faculty members does not have a widely recognized parallel in the procedures for evaluation of senior administration officials. Deans and some other academic administrators now face review approximately once every five years, but this is not tied to merit raises or promotions as is the review of faculty members.

— 44 —

It would be desirable to assure that administrators' performance is assessed systematically, with the same care for peer judgments and for evaluations by clients as is used in faculty reviews, and that the procedures of evaluation are made known throughout the University.

6. *Program Evaluation.* Even the most serious attempts to insure the quality of education in the University through assessment and selection of students, faculty, and administrators will be unrewarding if parallel evaluation of the summation of the interaction of these factors in the educational process is ignored. We therefore consider that the University should develop a continuing process of program evaluation as a guide to the degree to which success in attaining the primary objective of maintaining and improving educational quality is being achieved. The methods and purposes of program evaluation are at this time very much in flux and we refrain from detailed proposals as to mechanisms for carrying out such evaluations. We do, however, consider that desirable mechanisms can be found in three general areas, and would like briefly to discuss each of these:

- a. **Panel evaluations.** Assessment of program quality by panels comprised of variously selected experts is a technique which has been intermittently used in higher education and with increasing frequency in recent years. Although this method can be applied to undergraduate program evaluation, it is perhaps most suitable for assessment of the quality of graduate programs. We are aware of the large variation in the objectivity and accuracy of such evaluations and agree that if they cannot be done well, they should not be done at all. We feel that properly designed and conducted, they can be extremely useful in evaluating programs, and identifying for the program and for others concerned appropriate remedial actions.

Among what we consider to be the necessary attributes of suitable program evaluations are the following: The panel should be comprised of individuals whose objectivity and expertise in the area being examined are broadly accepted; the individuals selected usually would include representatives of the department and campus being studied, of the same discipline on other University campuses, and of distinguished representatives of the area from outside the University; where possible, the charge to the panel should be for the study of similar programs

throughout the University, rather than on one campus alone; adequate staff assistance should be provided to the panel in the form of prior data gathering, research needed during the study and secretarial assistance; the report of the panel should be submitted to the department(s) concerned with the program under study prior to its release by the panel, and replies from affected departments should be included with the report at the time of its release; the report of the panel should be directed both to the administration and to the Academic Senate for evaluation before any action is taken on it.

- b. **Standard examinations.** It is generally considered by faculty members that objective measures of the “value added” by higher education are impossible to obtain, and we tend to share this view. We believe that systematic follow-up of students after graduation would reveal important information about the quality of their education at the University, and attempts to accomplish this should be

— 45 —

encouraged. Also, the long term utilization of comprehensive examination evaluations of students in some higher educational systems leads us to believe that it may be possible to devise methods which can provide useful, if limited, measures of quality of University programs by appropriately evaluating the intellectual accomplishments of the students in these programs.

We had hoped to test the possible utility of standard examinations for purposes of quality evaluation of undergraduate programs by study of existing data consisting of the results of College Entrance Examinations and Graduate Record Examinations taken by the same students on their graduation from the University. Unfortunately, it proved impossible to obtain the necessary data for more than two prior years, and we have been unable to make such a test. We therefore suggest that an experiment of this type be conducted, at least on a limited scale, as a means of helping to make a decision on the use of standard examinations in the way we suggest in the University generally. Since the results of the Graduate Record Examinations can be obtained on computer tape, and since the results of the College Entrance Examinations for University students are now available in the same form, it should be possible for the planning group in University Hall to provide the data, which could be evaluated by appropriate Senate groups, the University Committee on Educational Policy being the first.

- c. **Nationwide rankings.** The results of various types of program evaluations conducted by the University can be made most meaningful if they can be related to other comparable institutions. For this purpose we suggest that it would be very beneficial to have current evaluations of program reputation such as are provided by surveys of professional opinion like those conducted earlier by Cartter and more recently by Roos and Anderson under the sponsorship of the American Council on Education. We have therefore asked President Hitch, as a member of the directorate of the American Council on Education, to suggest to that body that sponsorship of such surveys on a regular basis should again be undertaken. President Hitch has conveyed this request to the ACE and we hope that such data will be available in the future to provide a means of calibrating the results of internal University evaluations against the reputation of our programs in higher education generally across the country.
7. *Enrollments, Campus Ceilings and Redirection.* We alluded earlier to the probability that enrollment in the University, now increasing only slowly, will stabilize or decline in the period covered by our projection. Our evaluation of the available demographic data leads to projection (see Appendix 2) of stable or decreased enrollment in the 1980's if the traditional age group continues to supply the bulk of University enrollments. While we believe the University should extend its services to a broader segment of the population and while we believe that in a general environment of declining enrollments

for higher education across the country quality institutions such as the University would be in a strong competitive situation, realism requires us to anticipate a future enrollment projection which deviates only slightly from a steady state.

If that is the expected situation, in what ways should the University prepare to meet it? It is our conclusion that with a static enrollment and with nine campuses,

— 46 —

even if several of them are specialized in one way or another, the University and the State can make maximal use of resources only by insuring that these enrollments are distributed reasonably among the University campuses. The means for accomplishing such distribution are available, and have been sporadically used in the past, although with less stringency in recent years when they have been most needed.

Basically these means are two: First, campuses should have planned target ceilings for enrollment which are enforced by budgetary controls and administrative fiat if necessary and, second, an effective and workable process of student redirection should be enforced.

Campus objections to enforcement of enrollment ceilings have many bases, but perhaps the most important reason for wishing to exceed enrollment limitations is an assurance that resources will eventually follow the enrollments. The enrollment limits for each campus should not be immutably fixed, but should be subject to regular review and revision in response to changes in the character and desires of the campuses and the prospective size of the total student body. The agreed limitations for each campus should take into account not only the needs of that campus but the needs of the system as well. Once negotiated for each campus, the limitation should be stringently enforced—recognizing the impossibility of attaining an exact enrollment figure in any given year.

As a result of a fairly extended study of the way in which redirection of undergraduate students has worked in the University, particularly in the period in the 1960's when serious attempts were made to accomplish redirection, we have come to the conclusion that in some respects even the existing system of redirection has been given an unjustifiably bad name. The usual argument against redirection is that if the University refuses a student a place at the campus of first choice, the student will enroll in another institution altogether. While it is true that redirected students finally enroll in the University in smaller numbers than those who are accepted on the first choice campus, the difference is not a large one, and the proportion has tended to become smaller in recent years. We do not wish to make specific suggestions as to ways in which better redirection systems might be devised, but we do believe that it would be possible significantly to improve the present one. We therefore propose that the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools and the University Committee on Educational Policy be asked to study the mechanisms of redirection of undergraduate students in the University and to recommend any desirable improvements to the Assembly or the University administration as appropriate. We feel that consideration of improved methods of redirection should include evaluation of possible financial incentives for redirected students, perhaps based on additional costs incurred because geographically proximate campuses are closed, and the use of personal interviews where possible as part of the student application and acceptance process. The name given the process should also be considered—it has been suggested that “guided admission” is both more accurate and less objectionable as a descriptive title.

Although we are aware of some potential shortcomings and of the fact that many within the University oppose such a move, we suggest that the University should

— 47 —

study the possible utility of establishing a Universitywide process for the initial steps of admission procedures for undergraduates.

The Faculty and the University

While recognizing that in some measure every comment and suggestion made in this report is of concern to the faculty we feel that some matters we have considered and some proposals we wish to make are especially relevant to our colleagues. These problems constitute a somewhat diverse grouping being related for the most part by virtue of their direct impact on faculty concerns. No sense of priority is implied by the order in which they are presented—we consider that in different ways all of the sections which follow express matters which are or should be the concerns of the faculty generally, and especially of the Academic Senate.

1. *Faculty Participation in University Planning and Operation.* As a consequence of our evaluation of the unique academic nature of the University as an institution we strongly believe that the academic expertise and special viewpoint of the faculty should continue to be utilized in decision making and operation of the University at all levels. This practice has a long history in the University of California. Certain aspects of University operation are delegated to the Academic Senate and there is a common, although not universal, practice of using faculty representatives on administrative committees and of consulting faculty committees of various types concerning matters on which administrative decisions are to be made. We feel that these practices are more frequently resorted to in order to legitimize administrative initiatives than for purposes of utilizing faculty expertise. Because the focus of our study and of this report is on the University as a whole, we refrain from comment on this situation on the campuses other than to note that very significant differences exist between the campuses with respect to the degree to which faculty opinion is sought and, once obtained, utilized. Vigorous involvement in academic planning and educational policy on each campus must be the starting point and main focus of faculty involvement in the planning process.

Since our concern is with the University as a whole and especially with academic planning for the University, we will comment more extensively and make a proposal regarding faculty participation in academic planning for the University.

