



Record of the Assembly

University of California Academic Senate

**Offices of the Secretaries:
(North) 320 Stephens Hall, Berkeley
(South) 3125 Murphy Hall, Los Angeles
May 25, 1976**

Contents

	PAGE
Addresses by:	
The President.	iii
The Chairman.	xi
Divisional Grading Systems, Amendments	
Berkeley: Regulation A201 (D) 4. (Repetition of Courses). . . .	xiv
Los Angeles: Regulation A307. Establish plus-minus grading options. . . .	xiv
Regulations A306, 7, 8, 13. Establishment of DR grade. . . .	xiv
Interim Planning Committee.	xv
Academic Council.	xv
Privilege and Tenure: Senate By-Law 112. University Committee. . . .	xvi
Privilege and Tenure: Senate By-Law 113. Divisional Committees. . . .	xvi
Educational Policy Health Sciences Subcommittee: Senate By-Law 102(c). . . .	xvii
Budget and Interdivisional Relations...	xvii
Committees. Reports.	xviii
1976-77 Committee Appointments.	Appendix
Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs.	xviii
Educational Policy: Subject A. Recommendations.	xviii
Library: Senate By-Law 108. Committee membership.	xix
University Welfare	
Coordination of UCRS with Social Security.	xix

Legislative changes will be printed as an Appendix to the next Notice of Meeting for inclusion in the Manual.

— ii —

Meeting

The Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Tuesday, May 25, 1976 at 10:00 a.m. in the California Room, Faculty Center, Los Angeles Campus, with a luncheon recess at noon.

Present: Professors R. A. Cockrell, Secretary (North); B. H. Herrick, Secretary (South); W. L. Bostick, Parliamentarian, and 38 voting members of the Assembly, as shown in the Attendance Record on page xxi of these minutes.

Present by invitation: Professors E. Bodenheimer, Chairman, University Committee on Privilege and Tenure; A. F. Charwat, Chairman, Los Angeles Committee on Educational Policy; R. Gerstein, Chairman, University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction; O. A. Johnson, Chairman, University Committee on Committees; S. J. Maisel, Chairman, Committee on University Welfare; and P. D. Sheats, Chairman, University Committee on Subject A.

Professor D. A. Wilson, Chairman, presided.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of March 4, 1976 were approved as distributed.

Secretary's Note: Professor Wilson announced for the record that a member of the press had been invited to attend the meeting for the specific purpose of taping the remarks of President Saxon.

— iii —

Announcements by the President: D. S. Saxon, May 25, 1976

President Saxon said that, although he had no announcements to make in the proper sense of the word, he would seize the opportunity to offer some remarks.

After careful perusal of the Assembly agenda, he found it an impressive list of serious and weighty matters, illustrating well the deliberate and thoughtful (at best), and glacial (at worst) nature of Senate considerations and actions. In particular, he noted on the agenda the difficult and subtle matters of the relationship of academic grades and student discipline, revision of the famous By-Law 112 concerning privilege and tenure, Subject A, and the array of topics discussed in the Report of the Interim Planning Committee. The last reveals glaringly the strongly held and widely divergent points of view throughout the University on a broad range of fundamental issues having to do with our modes of governance, of participation, and of planning. And not merely modes, also agendas.

President Saxon related how in the past year he has been to each campus at least twice and visited a number of other universities throughout the country. He spent time meeting with many university presidents and

— iv —

foundation heads, singly and in groups, to discuss educational issues. He has also spoken at meetings of faculty, alumni, and citizens. And he has listened to their questions. Most recently, he spoke to a group of his own neighbors on a topic suggested by them—Higher Education in the Bicentennial Year. President Saxon found that, in a sense, the talk summed up the major themes that had emerged during the past year. He identified these themes briefly:

First, the American character of American higher education. One characteristic thread running through American history has been the recognition that education is the essential element in filling the need for leadership based on ability and talent rather than rank. Another is the importance of universal education to a democratic society, which relies on the wisdom and informed intelligence of its people. Yet another thread is the peculiarly American merger of the practical and liberal arts, signaled by the signing of the Land Grant Colleges Act in 1862. With the melding together of undergraduate education with graduate education and research—first undertaken by Johns Hopkins University in 1876—the major outlines of American higher education were complete. The University of California is the embodiment and the

— v —

pinnacle of this kind of education, on every campus and in all its work.

As to the outlook for the future, President Saxon identified some problems and some opportunities. The problems:

- demographic trends, which indicate a levelling off of population in the country, perhaps even a decrease in the number of young people. This means an end of rapid growth for the University and a correspondingly new set of problems.
- financial stresses, which have to do with increasing pressure for public funds. The University must compete with ever larger sets of needs.
- changing personal goals, including signs of diminishing faith in the value of education for its own sake.
- the pressure of a tight job market, for both graduates and undergraduates. The public

— vi —

asks why the University wants to educate where there are no jobs.

- disappointed expectations, due in part to higher education's promising more than it can deliver.
- basic skills of entering students, which appear to be at a lower level than in years past.
- the possibility of collective bargaining and its effects on academic governance.
- the political climate in which the University must function. Two important elements in this climate are the controversy over egalitarianism versus elitism and governmental regulation versus academic freedom. President Saxon commented in particular on these last two.

The University is regarded by many as elitist, as excluding on inappropriate grounds many who should be here. Underlying this charge is a confusion between excellence and elitism, which are taken to be the same thing. They are not. The University, like all other

— vii —

segments of higher education, is mandated to seek excellence in everything it does. Equating the pursuit of excellence with a denial of equality of opportunity leads to a charge of elitism, a charge that is both inaccurate and injurious to the University in its efforts to persuade society to underwrite the costs of education. The University will not be able to defend itself against this charge unless it makes available the opportunity for higher education independently of race, sex, and color. At the same time, it must be made clear that while the University must guarantee equality of **opportunity**, it cannot guarantee equality of **result**. The problem of egalitarianism versus elitism is international in scope; in Holland, for example, there is a serious movement which would mandate admission to higher education by lot.

The University's role, in short, must be made absolutely clear. It cannot be all things to all people. It is one element in the mosaic of academic institutions whose special roles are defined by the Master Plan for Higher Education. The total spectrum of higher education in California includes the State University and Colleges System, the community colleges, and an array of private

— viii —

institutions as well, each of which makes its own special contribution. It is in our interest that the entire system

work well, because by itself the University of California cannot respond to all of the educational and social needs of the State.

Governmental regulation versus academic freedom: the debate over academic freedom has shifted its focus away from the question of individual freedom to the question of institutional freedom. Some years ago, the debate on this question centered on concern for the liberty of the individual to express his or her views without political interference. Today the issue is different. It has to do with concerns about certain research, for example, which is increasingly viewed as dangerous. Thus, questions about new life forms and to what extent individuals have the right to carry out research using recombinant DNA come up often. What is the protocol? A growing body of regulations governing research has resulted, and these regulations are especially onerous in the area of research on human subjects, particularly certain anthropological and social research. Many of these regulations are not necessarily inappropriate, and certainly freedom is not an absolute. The University must be responsible for its actions,

— ix —

including its research. But the trend toward increasing governmental regulation has already had a broad and pervasive impact on the University.

There are other examples, outside the area of the University's research function, which show the far-reaching effects of governmental regulation. Environmental impact reports affect the University's capacity to offer courses of instruction: for instance, whether we will be able to build a new School of Dentistry at San Francisco has been seriously in doubt because of environmental impact requirements. Affirmative Action requirements, occupational safety act regulations, data reporting requirements of the Federal government—all of these bear on the University and carry financial costs with them. The problem is not to avoid regulations, but to find the minimum amount of regulation necessary to protect legitimate social concerns.

But if there are problems, there are also opportunities. Times like these, when mistakes cannot be buried by growth, create the opportunity for serious scrutiny and rigorous evaluation of the University; rigorous evaluation, in fact, probably never goes on without the

— x —

spur of truly compelling circumstances. There is the challenge of equal opportunity, of making a renewed effort to extend full educational opportunity to those now underrepresented in the University. The key to the problem of equal opportunity is the educational process.

We need also to take seriously the whole question of careful selection of programs, to set aside those of lesser quality and significance and to concentrate on new activities of high promise. Finally, we have the opportunity to redefine our goals and re-examine the values which should underlie the education offered by the University. All of us will have important contributions to make.