In the course of the past two years considerable evidence has come to us indicating that the present faculty participation in the University academic planning and budget allocation process represented by faculty members of the Academic Planning and Program Review Board (APPRB) is unsatisfactory as a means of providing input into this process by the Academic Senate. In July 1974 we conveyed this impression to the Academic Council. As primary reasons for this dissatisfaction, we cited the following: (1) The faculty members on the board, although recommended by the Academic Council, are considered to represent themselves, not the Academic Senate and because no mechanism for direct responsibility to the Senate exists, present faculty members neither report to nor receive information from formal Senate bodies; (2) the time commitment of the present representatives

— 48 —

does not permit them to become adequately knowledgeable about the details of the overall process and the specific details of questions brought to them; and (3) much of the preliminary staff work which shapes final decisions is done without faculty consultation and the final decisions regarding recommendations to the President are made by a group (the “Steering Committee”) which does not include faculty representation.

During the summer of 1974 Academic Council representatives carried out negotiations regarding APPRB representation with University administrators and in the fall of 1974 several changes in arrangements for faculty participation in the work of the APPRB were agreed upon. These changes mitigated in some measure each of the criticisms listed above. They were: (1) The Vice Chairman of the Academic Council was made an *ex officio* member of the APPRB; (2) a one-third FTE released time

position was made available to a Senate representative; and (3) a faculty member, in this case one of the appointed members, was made a member of the Steering Committee. We applaud the progress which these changes represent and believe that the University will benefit from them. We do not, however, think these changes are sufficient to provide for optimum utilization of faculty expertise in the planning and budgeting process and for adequate faculty representation in the new mode of University operation which our report suggests.

We therefore wish to propose a system which we think would further improve the observed shortcomings of the present arrangement with additional benefit to the process of planning for the future and allocating resources within the University. Our proposal is as follows:

The Academic Senate should establish a University Committee on Academic Planning. Two members of this committee, chosen by the Committee on Committees, would be appointed only after consultation with the President. These members would have two-year, overlapping terms and would serve on a partial released time basis. During the portion of their time devoted to committee work, they would be located primarily in University Hall and as part of their duties would in part comprise the faculty representatives on APPRB or whatever organization (s) may in the future serve the present functions of that group. They would be provided with office space and secretarial help in University Hall and would have free access to staff and data related to matters falling within their concern. They would also serve—to the limits permitted by the confidentiality of the information made available to them—as means of keeping the Senate the especially the appropriate University committees of the Senate informed about matters of academic planning. To this end the Chairman of this committee should be made a member of the Academic Council. The Chairman of this committee should also be the faculty representative on the APPRB Steering Committee if that or a similar group continues to function as in the past.

Our reasons for thinking that this proposal is preferable to the present arrangement are that the length of appointment and amount of released time are adequate for individuals to acquire the requisite knowledge about the University planning and budgeting operation so they could contribute in a significant way

— 49 —

to the process. The specification that an *ex officio* representative of the Academic Council be a member of the Steering Committee is, we feel, quite important. We consider it important also that the released time be arranged for each individual in such a way that there is a requirement for residence on a campus and participation in the normal duties of a faculty member to minimize the possibility of losing a faculty perspective.

The proposed arrangement differs from the typical Academic Senate assignment. There are some precedents for it, however, both at the campus level and in University matters. The University administration presently appoints faculty members on a part- or full-released time basis to perform various duties in areas closely related to that with which we are concerned. Joint Academic Senate/administration or Senate/Regent committees have functioned quite well in special cases, e.g., the present Education Abroad Committee and Chancellorial Search Committees. The cost of our proposal, which we estimate as between \$20,000 and \$40,000 annually, is substantial, but benefits in better cooperation and understanding between faculty and administration and better utilization of the unique knowledge and talents of the faculty in University decision making seem to be well worth the cost.

A further word regarding the proposed University Committee on Academic Planning may be useful. At various times the Academic Senate has, with varying degrees of success, established groups charged to look to the future of the University. The group responsible for this report is merely the most recent

of such attempts. In our work, we have eschewed a role as a reactive committee, being concerned to devote most of our effort to the study of appropriate educational objectives for the University. We have, however, noted the recurrence of questions relating to educational objectives and academic planning as well as others which relate less directly but which have considerable impact on the process of academic planning. We have come to the conclusion that a continuing group charged with concern for University academic planning will be needed in the years ahead when more and more careful planning will clearly be an urgent requirement. We suggest that in addition to the two members serving on a released-time basis, the committee should include the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Academic Council and the chairmen or designee members of CCGA, UCEP, and UCBIR.

2. *Faculty participation: Privilege and responsibility.* Earlier sections of this report should have made it clear that we are strongly in favor of faculty involvement in University operation to an extent which significantly exceeds the present practices. We are also aware of one very good reason for the reluctance of the administration to broaden consultation with the faculty, and particularly with the Academic Senate. This reason is the inconsistency of advice which is received from Senate committees. All too frequently the agreement to a given course of action or suggestions as to a specific method of proceeding received from a committee one year will be abrogated or modified to meaninglessness when the committee membership changes during succeeding years. This is not to imply that the response of the committee was right on one instance and wrong in another; the context may have changed, or both positions may have elements of good and bad

— 50 —

quality. The problem is that, regardless of the reasons, and regardless even of the suitability of the advice given at any juncture, the administration can quite reasonably feel justified in ignoring advice which may be contradicted next year, or which is given by a body whose authority is clearly transient. While it is difficult to blame administrators for proceeding with their own wishes in such circumstances, it is also necessary to recognize that the inability of Senate committees to speak with authority as representatives of the faculty frees the administration to select their preferences from a menu of conflicting advice or to ignore all advice and proceed as best suits them. We have given considerable thought to this problem, and, recognizing the diversity of faculty make-up and the firmness with which academic opinions are sometimes held, we have not discovered a simple or complete solution to the problem. However, because the problem exists and because its existence is a major obstacle in bringing about a closer working relationship between the faculty as represented by the Academic Senate and the administration of the University, we wish to propose a procedure which we consider holds some promise of mitigating the problem and which could set the stage for further improvement in the years ahead.

Our proposal is that all Academic Senate committees which are charged with advising the administration, whether Divisional or University in scope, should be required to report to their parent body, either the Divisional Senate or its representative organization for local committees, or the Assembly for University committees, all significant advice or proposals which have been given the administration. This advice should be noticed in the Call for the meetings of the parent body. It would also be possible to adopt a procedure of ratification whereby receipt of the report without dissent, or in the case of controversial topics, by majority vote, would constitute official support by the representative body for the committee's position. Subsequent alterations in that position should occur only with similar approval by the parent body, and in such cases the notice should indicate the way in which the previous position is being altered.

In addition to the rapidly changing composition of Senate committees, one reason for the variability in Senate advice and action is lack of information regarding previous advice or actions of the Senate, so

that reversal of a particular position may come about through failure to consider the reasons which had led to the earlier position. As a means of helping with this problem and assisting in development of a consistent Academic Senate position on various questions, we suggest that the Senate should consider developing a computerized information system. Summaries of the deliberations and actions of various Senate bodies would be stored in a computer data file in such a way that a rapid search could retrieve either specific items or all pertinent information on a general question. Preparation for committee or other meetings would then include obtaining from the networked system a summary of prior actions or consideration of the same or related problems. Such a file, if maintained in one location and accessible from terminals in each Division, could also facilitate interchange of information between Divisions, making it possible to determine rapidly the ways in which other campuses have handled

— 51 —

similar problems. If, as we suggest, a permanent University Academic Senate office is established, this office could be made responsible for maintenance of the files and operation of the system.

3. *Faculty Renewal.* A major problem in achieving the objective of high quality in the University when enrollments, resources and faculty are essentially stable is that of maintaining a sufficient influx of new faculty members. Continuous addition of young faculty is necessary so that the overall level of enthusiasm, competence and familiarity with the most modern aspects of various disciplines is consonant with the quality being sought. It is our view that a rate of addition of young faculty substantially lower than that experienced by the University during the period of rapid growth is adequate to serve this purpose, but we do feel that the situation in which a campus or a department finds itself with a preponderance of tenured faculty and is limited in its ability to add young faculty to the openings which occur due to retirement, resignation or death of older members is an undesirable one. In the University as a whole the vacancies which come about for these reasons are a relatively small fraction (in 1970-71, for example, 2.7% of the tenured faculty were terminated) and because of the large influx of young faculty in the 1950's and 1960's, the prospects for change in this fraction are small (of 4,232 tenured University faculty in 1971, 55% were in the age group 38-52, with prospective retirement between 1985 and 2000). While faculty renewal from these sources of openings is not entirely trivial, it does not seem adequate to maintenance of quality at the proper level for the University. In the paragraphs below we discuss some of the possible methods of supplementing the vacancies which occur in this way.