This is a time of shaking out, for institutions and for people. President Saxon said he had no doubt that the remarkably talented people who constitute the University of California will make the most of these opportunities. He is optimistic about the University's future.

There were no questions from the floor, and Professor Wilson thanked President Saxon for his thoughtful remarks.

— xi —

Address By the Chairman: Professor D. A. Wilson

I would like to begin my announcements with the old bromide that we live in challenging times. My own suspicion is that everybody in any position of responsibility has a feeling of being challenged, sometimes to

the point of crisis. Nevertheless, I will take this opportunity to sketch outlines of the challenge or challenges the University and the Senate must face.

I will begin by reporting concretely on various activities that may be interpreted as responses to challenge and, therefore, as symptoms of the situation.

The first of these is the President's Task Force on Admissions. This Task Force, which was discussed at the last meeting of the Assembly, is now in business, having met twice. It is charged to deal with several interrelated questions: affirmative action; modification of admissions standards, particularly in reference to the proposal of BOARS¹; a restudy of the eligibility pool as required by the Master Plan and undertaken by CPEC²; and the experimental program in modified requirements for Junior transfers from community colleges. The Task Force which includes Senate representatives, as well as students and administration, will report to the President in the Fall of 1976. The report will then be considered by appropriate segments of the University, including the Senate, of course.

The political interest that has been aroused by this question of admissions is very great. There is concern from various groups that any changes will adversely affect them in some way or other. This interest, which is quite heated, may be interpreted as both complementary and insulting to the University because it shows that eligibility for admission is desirable while confidence in the University's capacity for fairness is not very great. Some flavor of this difficulty may emerge when we discuss Graduate Admission Standards later today. I think we must take that message very seriously.

A second activity that you should be aware of is a joint proposal from the Academic Council and the Student Body Presidents' Council to the President for the establishment of yet another task force: this one on teaching evaluation. The proposal would lay this task out in three pieces: to review the existing literature and experience on evaluation of university teaching; to extract those elements appropriate and applicable to teaching in the University of California; and to recommend means of implementing reliable, flexible and effective teaching evaluation methods for two purposes, viz., to assist faculty to improve their teaching and to assist various agencies to assess and weigh teaching effort. We hope this study will lead to some greater resolution of the difficulties in this area and some commensurate reduction of the rhetorical adventures so commonly pursued by one and all. With luck and support this task force should begin its work soon.

The need to examine with some clear vision the issue of faculty workload, particularly

— xii —

in teaching, is closely related, but different. The Academic Council, working with Senate committees and the administration, will be getting to this question in the near future. As yet, there is no enthusiasm in the University or in the agencies of government for iron formulas of class hours. There is a clear need for good and reliable measures and some sensible means for inducing modification in an effort to accommodate to various changes in circumstances.

A propos of changing circumstances, yet another committee has been set up to review within the University and, ultimately, in cooperation with CPEC the correct way of setting faculty compensation. There has been this year as much discontent revealed about that matter as in any year I can remember; discontent, not only with the amounts, but with the methods. At this very moment, there are at least four proposals active in the processes of assembling the University's budget. Each is a reflection of somebody's idea of how to do the calculations. I interpret this as a serious dispute about a matter of some considerable concern to members of the Senate. The University should have its own position in hand within a month and we hope that some consensus will develop before next year's budget is written. Incidentally, Senate committees and faculty employee groups will be urged to contribute to this job.

1. Board of Admissions & Relations with Schools
2. California Postsecondary Education Commission

To return to my theme of challenge, I will assert that the above-mentioned activities, that are the most important of their kind, are symptoms of a situation increasingly dominated by two pressures—constrained resources and expanded accountability. The University is getting better at dealing with these pressures through its improving planning processes. The Senate is, also, getting better at assuming its proper role in these planning processes, as you will hear at least briefly later in the report of your Interim Planning Committee.

We have been brought up to believe that the University by its internal means establishes its educational policies, drafts its plans, develops and implements its programs, teaches its courses and gives its degrees. This conception of educational autonomy for the University is now being strongly challenged both in the State and nationally.

ITEM: The Governor would have us limit our enrollments.