- a. **Incremental growth.** While it is our belief that overall growth of the University during the period covered by our report will not be large, it could be a significant source of new positions. If it becomes possible to improve the present staffing formulas or to alter the current system in which faculty size is entirely enrollment-driven, help in renewing the faculty from this source could be substantial. Whatever the number of new faculty which can be obtained from this source, however, it is our conviction that these positions will be best used if they are filled with young faculty, entering on the lower rungs of the academic ladder. We recommend, in other words, that the practice of recruiting tenure faculty be restricted to those cases in which it can be demonstrated that only a tenured appointment offers the best possible means of adding needed strength to a program or solving a specific and urgent problem and that the search for excellence among new faculty members should center on recognizing its potential in professionals just starting academic careers.
- b. **Temporary appointments.** We have considered at some length the mode of faculty development usually called the "revolving door policy" and we conclude that for the University of California not only would it be an unsatisfactory procedure and undesirable departure from prior practices, but that it probably would adversely affect the ability of the University to attract outstanding young faculty, even in the buyer's market which now obtains. While we reject a

which non-tenured faculty are employed without any prospect of tenure as a consequence of satisfactory performance, we do feel that temporary appointments can help the University to attain the level of flexibility in staffing necessary to operating within the constraints which seem probable in the next decade. Temporary appointments, clearly offered as such, can be a means of meeting transient staffing needs and can also be used to identify exceptional individuals who should be retained in the system. The benefits to a campus — particularly one which is in process of changing its composition, as an example, one moving toward campus specialization — of keeping some fraction of its potential appointments as temporary positions can be great, and we believe that all campuses would benefit from a permanent pool of temporarily assigned positions.

- c. **Early retirement.** One obvious means of increasing faculty turnover would be to increase the attractiveness of retirement earlier than the mandated age limit. Recognizing this, the University has made some changes in the retirement system intended to make it more financially feasible for those faculty who for various reasons may wish to retire early to do so. This option has so far been little exercised, and our observation is that one reason for this is that the procedures used have been complex and unclear to a point which almost makes it appear that the intention is to discourage early retirement. Other reasons relate to inadequate funding of this procedure. We believe that the early retirement option could be a significant factor in assisting the University to maintain an influx of new faculty compatible with the maintenance of quality necessary for the future health of the institution. If the potential benefits of early retirement are to be realized at least two improvements are needed: (1) The actuarial base of the University retirement system must be adjusted to an expectation of earlier retirement, or the funds necessary for financing early retirements must be provided from other sources, and (2) the benefits to the retiree, the procedures for carrying out early retirement and the responsibility of all those concerned for prompt and effective action must be clearly set forth and compliance with the procedures insured at all levels.

Other forms of early retirement such as partial retirement should also be considered in seeking means of insuring an adequate flow of new faculty into the University.

- d. **Tenure ratios.** We, together with most of those with whom we have discussed the matter, reject the use of specified ratios of tenure to non-tenure appointments as an adequate or feasible means of meeting the problem of continuously renewing the faculty.
4. *Faculty Representation.* Early in the work of this committee, we came to the conclusion that the contact of the University with public representatives and particularly the representation of the University in Sacramento was deficient in that the academic viewpoint as represented by the faculty was not adequately included in the University's presentations. We suggested to the University administration that an effort should be made to attach a faculty member to the Office of the Vice President — Governmental Relations in Sacramento on a part-time basis. A part-time faculty member has subsequently been added to that office, and in the past two years extensive efforts have been made to utilize faculty expertise in presenting the University's

budget to the legislature. We feel that both these actions have been beneficial for the University although in neither case have the full potential benefits been realized.

In the case of faculty participation in the budget hearing process before the legislature the effort has been unsatisfactory in that too large an operation was mounted too late with resultant confusion

and marshalling of unused resources. We believe that if faculty members are added to APPRB as we suggest in an earlier section of this report, that they should make up the core of the faculty aspects of the University's budget defense, because they will be the most informed and knowledgeable faculty members regarding a particular budget, having been involved in its details from the beginning of the process. Additional faculty members could be brought into the budget defense to provide information in clearly identified areas. The faculty members of APPRB should also be participants in the negotiations with the State Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst which precede the public budget hearings in the legislature.

On matters not directly related to the details of a specific budget, we feel that the needs of the University, of the public and not incidentally, of the faculty, would better be served if there were a continuous presence of University faculty members in Sacramento. This could be accomplished in a variety of ways, but our preference would be for additional part-time faculty to be added to the Office of Governmental Relations so that representatives of the government at all levels would have an opportunity to consult with faculty members on questions regarding the University and so that they could assist those responsible for presenting the University's position on various issues in assessing their impact on the academic aspects of the University.

If the administration is unable or unwilling to use additional faculty members as part of their Sacramento office in this way, we suggest that the Academic Senate should consider whether it should sponsor a minimal level of faculty representation in Sacramento, financing it by a small levy on Academic Senate members, perhaps supplemented with funds from other sources outside the University. An arrangement such as this may not be considered desirable for a variety of reasons, and it may be rendered less attractive by the development of faculty representation by unions or faculty associations in the near future. However, as we discuss in the next section, we believe it important that the faculty view on matters other than salaries and conditions of employment should be presented to the legislature and government and particularly that academic aspects of the University should not be represented by collective bargaining units.

5. *Collective Bargaining and the Academic Process.* Since collective bargaining for public employees, including University faculty, may become law before this report is published, we would like to note one of the possible impacts of the advent of collective bargaining in the University on educational policy and academic planning and particularly on the role of the faculty in these aspects of the University. If the faculty chooses a faculty association, union or other agency to be its bargaining agent it will be important to have the limits of matters which are to be made part of the bargaining process clearly delineated if the present relation of the Academic

— 54 —

Senate to the University — and any possible future improvement — is not to be imperiled. It is our conviction that the faculty can have greater impact on the academic process through joint consideration of academic questions in the manner which has been used in the past rather than to make the entire gamut of faculty working conditions subject to negotiation in adversary bargaining proceedings. For this reason we believe that any bargaining agent selected by the faculty should have a writ which runs only to representation on matters of compensation and standards of fair employment practices in the narrow sense applied to industrial labor/management negotiations. Otherwise, the beneficial functioning of the Academic Senate and its participation in University governance seem likely to be severely impaired with consequent loss of much of the faculty's influence on aspects of the University's operation which influence its desirability as an academic employer.

6. *Utilization of the Faculty: Retraining and Peripheral Teaching.* In the steady state situation which appears likely to obtain in the University in the next decade there is a strong possibility that the

needs of educational programs, influenced by changing student taste and interests, will result in a decline in the demand for the talents of some faculty members. If the demand for the instructional services of some tenured faculty becomes insufficient to provide a normal teaching workload, a variety of courses of action may be considered. It is our view that the last of these should be dismissal of tenured faculty members for “programmatically” reasons. Further than this, we are of the opinion that good will, dedication to using the entire resources of the University together, and strong efforts in seeking innovative means of solving such problems will make it unnecessary to dismiss for this reason any faculty members who hold tenure. We suggest below two additional procedures, the well-considered employment of which should assist in this aspect of meeting the problems of full faculty utilization in a stable University.

- a. **Faculty reeducation.** We have become aware of many cases in which the special subdisciplinary competence of a faculty member is excess to the present needs of a department or program while at the same time teaching overload has developed in another part of the same program. In many cases this situation can be rectified simply by an intensive period of study on the part of the individual whose specialty has suffered a decline in demand. However, in many cases a more extensive process of reeducation is required and we suggest that this process should be facilitated. Special leave for purposes of acquiring specific new competences for meeting programmatic needs is one of the ways in which this could be accomplished. Special leave for this purpose could be directly available, it could also be integrated with sabbatical leave, perhaps with an additional increment of leave with full pay where sabbatical leaves are used for an approved program of reeducation designed to meet identified program needs.

In addition to leaves specifically for purposes of reeducation, a combination of temporary intercampus transfer for teaching purposes with a study program at the new campus designed to meet program needs at the home campus should be considered.

- b. **Teaching in areas outside normal department affiliation.** Many cases of extra-disciplinary teaching in interfacial areas between disciplines are now

— 55 —

found. These usually arise because of a perceived need for interdisciplinary courses, but in our view there is no particularly good reason why similar arrangements cannot be used to solve the problems which arise from maldistribution of expertise on a campus. Many faculty members have competences only distantly related to those required for their primary teaching functions and we see no reason why such competences should not be employed in the solution of shortages of faculty in areas quite distant from departmental bases where the necessary competence exists. This procedure has the attraction that it does not require a complete shifting of an individual's professional orientation, but permits continued teaching of a part of the course load in the individual's primary discipline, directing graduate students in that area, while justifying a part of the teaching function by handling courses in areas outside the primary program. A variety of likely combinations occurs to us, e.g., a physicist could teach mathematics, a social historian could teach sociology, etc., but it is our belief that the nature of the academic mind is such that many unlikely combinations exist and that their use might provide new insights and different perspectives to the benefit of students while making possible the most efficient utilization of faculty talents.

Appreciation

This report represents the culmination of three years of data gathering, consultation and discussion by this committee. The undersigned are solely responsible for mistakes, misstatements, distortions and improper

suggestions which appear in the report. We have, however, had the benefit of help and good advice from a variety of individuals, and some of them should be mentioned:

During the early, study, phase of the work of the committee and prior to beginning the actual writing of the report, we were fortunate to have as members of the committee Professor J. Herman Blake (SC), Professor Rosemary Park (LA) and Professor Eleanor Searle (LA).

During the writing of the report we have consulted with many individuals, but our major reliance has been on the advisory group consisting of Professor Helen S. Astin (LA), Professor George W. Brown (I), Professor John S. Galbraith (LA), Professor Eugene C. Lee (B), Professor Phillip R. Lee (SF), Professor Neil J. Smelser (B), Professor Sally Sperling (R) and Professor Martin A. Trow (B). Where the report has merit it is very likely because we heeded their advice, where it does not it is certainly because we have chosen to ignore it. In either case our appreciation for their help and that of all those who gave freely of their time and thought is unbounded.

Respectfully submitted
FREDERICK E. BALDERSTON (B)
NORMON M. KROLL (SD)
PAUL E. ZINNER (D)
RANDOLPH T. WEDDING (R), *Chairman*
April 17, 1975

— 56 —

Appendix 1: Index of Comments, Suggestions and Proposals

Academic Senate, responsibility for advice	49
Administration, strong University	23
Administrators, evaluation of	43
Campus	
autonomy	23
ceilings	45
closure	22
selective development	23
Collective bargaining	53
Committee on Academic Planning	48
Computers	33
Enrollment trends	22
Faculty	
disciplinary conferences	32
early retirement	52
evaluation	42
participation in planning and operation	47

public representation	52
renewal	51
representation on APPRB	47
retraining	54
standards	43
teaching evaluation	42
teaching outside discipline	54
temporary appointments	51
tenure appointments	51
tenure ratios	52
Graduate student standards	41
Innovative programs	36
Intercampus	
coordination	29
equipment and facilities	32
instructional cooperation	29
joint or group graduate programs	31
organized research units	31
transfers	30,34
Libraries	33
Professional student standards	41
Program	
evaluation	44
national rankings	45
panels	44
standard examinations	44
Tenure	35
Undergraduate	
admission procedure	46
admission standards	38
graduation requirements	40
redirection	45
University	

Academic Senate	37
departments	35
educational objectives, general context	19-20
educational policies	37
One or nine?	23

— 58 —

Appendix 2: Projection of University of California Undergraduate Enrollments to 1990

Enrollment projections are based on projected California population in the 18-24 year-old age group. Population projections from Demographic Unit of California Department of Finance, using Series D fertility assumptions and assuming *zero net migration*. Interpolation of population projections from Purves (1973).

Projections of enrollment beyond 1990 using the same population assumptions indicate an increased enrollment reaching *ca.* 120,000 in 2000 AD.

Shorter line is for actual U.C. undergraduate enrollments, 1960-74.

These projections were obtained using the regression equation: U.C. Undergraduate Enrollment = .0428 (California 18-24 year Population) - 2081. This gives a correlation coefficient, $r = .9863$, with $P < 0.001$. This relation between 18-24 year-old California population and U.C. undergraduate enrollment was found to be the only significant parameter when a number of demographic factors were tested in a multiple linear regression fit against U.C. undergraduate enrollment for the period 1960-1974.

— 59 —

Appendix 3: B.A. Degrees Offered on Three or More U.C. Campuses, Excluding the Professions

- 0100 Agriculture and Natural Resources*
- 0200 Architecture and Environmental Design*
- 0300 Area Studies*
- 0400 Biological Sciences
 - 0401 Biology, general
 - 0402 Botany, general
 - 0407 Zoology, general
 - 0414 Biochemistry
- 0500 Business and Management*
- 0600 Communications*
- 0700 Computer and Information Sciences, general
- 0800 Education*
- 0900 Engineering*
- 1000 Fine and Applied Arts
 - 1002 Art
 - 1003 Art History
 - 1005 Music (liberal arts program)
 - 1007 Dramatic Arts

1008 Dance
1100 Foreign Languages
 1102 French
 1103 German
 1104 Italian
 1105 Spanish
 1106 Russian
 1109 Latin
 1110 Greek, classical
1200 Health Professions*
1300 Home Economics*
1400 Law*
1500 Letters
 1501 English, general
 1503 Comparative Literature
 1504 Classics
 1505 Linguistics
 1506 Speech

 1509 Philosophy
 1510 Religion
1600 Library Science*
1700 Mathematics
 1701 Mathematics, general
1800 Military Sciences*
1900 Physical Sciences
 1901 Physical Sciences, general
 1902 Physics, general (excl. biophysics)
 1903 Chemistry, general (excl. biochemistry)
 1914 Geology
2000 Psychology
 2001 Psychology, general
2100 Public Affairs and Services*
2200 Social Sciences
 2201 Social Sciences, general
 2202 Anthropology
 2204 Economics
 2205 History
 2206 Geography
 2207 Political Science and Government
 2208 Sociology
 2211 Afro-American Studies
 2213 Mexican-American Studies
4900 Interdisciplinary Studies
 4901 General Liberal Arts and Sciences
 4902 Biological and Physical Sciences
 4903 Humanities and Social Sciences

Source: University of California, Academic Plan, 1974-78, pp. 82-101.

The four-digit numbers are HEGIS (Higher Education General Information System) classification numbers. Those general headings marked (*) are excluded from this list of B.A. degrees on grounds of professional specialization.

— 61 —

Report of the Academic Council

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

— 62 —

- A. *New “Engineer” Degree.*—In accordance with By-Law 80 (B) (6), the Academic Council herewith notifies the Assembly that on December 18, 1974, it approved a request from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs for establishment of a program of graduate study in Engineering leading to the “Engineer” degree, in the School of Engineering and Applied Science on the Los Angeles Campus.
- B. *Amendment to Grading Code, Riverside Division.*—On February 11, 1975, in accordance with the provisions of By-Law 80 (B) (4) and after consultation with the University Committee on Educational Policy and the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, the Academic Council gave provisional approval on behalf of the Assembly to a request from the Riverside Division to amend Regulations DR 1.4 through DR 1.4.3, as follows:

Present Wording	Amended Wording Recommended
DR1.4 The grade I (incomplete) denotes that a student's work was of passing quality, but incomplete for good cause. Subject to the provisions of SR 634, units are not charged and grade points are not assigned for I grades. The grade I can be replaced as follows:	DR1.4 The grade I (incomplete) denotes that a student's work was of passing quality but incomplete for good cause. Subject to the provisions of <i>DR1.4.3</i> , units are not charged and grade points are not assigned for I grades. The grade I can be replaced as follows:
DR1.4.1 Upon completion of the required work, as specified by the instructor, the grade I shall be replaced by a grade A to F or S/NC.	DR1.4.1 [No Change]
DR1.4.3 As an alternate procedure, if a student repeats and successfully completes a course previously graded I, the new grade is assigned and the I is removed from the transcript.	DR1.4.2 [Renumber; no other change]
DR1.4.2 When a course graded I has not been successfully completed (as specified in DR1.4.1 above) after one calendar year, it must remain permanently recorded as an I on the transcript (except that the appropriate dean may extend the time for successful completion when he considers that circumstances warrant it).	DR1.4.3 [Renumber] When a course graded I has not been successfully completed after <i>three additional quarters, or by the time the student is ready to graduate, whichever is less, it will be replaced by a grade of F, or by NC if the course was undertaken on an S/NC basis.</i> The appropriate dean may extend the time for successful completion when he considers that circumstances warrant it.

- C. *Officers of the Academic Senate, 1975-76.*—
- By the terms of By-Law 58, David A. Wilson serves as Chairman, 1975-76.
 - Nominations for Vice Chairman of the Assembly, 1975-76, and member-at-large, Committee on Committees, will be presented at the meeting.
- D. *Meetings of the Assembly, 1975-76.*—In accordance with By-Law 63 (A), and after consultation with the President of the Academic Senate and the Academic Council, meetings of the Assembly for 1975-76 have been scheduled as follows:

Thursday, December 4, 1975, Berkeley Campus
 Wednesday, March 3, 1976, Los Angeles Campus
 Tuesday, May 25, 1976, Berkeley Campus

The March meeting may be cancelled if there is not sufficient business. In that case, the May meeting of the Assembly will be held at the Los Angeles Campus.

E. *Allocation of Divisional Representatives, 1975-76.*—In accordance with By-Law 50 (D), the Academic Council has approved the following allocation of Divisional representatives to the Assembly of the Academic Senate effective September 1, 1975:

Berkeley	8	Los Angeles	9	San Francisco	3
Davis	5	Riverside	2	Santa Barbara	2
Irvine	2	San Diego	3	Santa Cruz	1

F. *Variances from Senate Regulations.*—In accordance with the provisions of Senate By-Law 80 (B) (5), and after consultation with the University Committee on Educational Policy, the Academic Council notifies the Assembly that it approved on June 12, 1974, a request from the Santa Cruz Division for exception to Senate Regulations 300, 610, and 630 for part-time students in unspecified, regular major programs on campus.