ITEM: The Governor's Office would have us speed up our Ph.D. programs.

ITEM: Some in the Legislature would have us change the proportion of graduate and undergraduate students.

ITEM: Some in the Legislature would have us design our student body by ethnic and sex categories.

ITEM: Some in the Legislature would instruct us on what professionals to train.

ITEM: Some in the Legislature would have us separate teaching and research as components of faculty activity.

ITEM: Some in the Legislature would instruct us to undertake certain kinds of research.

ITEM: Some in the Legislature would hand over part of our funds for instruction (and, therefore, curriculum planning) to an external agency.

— xiii —

ITEM: Some in the Legislature would regionalize higher education and thus break down the Master Plan assignment of mission.

Not all of these ideas are evil, bad or unproductive; but they sum up to a substantial challenge to our capacity to form our own policies and plans. Privacy legislation, that might result in open personnel files, is a particular case in point. You will remember at the March meeting our lengthy discussion of the Taylor Committee Report and the need to develop procedures that yield the substance of information in files and provide various safeguards while, at the same time, protecting confidentiality of sources. There are two bills about this matter now in the Legislature. The Academic Senate was able to develop with the authors language in each of these bills that would permit the protection of confidentiality of source of evaluation, as long as the subject of the file has access to the text or a comprehensive statement of the substance of the document. A small segment of the University community appears to find this provision insufficient. Unwilling or unable to persuade the University of the validity of their extravagant suspicions, this group has solicited non-University political alliances to impose its view on the University faculty by legislation. It is too bad, but we need to pull ourselves together to deal with the substantial challenge implicit in these matters with the confidence that we know what we are about.

I am most concerned that there may be among us some loss of confidence in what we are dedicated to do. "Brothers," said Ulysses, "ye were not formed to live like brutes, but to follow excellence and knowledge." We are assembled in the University of California to live by that belief. That is the great challenge. We are required to select as students and colleagues those most able to follow knowledge because it is, as A. E. Housman said, "not merely a means of procuring good but is a good in itself, simply; it is not a coin which we pay down to purchase happiness; but has happiness indissolubly bound up with it."

We appear to be living in a time when the dominant public value of the society, of which the University is a necessary and appropriate part, is equality. We may all have our own personal and idiosyncratic reactions to this situation. Most of us, I am sure, welcome the drive for equality as noble in itself and appropriate to American society. Nevertheless, we should not blink at the fact that we are all part of an institution—the

University of California—that finds its very foundation on a principle of selectivity. Selectivity applies to our students, to ourselves and colleagues, and to the programs that we involve ourselves in, whether they be teaching or research programs. It is an inescapable part of all that we do. The people of California presumably support the University in the expectation that it will provide the best possible education, the best possible research, the best possible environment for learning. We are assembled as a University; to discover and to nurture that vocation for learning is one of the noblest characteristics a person can have. Those ends cannot be accomplished without selection. We, of course, are asked to do other things besides mere learning. We are asked to be useful; we are asked to be of service. This is also proper. One of the useful services we are being asked for these days is to enhance and enlarge the area of equality in

— xiv —

life. This expectation is sometimes seen, both by ourselves and by others, as in conflict with our principle of selectivity. If this conflict were real, we would be doomed. But the conflict need not be real. The appearance of conflict arises from a confusion about the basis of selectivity. The basis appears, from certain perspectives, to be capricious or arbitrary or prejudiced. But it must not be. If we can agree that our central purpose is to further learning for its own sake and to discover and nurture the vocation for learning in ourselves and in our students, we may have the beginning of a clarification of this confusion. If we can then go on to define clearly what the general idea of learning means concretely in our own fields, we will move forward substantially toward understanding the apparent conflict. That is a basic planning task of the faculty.

We are said to be elitist and we are defensive about it. But surely our aim to support a learned elite needs no defense. If we glance about in this bicentennial year of choosing leaders—and what is an elite but a community of leaders—we surely share a pang of longing both for some leadership and some learning. This country must have a leadership of science, of humanism, of arts, of professions. Our trust is to maintain that leadership even though it also means that we must enjoy and share with our young friends that “least perishable of pleasures,” the pleasure of learning and knowing.

* Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Amendments to Divisional Grading Systems

Berkeley Regulation A201. (Notice, p. 3)

The proposal for amendment to Berkeley Regulation A201(D)4 (Repetition of Courses) was approved unanimously without discussion.

Los Angeles Regulations A306, A307, A308, A313, A315. The Chairman of the Los Angeles Committee on Educational Policy, Professor A. F. Charwat, was present to provide clarification on the proposed changes in the regulations, as well as to review the history of his committee's actions.

Professor Graham moved to amend the language of proposed Regulation A315 [Notice, p. 8] as follows:

The report of the grade DR must be accompanied by a letter from the instructor to the dean of the school or college, **[add]**, *and to the student*, stating the basis for the action.

The amendment was seconded, and passed.

Professor Viswanathan moved the following:

A307(A) be amended to delete:

The passing grade A may be modified by a minus (-) suffix.

The sentence immediately following the deleted sentence above should be amended to read:

The passing grades A, B, C and D may be modified by (+) or minus (-) suffixes.

Amend A307(B) as follows:

'Plus' grades carry three-tenths grade point more per unit and 'minus' grades

— xv —

carry three-tenths grade point less per unit than suffixed grades. The grade A+ carries 4.0 grade points, the same as for unsuffixed grade A; but when A+ is reported, it represents extraordinary achievement.

Professor Fretter registered disapproval of attempts by the Assembly to modify Divisional grading proposals. In his view, they should either be approved or returned to Divisions without approval. The question was posed to Professor R. Gerstein, Chairman of the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, of whether the Assembly had the authority to amend grading code proposals. Professor Gerstein thought that, although perhaps possible, such amendments were inappropriate.

The vote was taken on the series of Viswanathan amendments and they were defeated.

The main motion, with the amendment proposed by Professor Graham, was passed unanimously.

Interim Planning Committee

Professor Fretter moved that the report of the IPC be received by the Assembly but be returned to the Interim Planning Committee for further consideration and action.

The motion carried unanimously.

Professor F. H. Ridley (Los Angeles) was commended for her outstanding contribution to the Assembly in distilling the massive accumulation of data into the well-coordinated Addendum to the Notice.

Professors Fretter and Wilson recently visited the nine campuses to discuss program review processes. Their reports will be released to the various campuses in the near future.

The Interim Planning Committee met recently in Tiburon with administrators and staff persons to discuss improvement in components of the Senate and in Senate-Administration relations. Because of its almost exclusive attention to personnel matters, the UCBIR was identified as of limited usefulness as a resource tool for systemwide planning. The concept of a permanent planning committee was endorsed and the proposal for the formal establishment of such a committee will be submitted to the Assembly in December.

Academic Council

Professor Fretter being in the chair, Professor Wilson presented the Academic Council report.

— xvii —

1. PRIVILEGE AND TENURE

Professor Wilson yielded the floor to Professor Bodenheimer, Chairman of the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure. Professor Bodenheimer explained that the report grew out of a recommendation of the Taylor Committee Report on Personnel Records and urged endorsement. Rules

and Jurisdiction Committee Chairman Gerstein warned the Assembly that the Senate cannot extend jurisdiction to non-Senate faculty under strictures imposed by the Standing Orders of The Regents. He reported that Regents' General

— xvi —

Counsel interprets the Standing Orders specifically to exclude non-Senate faculty from protection under the Privilege and Tenure auspices.

Professor Wilson moved adoption of the revised Senate By-Law 112, new Senate By-Law 113, and the resolution to implement By-Law 113 (Notice, pp. 8-13). There was discussion of extension of jurisdiction to all officers of instruction and of alternatives to existing legislation.

Professor Laties moved, and it was seconded, to amend 113(A) (1) (a) by inserting “officer of instruction” so that it would read:

Any member of the Academic Senate or **officer of instruction** may complain to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure of his Division. ..

There followed a brief discussion in which Professors Adams, Bodenheimer, Bovell, Laties and Wilson participated.

The vote was then taken and the amendment failed to carry.

Professor Raleigh moved to amend 113(B) (1) (b) to follow the proposed text of that section, as follows:

Whenever a confidential faculty file is under scrutiny by a Committee on Privilege and Tenure, a member of the Budget Committee shall be for that occasion an *ex officio* member of the Privilege and Tenure Committee.