G. *Memorials to The Regents.*—At its meeting of February 26, 1974, the Representative Assembly of the Berkeley Division proposed the following two memorials:

- I. The Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate, acting through the Representative Assembly, respectfully requests that the Regents increase by 5.1 percent of UCRS members' salaries the Regents' contributions to the Retirement System in lieu of member contributions. Such increase shall be funded by decreasing such members' salaries an equivalent amount and by adjusting all retirement, insurance, fringe benefit and other computations accordingly so that there is no effective decrease in these other benefits.
- II. We respectfully request the Regents to instruct its Committee on Investments to vote the corporate securities held in the University of California Retirement System on all Shareholder proposals relating to general economic, political, racial, religious, social, or similar causes, that are significantly related to the business of the respective company by voting 50 percent of such voting power in favor of such proposal and 50 percent in opposition to such proposal so as to neutralize the Regents' voting power on issues of social concern.

— 63 —

Furthermore, we respectfully support California Assembly Resolution 974 which, in effect, seeks to insure that the Regents in voting corporate securities held by it in trust shall likewise take a neutral stand on issues of social concern in voting such stock at corporate stockholders' meetings.

Before being submitted by mail ballot to all members of the Academic Senate the memorials must be discussed by each Division, in accordance with Senate By-Law 170. This has been done, and the actions of the Divisions with respect to each of these memorials were as follows:

Memorial I.

Davis: Adopted.

Irvine: Adopted, with separate motion passed to transmit the resolution to the President rather than

as a Memorial to The Regents.
Los Angeles: Adopted.
Riverside: Adopted.
San Diego: Adopted.
San Francisco: Sense Approval.
Santa Barbara: Referred to Committee.
Santa Cruz: Referred to Committee.

Memorial II.

Davis: Adopted.
Irvine: Adopted, with separate motion passed to transmit the resolution to the President rather than as a Memorial to The Regents.
Los Angeles: Defeated.
Riverside: Defeated. Substitute motion passed:

The Riverside Division recommends that UCB Resolution II be changed so as to eliminate the request for a 50/50 vote by Regents on the shareholder proposals indicated, and be reformulated in terms of a request to The Regents to submit to the University community annually a written report on its shareholder voting and brief reasons therefor, on proposals relating to general economic, political, racial, religious, social or similar causes that are significantly related to the business of the respective company.

The Riverside Division also recommends that Resolution II be further modified by requesting The Regents to give appropriate consideration to both sides of social and environmental issues, rather than automatically voting with the recommendations of management.

San Diego: Adopted.
San Francisco: Approved the version adopted by the Riverside Division.
Santa Barbara: Substitute resolution passed, recommending the memorial be recast as follows:

We respectfully request the Regents to explore the practices followed by other universities which reportedly do cast the votes of their corporate securities in socially constructive ways, and establish thereafter similar procedures to govern their own exercise of such powers.

— 64 —

Santa Cruz: Defeated. Approved the sense of the San Francisco, Riverside and Santa Barbara resolutions.

By-Law 170 stipulates that “Any Divisional recommendations concerning the proposed memorial shall be forwarded to the Assembly which shall reconcile any divergencies.” In view of the variety of Divisional recommendations concerning each of these proposed memorials, reconciliation by the Assembly of these divergencies is required for each of the two memorials proposed by the Berkeley Division. In order, therefore, to place these two memorials before the Assembly for its consideration of them, the Academic Council moves the adoption by the Assembly of Memorial II as originally approved by the Berkeley Division. In the case of Memorial I, the Academic Council recommends to the Assembly its adoption of the following amended version of the resolution:

We respectfully request that The Regents increase their contributions to the University of California Retirement System by an amount equal to the members' contributions, in lieu of member contributions. Such increase shall be funded by decreasing such members' salaries an equivalent amount, and by adjusting all retirement insurance, fringe benefit and other computations accordingly

so that there is no effective decrease in these other benefits.

The reason for recommending the proposed amended version of Memorial II is two-fold. First, an amendment of the original Berkeley Division Memorial would be required to replace “5.1 percent of UCRS members' salaries” by “4.1 percent of UCRS members' salaries” in view of the increase in The Regents' contributions to the UCRS as part of the fringe benefit package gained by faculty effective July 1, 1974. More significantly, the University of California administration is considering at this time the possible coordination of UCRS with Social Security. In the event of such coordination the percentage of a faculty member's salary which would represent his or her contribution to the retirement system would likely change, by an amount not yet known. The Council feels that there is merit to the intent of this memorial even in the event of coordination of UCRS with Social Security, and therefore has omitted reference to a specific percentage of a faculty member's salary by which The Regents' contributions to UCRS should be increased.

H. *Senate Participation in Academic Planning.*—The University has engaged in various forms of academic planning for many years. The focus of attention, the structure of the planning process and the identification of planning problems are conditioned by the circumstances of the time. Since 1971, the focus of attention has been a complex of issues consequent on a very abrupt decline in growth rate throughout the system following a period of rapid growth. The structure that has been developed to deal with this complex of issues includes nine separate campus planning processes under the direction of the campus administrators coordinated and supplemented with a Universitywide perspective by the Academic Planning and Program Review Board. Each campus has its own pattern of program review and program development which involves the participation of administrators (including planning staffs), faculty and students. Each pattern combines the responsibilities and authority of both the campus administration and Academic Senate Division.

— 65 —

The APPRB serves the University as a whole. It is made up of seven administrators, four faculty and two students appointed by the President. A number of administrative members appears to be *ex officio*. One faculty member is *ex officio*, viz., the Vice Chairman of the Assembly of the Academic Senate. This structure is described in various places including the “University of California Academic Plan 1974-1978” (pp. 15-22) and the “University of California Academic Plan, Phase II, Volume 1—The University-wide Perspective” (pp. 1-19).

We may assume that planning in the University is accepted as necessary and appropriate for an institution that embodies a public trust to further higher education for the State of California by a system that has nine campuses, a projected enrollment of almost 130,000 students and expends between 4-5% of the State budget. The faculty's commitment to such a trust cannot be doubted. Their investment of energy and imagination is required. The prudent management of money and property is no less required. Neither unused capacity nor teacherless students nor learning lost through imprudence may be tolerated by the faculty.

But planning in the University is complicated, sometimes to the point of near paralysis, by several disjunctions within the institution. By these we mean the disjunction between the administration and the Senate; the disjunction between program development and budgetary decision making; the disjunction between established (one might go so far as to say entrenched) departments and new regions of knowledge and learning; the disjunction, in the Senate, between the presumption of perfect democracy of scholars and the need for responsible representative faculty government; and the disjunction between change by growth and change by reallocation.

Planning requires cooperation of administration and Senate as well as participation of the faculty as such. It is to be expected that the rate at which the administrative apparatus of the University can change in response to differing circumstances is more rapid than the same rate for the Senate. In some ways the Senate structure needs modification to be adapted to current circumstances. Yet we know that we of the faculty are perhaps even slower to adjust our biases and frames of reference which are intimately related to concerns for departments and disciplines. As a result of the circumstantial constraints and the enhanced significance of budgetary instruments, initiative tends to drift toward administrative officers. In fact, some progress has been made to reassert faculty initiative through the Divisional and Universitywide Senate. Further changes are required.

Where are we now? There are a number of documents in various stages of completion and approval. These are (1) the framework of the "University of California Academic Plan 1974-1978," (2) nine campus plans (3) "University of California Academic Plan, Phase II, Volume 1—The University-wide Perspective," and (4) Volume 2, "The Chancellor's Statements." In these documents are to be found the programs of the University and the policies to guide their modification. They also contain the procedural rules for reviewing program changes and implementing policies. These rules indicate the important fact that planning is a continuous business rather than a set of documents. The Senate's role in that continuous business is at issue.

— 66 —

What functions should the Senate assume in the process? One function of the Senate is to maintain standards of academic quality in both personnel and programs that are appropriate for the University of California. A second function is to facilitate, within as broad an institutional frame as possible (campus, university, academia), the development of those regions and salients of research and teaching which assure a sustained contribution by the University to civilization and to society. In short, the Senate's responsibility is to see that the needs of the liberal arts, sciences and learned professions remain in the driving force of the institution.

More concretely the agencies of the Senate must responsibly contribute to and guide the processes of program review—review of both existing and proposed programs—and the processes of policy implementation. The Senate, however, must continue to recognize its need to share authority with the administration, or put otherwise, the need to relate programs to resources and plans to budgets.

During this year (1974-75) the structured role of the Senate in University-wide planning has been the membership of the vice chairman of the Assembly of the Academic Senate on APPRB, the consultation by the chairman of APPRB (Vice President McCorkle) with the Academic Council and UCEP, and the review of draft planning documents by the Council, the University Committee on Educational Policy and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs. It is not surprising that the role has been played largely by improvisation. At the same time, completion of the work of the Committee on Long Range Educational Objectives and Academic Planning (CLREOAP) has proceeded in parallel including similar improvised consultation with various standing Divisional and University committees.