Subsequently, with Professor Raleigh's consent, that amendment was changed to add words, as follows:

Whenever. .. Budget Committee **or its analogue** shall be. ..

The motion was seconded and discussed by Professors Bodenheimer, Buffa, Garbarino, Michaelsen, Viswanathan, Volman and Wilson.

The vote was then taken and the amendment failed to carry.

Professor Nevius presented a proposal from the Los Angeles Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure to amend 113(B) (1) (e), as follows:

If no settlement can be reached, the Committee, **may, in its discretion**, conduct a formal hearing in accordance with the provisions set forth. ..

Following seconding, there was a brief discussion by Professors Bodenheimer, Bovell and Gerstein.

The vote was then taken and the amendment failed to carry.

Professor Garbarino moved, and it was seconded, to amend 113(B) (3) (d), as follows:

No evidence other than that presented at the hearing *or available from inspection of personnel files*

shall be considered. ..

This amendment failed to carry.

The motion, as originally proposed, to revise Senate By-Law 112, to enact Senate By-Law 113, and to approve the resolution passed by unanimous vote.

2. ENACTMENT OF SENATE BY-LAW 102(C) (Notice, pp. 13-14)

Professor Wilson moved to enact Senate By-Law 102(C), Educational Policy Health Sciences Subcommittee, and the motion was unanimously approved.

3. OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Professor Wilson announced that Professor Fretter, of the Berkeley Campus, will serve as Chairman of the Assembly and the Academic Council in 1976-77 and that the Academic Council nominates as Vice Chairman, Professor John S. Galbraith of the Los Angeles Campus.

There being no additional nominations, this nomination was confirmed by unanimous vote.

For the Committee on Committees, Professor Wilson stated that the Academic Council nominates Professor O. A. Johnson, Riverside, for Chairman 1976-77, and Professor A. C. Helmholtz, Berkeley, for at-large member 1976-78.

Both nominations were confirmed by unanimous vote.

4. REALLOCATION OF DIVISIONAL REPRESENTATIVES TO THE ASSEMBLY (Notice, p. 14)

This report was received.

5. SCHEDULE OF ASSEMBLY MEETINGS

The following schedule of meetings for 1976-77 was announced:

Wednesday	December 1, 1976	Los Angeles
Wednesday	March 2, 1977	Berkeley
Wednesday	June 1, 1977	Los Angeles ³

* Unless the March meeting is cancelled, in which case this meeting will be held in Berkeley.

6. MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Professor Wilson informed the Assembly that despite his request for postponement of Regental action to allow the Senate opportunity to study the Regents' report, The Regents rejected the Academic Senate Investment Memorial. Copies of The Regents' report will be furnished to the Divisions.

7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECORD KEEPING

3. * Unless the March meeting is cancelled, in which case this meeting will be held in Berkeley.

Professor Wilson reported that the Academic Council, responding to a recommendation of the Special Committee on Long Range Educational Objectives and Academic Planning (CLREOAP), has been conducting a study of ways to improve records management of statewide Academic Senate materials. A final report is anticipated in August 1976.

Professor Wilson resumed the chair.

University Committee on Budget and Interdivisional Relations

Professor Raleigh, Chairman, reported no items for discussion.

— xviii —

University Committee on Committees

Professor O. A. Johnson, Chairman, reported that the 1975-76 Committee changes listed following the heading "Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools" (Notice, p. 16), should read "Budget and Interdivisional Relations." He then submitted the list of 1976-77 Committee Appointments for the information of the Academic Senate. Copies were distributed at the meeting and the appointments are printed as an appendix to these minutes.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

Professor DeVay, Chairman of CCGA, introduced the report (Notice, p. 17), and explained the various premises from which the recommendations originated. He moved approval of the resolution to raise the minimum grade point average for entering graduate students to 3.3 and to require the Graduate Record Examination for admission.

Professor Wilson recognized Mr. Jeff Koon, Vice-Chairperson Elect, Graduate Assembly (ASUC), Berkeley. He urged the Assembly to defeat the resolutions for a variety of reasons. (A copy of his remarks is on file with the Secretary's papers of this meeting.)