As planning moves into the next phase, some changes in Senate participation are in order. The two kinds of activities of this next phase appear likely to be (1) more active and perhaps more systematic program review and (2) efforts to find means to implement the plans and policies now in effect. It is not at all clear how these activities will develop at either the campus or the Universitywide level. What is clear is that the participation of Senate committees is necessary in order to assure the systematic contribution of faculty knowledge and judgment throughout the developing processes.

The generalized concept “program” is the unit of academic planning. This concept is not precise but includes a variety of identifiable activities that have some substantive and budgetary distinctiveness. The range includes, at least, lower division programs, undergraduate majors, graduate degree programs and Organized Research Units. In the course of implementing plans, it is necessary to review proposed changes in programs; it is important to review certain sets of programs; and perhaps it is advisable to review all programs.

The appropriate level, configuration, and type of program review is not clear in all cases. Consider the following minimum listing of considerations necessary to carry out a program review:

1. *Program Types*
 - a. New Program approval
 - (1) undergraduate major
 - (2) graduate degree
 - (3) graduate program change
 - (4) organized research program
 - b. Existing Programs (improvement)
 - (1) undergraduate major
 - (2) graduate degree
 - (3) graduate program change
 - (4) organized research program
 - c. Existing Programs (discontinuance)
 - (1) undergraduate major
 - (2) graduate degree
 - (3) graduate program change
 - (4) organized research
2. *Level of Review*
 - a. Department
 - b. College
 - c. Division-Chancellor's Office
 - d. Senate-President's Office
 - e. California Postsecondary Education Commission
 - f. Regents
3. *Type of Review Body*
 - a. Self review
 - b. *Ad hoc* committee
 - c. Standing committee
 - (1) Senate
 - (2) Administration
 - (3) Mixed
 - (4) External visitors
 - (5) Permanent staff
 - (6) Students
4. *Occasion for Review*

- a. by proposal
 - b. problem signal
 - c. policy indication
 - d. regular schedule
 - e. legal requirement
5. *Review Criteria*
- a. quality of instruction
 - b. professional performance
 - c. centrality of mission
 - d. intellectual uniqueness
 - e. social value
 - f. potential
 - g. costs
 - h. relationship to similar programs at other campuses
 - i. student demand
6. *Technique of Implementation*

— 68 —

Given this range of considerations it is not surprising that there is a good deal of reviewing going on with a good deal of overlapping and redundancy. As efforts proceed to implement the campus academic plans and the University planning policies, further efforts toward program review may safely be predicted.

The Senate's interest and responsibility in program review is clearly to assure proper consideration of academic substance and judgments of academic quality. These Senate interests should be protected while striving to reduce delay and redundancy to the minimum.

Recommendations The Academic Senate, Universitywide and Divisional, needs better coordination of the work of standing committees with planning and program review processes. At the University level the critical committees are the Academic Council, CCGA, UCEP, UCBIR, Library Committee, and Committee on Computer Policy. The Senate should coordinate through a planning committee consisting of the vice chairperson of the Assembly as chairperson, the chairperson of the Assembly, the chairpersons of UCEP, CCGA, and UCBIR or their designees from those committees, and two members on two-year staggered terms appointed by the Committee on Committees from among members of Divisional committees responsible for academic planning. Since the scheduling of library and computer planning appears to be somewhat independent of the academic calendar, the chairpersons of these two committees should meet with the planning committee as appropriate. This planning committee should coordinate Universitywide Senate participation in planning and program review. All recommendations of standing committees on planning or program review matters should be reviewed by this committee to assure that such recommendations are consistent among themselves. The chairperson of this planning committee should be responsible for reporting Senate advice to APPRB, to APPRB's steering committee, to the Academic Council and to the Assembly of the Academic Senate. The planning committee should review in cooperation with the Academic Council campus planning and program review procedures to assure proper Senate participation. If the Assembly or the Council decide it to be appropriate the chairperson of the Assembly should report Senate planning advice to the President.

In review of proposed or existing graduate programs CCGA should strive to develop appropriate Universitywide criteria and to work closely with the Office of the President. By working closely with the President's Office, CCGA should have available to it relevant administrative staff analyses and budgetary information. The importance of a closer relationship between CCGA and the Office of the President is increased by the fact that the Office of the President has final authority for approval prior to presentation to the Board of Regents. The effectiveness of CCGA review of programs and coordination of Office of President Staff would be enhanced by the use of *ad hoc* committee procedures for graduate program review.

The charge to UCEP should be enlarged to include review of programs aimed to improve undergraduate instruction. The UCEP should also closely monitor Senate participation in campus planning.

Use of Staff. One of the problems faced by Senate committees is lack of staff at a time when a plenitude of staff support is devoted to planning both on campuses

— 69 —

and in the Office of the President. The Senate planning committee should seek agreement from the President and, through the Academic Council, from Chancellors that appropriate staff work will be available in a timely fashion to Senate committees. The vice chairperson of the Assembly should be responsible for assuring this staff support.

The Problem of Time. One of the strengths of the Academic Senate is its roots in the teaching faculty. The price of this strength is the part-time character of the faculty participation in Senate work. Because of this situation the exercise of the Senate's role in governance including planning and program review must be possible on a part-time basis. The temptation to seek more and more released time for Senate committees should be resisted. At the same time recognition throughout the University in departments, colleges, schools and budget committees of the value of Senate service to the entire academic enterprise of teaching and research is necessary.

The key to these recommendations lies in the belief that the strength of the Senate is to be found in its standing committees, that this strength if appropriately channeled and coordinated will enrich the development and implementation of plans and program reviews, and that the vice chairperson of the Assembly, supported, advised and consoled by the chairperson, can successfully assume responsibility for this effort.

Resolution

WHEREAS, the Academic Senate needs better coordination of the work of standing committees with campus and University planning and program review processes, and

WHEREAS, the Universitywide standing committees which are critical in planning are the Academic Council, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, the Committees on Educational Policy, Budget and Interdivisional Relations, Library, and Computer Policy, it is therefore

RESOLVED, that the Assembly of the Academic Senate shall establish an Interim Planning Committee consisting of the vice chairperson of the Assembly as chairperson, the chairperson of the Assembly, the chairpersons of CCGA, UCEP, and UCIBIR, or designees from those committees, and two members appointed for two-year staggered terms by the Committee on Committees from among members of Divisional committees responsible for academic planning, which shall:

(1) Coordinate Universitywide Senate participation in planning and program review;

- (2) review recommendations of standing committees on planning or program review matters to assure that such recommendations are consistent among themselves;
- (3) review, in cooperation with the Academic Council, campus planning and program review procedures to assure proper Senate participation.

The chairperson of the Interim Planning Committee (who is an *ex officio* member of APPRB) shall be responsible for reporting Senate advice to APPRB

— 70 —

and to APPRB's steering committee as well as to the Academic Council. The Assembly shall receive periodic reports on academic planning as part of the Academic Council report.

The chairperson of the Assembly of the Academic Senate shall, upon the recommendation of the Assembly or the Academic Council, report Senate planning advice directly to the President of the University.

Respectfully submitted for the Academic Council

A. A. MARADUDIN, *Chairman, 1974-75*

April 24, 1975

Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

A. Practices and reforms essential for the protection of academic freedom

Of all discretionary activity by administrators, inaction is the most difficult to control. The present procedures for faculty promotion sometimes make it impossible to ascertain whether academic freedom has been disregarded.

In order for it to be possible to monitor academic freedom, there must first be a process for promotion in which burdens of proof, explanation and moving forward are carefully allocated. While the burden of proof rests upon the faculty member to demonstrate that he merits a promotion, the burden of moving forward and the burden of explanation must be placed upon the administration.

Recommendation One: When a merit increase is denied after the normal prescribed period of service in the same step (two years for Assistant and Associate Professors), the faculty member shall be given a written statement explaining why he has not met the burden of proof which would entitle him to a merit increase. This explanation should include a statement of the facts as found and a statement of reasons based upon previously published standards.

Such a statement of facts will give the faculty member some opportunity to challenge the accuracy of these facts. Implicit, and perhaps explicit, in the statement of reasons is an indication of what the faculty member has to do in order to qualify for a merit increase or other promotion.

Because of its narrow adversary focus, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure is ill-suited to adjudicate charges of denial of academic freedom. (And, P & T is the Senate's only adjudicatory committee.) When a complainant chooses, even for laudable motives, not to demand compensation—e.g., reinstatement, promotion, back pay—the Committee may be less inclined to pursue the matter.

Recommendation Two: The principle is hereby reaffirmed that P & T has a responsibility to investigate charges of denial of academic freedom whether or not the complainant seeks a personal remedy. The Committee on Privilege and Tenure should refer general issues of academic freedom to the Committee on

Academic Freedom, whenever appropriate.

To the extent that it does pursue a complaint, the Committee on Privilege and

— 71 —

Tenure sometimes relies solely upon the parties to adduce evidence, and does not of its own motion seek the facts.

Recommendation Three: The principle is hereby reaffirmed that P & T has a primary responsibility to seek information on all essential aspects of a charge that academic freedom has been infringed, and in particular to call all witnesses who can shed light, whether or not requested by the complainant.

Prompt and effective action by a complainant not only makes more likely the ascertainment of alleged misconduct, but it has a wholesome preventive potential.

Recommendation Four: Faculty members, and especially junior faculty members, are urged to complain promptly to the appropriate committees of the Academic Senate whenever they believe that their academic freedom has been infringed.

Faculty members who bring such matters to the attention of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure should also inform the Committee on Academic Freedom.

Recommendation Five: On each campus, the names of volunteer former members of the Committee on Academic Freedom and of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure should be publicized as being available to offer counsel to faculty members who are uncertain as to whether their academic freedom has been infringed or otherwise unsure how to proceed.

Faculty members charging a violation of academic freedom are urged to secure an appropriate representative to present their case to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

B. Prior Restraint

Section III, Part A, Paragraph 5, of the *Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students* (revised October 29, 1973) provides that:

A request for use of a University facility... shall be denied if circumstances are such that the event will present a clear and present danger to the orderly operation or peace of the campus.

On March 20, 1974, the Santa Barbara Senate Committee on Academic Freedom wrote to the Chairman of the Santa Barbara Division, Professor Robert Kelley, on behalf of three members of CAF and the undergraduate student representative, that this paragraph “was a prior restraint on the expression of ideas.”

In a memorandum dated September 3, 1974, Milton H. Gordon, Associate Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, wrote to Eugene Shands, Coordinator, Facilities & Regulations, UCSB, in part as follows:

... You have also enclosed a letter from Professor Robert Kelley... protesting certain parts of the Regulations, particularly those dealing with what Professor Kelley considers “clearly unconstitutional” infringements upon free speech...

I understand Professor Kelley's concern regarding the restraint on speech activities reflected in this section. However, the section, in my opinion authorizes the Chancellor to curtail that type of speech activity which is not protected by the Constitution, i.e., speech which raises a clear and present danger of criminal activity because of an immediate call for violent action. The courts have long held that speech activities in such

circumstances are not constitutionally protected.

— 72 —

The unconstitutionality of this section of the *Policies* is patent in its use of the future tense “will” in connection with the “clear and *present* danger” formula (emphasis added) which is derived from the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Associate Counsel Gordon's attempt to wrap the Constitution around this provision is very unpersuasive, inasmuch as he ignores the use of the future tense and refers instead to “speech which *raises* a clear and present danger... because of an **immediate** call for violent action” (emphasis added). Mr. Gordon's argument seems to be directed to the termination of a speech in progress; the section of the *Policies* which he is defending is directed to “[a] request for use.”

Moreover, Mr. Gordon's reference to a “call for violent action” poses a situation much more specific than the vague “danger to the orderly operation or peace of the campus” cited in the *Policies*. Instead of “a clear and present danger,” then, the *Policies* hinge the limitation of speech upon a speculative and future danger.

Chancellors and their delegates—especially the latter and particularly when acting in haste—are not going to read Mr. Gordon's memorandum; they are going to read the clear (and unconstitutional) language of the *Policies*.

The entire *Policies* should be referred to a Select Committee appointed by the Statewide Senate Committee on Committees and the President of the University to tailor provisions which meticulously take into account the responsibilities of the Administration and the requirements of the United States Constitution.

C. The Convenio

In 1965, The University of California and the University of Chile agreed to establish a major program of cooperation known as the *Convenio*. This unique agreement bound each University to recognize the other's course of study and academic degrees, and to cooperate in the exchange of students and faculty members. Each University agreed to form a Policy Committee to formulate specific programs of mutual benefit, and to administer each party's responsibilities under the jointly approved programs. The program was given a ten-year grant totaling ten million dollars by the Ford Foundation. Although the Ford Foundation grant will expire within a year, the *Convenio* itself is of indefinite duration. The agreement can be terminated at any time by either party upon 30 days' notice.

Since the 1973 coup, a military general has been appointed Rector of the University of Chile, and purges have been carried out among faculty and students. Hundreds and perhaps thousands of faculty members were dismissed from their jobs or forced to resign on political grounds. Thousands of students were expelled. Many of these people have been arrested, or banished, or forced into exile. Some have been tortured, some killed.

Denial of academic freedom, then, is flagrant and notorious. To continue the *Convenio* is to condone this denial.

It is the sense of the University Committee on Academic Freedom that the University of California should withdraw from the *Convenio* with the University of Chile. Students presently in the program should be helped to complete their studies, but alternative funding should be sought.

Respectfully submitted for the Committee
S. ANDERSON, *Chairman*
March 21, 1975

Appendix: Notice of Meeting, Assembly of the Academic Senate

[Revisions to the *Manual of the Academic Senate* (amended through April 15, 1974) are printed herein. Please insert the revised pages, and remove those distributed earlier, to keep your copy up to date.]

RECORD OF CHANGES - MANUAL OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE					
<i>Notice of Meeting, May 29, 1975:</i>					
By-Law/Regulation	No.	Action	Page Numbers		
			Replace	Delete	
Public Health, School of	48	CC 19 Nov 1974	7	7	(Rev. 15 Apr 74)
Academic Council	80	Correction	11	11	(Rev. 15 Apr 74)
Committees	96	Correction	12	12	(Rev. 15 Apr 74)
Computer Policy	97	En 3 Dec 1974	(Page 12, as above)		
Editorial	98	Reprinted Without Change	12(a)	12(a)	(Rev. 15 Apr 74)
[Admission requirements]	424	Correction	27	27	(Rev. 15 Apr 74)
Grades	Art. 3	Placement of Heading Corrected	41, 42	41, 42	(Rev. 15 Apr 74)
Faculty of the School of Public Health, Appendix II		Am 11 Jun 1974	58-60	58-60	(Rev. 15 Apr 74)
Faculty Code of Conduct, Appendix V [several pages omitted from April 1974 edition]			75(d)-(i)	75(d)(e)	(Rev. 15 Apr 74)

[Note: Footnote on page 23, and references to it, should be deleted wherever they appear.]

29 May 1975.

By-Laws of the Academic Senate, Page 7

38. (A) Except as otherwise provided, each Faculty may organize, select its officers and committees, and adopt rules consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate (See By-Law 144). The Chairman of the Faculty and members of its Executive Committee are selected by it. The chief administrative officer of the college or school shall be an *ex officio* member of the Executive Committee but may not serve as Chairman of the Faculty, except in Faculties of colleges and schools which are substantially coincident with departments of the same name.

(B) Each Faculty may present to the agency to which it is directly responsible recommendations and proposed modifications of legislation of that agency or the Senate, and may delegate portions of its authority to its committees or executive officers. The Division or the Assembly may impose specific duties on a Faculty.

Article 2. School of Public Health (Berkeley-San Francisco)

48. (A) The Faculty of the School of Public Health (Berkeley-San Francisco) consists of:

- (1) The President of the University.
- (2) The Chancellor at Berkeley.
- (3) The Chancellor at San Francisco.
- (4) All members of the Academic Senate who are members of the Department of Public Health (Berkeley-San Francisco).
- (5) Members of the Academic Senate selected by the faculty named, as specified below:
 - (a) Two representatives each from the College of Natural Resources (Berkeley), the College of Letters and Science (Berkeley), and the School of Medicine (San Francisco).
 - (b) One representative each from the College of Chemistry (Berkeley), the College of Engineering (Berkeley), the College of Environmental Design (Berkeley), the School of Business Administration (Berkeley), the School of Criminology (Berkeley), the School of Dentistry (San Francisco), the School of Education (Berkeley), the School of Nursing (San Francisco), the School of Pharmacy (San Francisco), the School of Social Welfare (Berkeley), and the School of Veterinary Medicine (Davis). (Am 21 Jan 74) (CC 11 Nov 74)

(B) Instructors of less than two years' service are not entitled to vote. (EC 18 Nov 68)

TITLE III. THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Chapter 1. Membership, Officers, Meetings

50. *Membership.* The Assembly of the Academic Senate consists of

- (A) The President of the University.
- (B) The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Assembly.
- (C) Thirteen members *ex officio*: the chairman of each Division of the Academic Senate or the Divisional vice-chairman (but *only* in the absence or disability of the Divisional chairman); the chairman and vice-chairman of the Committee on Educational Policy; and the chairmen of the Committee on

— 11 —

By-Laws of the Academic Senate, Pages 11-12

Senate committees, it may provisionally approve Divisional regulations requiring Assembly ratification in accordance with By-Law 144 (C). Except as provided in (5) below, the Council shall not act if the matter can be included in the agenda of a regular Assembly meeting to be held within sixty calendar days after Divisional action. Such approval is effective until the end of the next following term in which a regular Assembly meeting is held. Each such Council action must be reported to the Assembly, which determines whether approval shall continue beyond the term herein specified.

(5) At the request of a Division and with the advice of the Committees on Educational Policy, Rules and Jurisdiction, and the consent of the committees whose jurisdiction is involved the Council may approve exceptions to Senate Regulations required by part-time degree programs under the jurisdiction of the Division. The duration of any exception may be specified by the Council, but in no case may it be more than four years.

Notice of affirmative Council decision shall be sent to all members of the Assembly. The Council's action shall take effect within two weeks following notification unless during that period 12 members of the Assembly request referral of the matter to the next meeting of the Assembly. Annually, the Council shall report to the Assembly the Council's decisions under this provision.

(6) The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs may submit to the Academic Council for final action on behalf of the Assembly proposals for the establishment of new graduate degrees submitted in accordance with By-Law 104 (B) (5), when such proposals cannot be included in the agenda of a regular Assembly meeting to be held within sixty calendar days after Committee action. (Am 7 Jun 72)

TITLE IV. STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

90. *Academic Freedom.* (A) *Membership.* This committee consists of one member from each Divisional Committee on Academic Freedom.

(B) *Duties.* This committee studies and reports to the Assembly upon any conditions within or outside the University which, in its judgment may affect the academic freedom of the University, its faculty, and its students, with particular reference to the acceptance of and resignation from positions in the University and to the reputation of the University and of individual members of the faculty and students. (Am 15 Jun 71)

92. *Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools.* (A) *Membership.* This Committee consists of one member from each Division normally serving three-year staggered terms.

(B) *Duties.* This committee

- (1) regulates the examination and classification of all applicants for admission to undergraduate status, and reports thereon to the Assembly. It has the power in exceptional cases to admit applicants with minor deficiencies.
- (2) It determines the basis of acceptance of the findings of the College Entrance Examination Board.
- (3) In passing on applications for advanced standing from other colleges and universities, it maintains the standards of preparation required of students who enter the University directly from California secondary

— 12 —

matters. It annually reports to the Assembly statistical information about applicants admitted to advanced standing, and about the scholastic achievement of students admitted as freshmen, and at appropriate intervals it reports on its policies and practices regarding admissions, specifying exceptions to Senate Regulations that have been permitted. (Am 15 Jun 71)

94. *Budget and Interdivisional Relations.* (A) *Membership.* This committee consists of the Chairman of the Assembly, one member from each Divisional Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations, and the Chairman, appointed by the University Committee on Committees from former Divisional Budget Committee chairmen.

(B) *Duties.* This committee

- (1) confers with the President on general policy concerning the University budget, appointments and promotions, and related matters;
- (2) reviews standards and policies applied by Divisional Committees on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations and advises the President thereon;
- (3) reports annually to the Assembly on its policies and practices. (Am 15 Jun 71)

96. *Committees.* (A) *Membership.* This committee consists of the Chairman of the Assembly, one member appointed by each Divisional Committee on Committees from its current membership to serve on the

University Committee on Committees for a two-year term, and two members at large named by the Assembly for two-year staggered terms. The Chairman of the Committee shall be chosen by the Assembly from the members at large for a one-year term. (Am 2 Dec 71)

(B) *Duties.* This committee

- (1) **appoints the chairman and all appointed members of all other Senate** Committees which report to the Assembly; (see, however, By-Law 6)
- (2) appoints a Senate member to serve *ex officio* for three years on the University Board of Patents and two Senate members to serve on the Governing Board of the University of California Retirement Systems in accordance with the Standing Orders of The Regents.

(C) This committee, or a committee nominated by it, is authorized to confer with the President, upon his request, concerning the appointment of a chief campus officer or a University-wide administrative officer. (Am 2 Dec 71)

97. Computer Policy. (A) *Membership.* This committee consists of one representative of the committee of each Division which is most closely concerned with computer policy.

(B) *Duties.* The committee represents the Senate in all matters of instruction and research policy involving the use of computers and advises the President concerning the acquisition and use of computers at the University. (En 3 Dec 74)

Revised 29 May 1975

— 41 —

Regulations of the Academic Senate, Pages 41-42

Chapter 4. Credit in Courses

Article 1. General Provisions

760. The value of a course in units shall be reckoned at the rate of one unit for three hours' work per week per term on the part of a student, or the equivalent.

762. No student, by performing additional work, may receive upper division credit for a lower division course or graduate credit for an upper division course.

¹ **764.** Credit in special study courses for undergraduates is limited to five units per term.

766. *Credit for Military Summer Camps.* (Rp 17 Nov 70)

768. *Credit for Summer Practice Cruises.* (Rp 17 Nov 70)

* For variances, see Appendix IV, pp. 65-66.

Article 2. Examinations

770. No student shall be excused from assigned final examinations, except as provided in SR 772 (D).

772. (A) Final examinations are required in all undergraduate courses, except as provided elsewhere in this Regulation. Whenever practicable each such examination shall be written and must be completed by

1. For variances, see Appendix IV, pp. 65-66.

all participants within a previously announced time limit. Examinations in non-laboratory courses may not exceed three hours' duration.

- (B) Examinations are normally not required in laboratory courses or their equivalent, as individually determined by the appropriate Committee on Courses. At its option, the department concerned may require a final examination in any laboratory course, subject to prior announcement in the schedule of classes for the term in question.
- (C) With the approval of the appropriate Committee on Courses and upon recommendation of the department concerned, the final examination may be omitted in any undergraduate course or sets of courses either once or for a longer period.
- (D) At the end of the term in which a student is expected to be graduated, his major department may examine him in the field of the major, may excuse him from final examinations in courses offered by the department during that term, and, with the approval of the appropriate Committee on Courses, assign a credit value to such general examination.

Article 3. Grades

778. (A) Under the conditions stated below, each Senate Division may determine the categories of grades used in reporting student work undertaken for credit under the jurisdiction of the Division.

(B) The grading system to be used by a Division and modifications thereof must be reviewed by the University Committee on Educational Policy and be certified for consonance with the Code of the Academic Senate [see By-Law 144] by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction. These Committees report their findings to the Senate Assembly for information. Thereafter

— 42 —

the proposed grading system becomes effective as provided by Divisional action unless the Assembly determines otherwise.

² 780. (A) Except as provided in SRs 778, 782, and 784, the work of all students in the University shall be reported in terms of six grades:

- (1) *passing*: A (excellent), B (good), C (fair), D (barely passing);
- (2) *not passing*: F (failure).
- (3) *undetermined*: Incomplete.

Grade points per unit shall be assigned by the Registrar as follows: A 4, B 3, C 2, D 1, F and Incomplete none.

(B) All grades except Incomplete are final when filed by an instructor in his end-of-term course report. However, the correction of a clerical or procedural error may be authorized as the Division directs. No change of grade may be made on the basis of reassessment of the quality of a student's work. No term grade except Incomplete may be revised by re-examination.

(C) Repetition of courses not authorized by the appropriate Committee on Courses to be taken more than once for credit is subject to the following conditions:

- (1) A student may repeat only those courses in which he received a grade of D, F, or *Not Passed* ; however, Divisions may authorize repetition of courses graded Incomplete. Courses in which a grade of D or F has been earned may not be repeated on a *Passed* or *Not Passed* basis.
- (2) Repetition of a course more than once requires approval by the appropriate dean in all instances.
- (3) Degree credit for a course will be given only once, but the grade assigned at each enrollment shall be

permanently recorded.

- (4) In computing the grade-point average of an undergraduate who repeats courses in which he received a D or F, only the most recently earned grades and grade points shall be used for the first 16 units repeated. In the case of further repetitions, the grade-point average shall be based on all grades assigned and total units attempted.

(D) The grade Incomplete may be assigned when a student's work is of passing quality, but is incomplete. The student is entitled to replace this grade by a passing grade and to receive unit credit provided he completes the work of the course in a way authorized by the Division. See Paragraph (B) above. He shall receive appropriate grade points only if he establishes that his work was incomplete for good cause. Each Division is authorized to adopt appropriate regulations for the administration of this grade.

(E) Modifications of this regulation must be approved by the Assembly. (Am 17 Nov 70)

³ **782.** Under such regulations as each Division may determine, a student in good standing is authorized to undertake up to an average of one course per term on a *Passed* or *Not Passed* basis. A grade of *Passed* shall be awarded only for work which would otherwise receive a grade of C or better. Units thus earned shall be counted in satisfaction of degree requirements, but such courses shall be disregarded in determining a student's grade-point average. Divisions wishing to undertake more extensive grading experiments shall submit individual proposals for consideration by the Assembly.

⁴ **784.** With the approval of the Graduate Council concerned, certain work of

* For variances, Appendix IV, pp. 66-78.

3. For variances, Appendix IV, pp. 66-78.

4. For variances, Appendix IV, pp. 66-78.