Professor Rosen moved to return the report to CCGA for further study and more thorough consultation by the Divisions. The motion was seconded.

For the benefit of CCGA's future deliberations, the Assembly continued to discuss the proposal. Sentiment was expressed against legislation which mechanically reduces numbers admitted. The CCGA report, some thought, did not demonstrate a decline in standards affecting student performance. A greater exercise of judgment, rather than the imposition of rigid standards, was believed by many speakers to be desirable.

The motion to return the report to CCGA was passed by a vote of 21 to 13.

University Committee on Educational Policy

Professor Fawcett, Chairman of UCEP, presented the report (Notice, pp. 23-25), and moved that it be approved and be referred to the University Committee on Subject A for implementation.

Professor Wilson read to the Assembly a letter from the Subject A Committee as follows:

May 24, 1976

Dear Professor Wilson:

At its meeting of May 8, 1976, the Statewide Committee on Subject A asked me to convey the following points to you, in the hope that you will convey them to the Assembly during its consideration of the University Committee on Educational Policy report on Subject A.

- (1) In supporting the recommendations of UCEP, the committee wishes to re-emphasize

— xix —

its belief in the value of Subject A, or its equivalent, as a practical response to the present need for university-level instruction in composition.

- (2) We would emphasize too the adverse educational effects of the present confused status of Subject A with regard to the fee and the denial of credit. Both stipulations have the effect of discouraging student attempts to improve writing, and they do so inequitably.
- (3) The cost to the University of abolishing the Subject A fee is not negligible, but in view of its end—literacy—this cost, we feel, is by no means excessive.
- (4) In regard to the use of Subject A as an admission requirement, we call to your attention the attached statement by Mr. Everett L. Jones, Supervisor of Subject A at UCLA.

Respectfully submitted

B. T. Clark (SC)

E. Evans (SB)

R. A. Flores (I)

M. R. Krom (D)

T. O. Pelzel (R)

G. D. Stout (B)

D. T. Wesling (SD)

P. D. Sheats (LA), Chairman

Professor Sheats, Chairman of the Committee on Subject A, was present and endorsed the motion.

The motion to approve the report and refer it to the Committee on Subject A was put to vote and passed.

University Library Committee

The report of the Library Committee was presented by Professor Wilson.

The University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has reviewed the proposed change in Committee membership and found it to be consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate. Professor Buffa then moved that the amendment be approved.

The amendment to Senate By-Law 108. Committee Membership (Notice, p. 26) was approved by unanimous vote.

Unfinished Business

A question about timely implementation of the recommendations of the Taylor Report (mandated by Assembly action on March 4, 1976) was raised. Professor Wilson responded that the action to revise Senate By-Law 112 and enact Senate By-Law 113 (Privilege and Tenure) and the concurrent administrative review of the matter is evidence of timely action.

University Welfare

Professor S. J. Maisel, Chairman of the Committee on University Welfare, noted that 12 percent of the faculty had voted to coordinate their UC Retirement System benefits with Social Security, while 88 percent did not. He disaggregated these benefits by age: of those aged 60 and over, 35 percent voted to coordinate; of those 40 and over, 22 percent; while, of those aged 39 and under, only 7 percent saw

— xx —

coordination in their own interests. He noted, as well, that the abstention rate, equivalent to a “no” vote, was 40 percent of all employees.

Professor Maisel moved that the Assembly refer the matter of UCRS coordination with Social Security to the Academic Council and that the Academic Council draft a recommendation on this matter to The Regents. The Academic Council should, in any recommendation of approval, recommend that approval be dependent on the opportunity for a second vote for those who have not yet coordinated and, prior to that vote, a sample survey be taken to determine why people voted “No” so The Regents might take action prior to the second vote to remove all possible impediments to coordination.

The motion carried unanimously.

Second Roll Call

Professor Cockrell called the roll.

Professor Rosen moved a special thanks to Professor David A. Wilson for his excellent work as Chairman during the year.

The motion was approved by acclamation.

Adjournment: 4:00 p.m.

Attest:

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

B. H. HERRICK, *Secretary* (South)

— xxi —

Attendance Record

Names of Members	Dates of Meetings 1975-76		
	Dec. 4	March 4	May 25
<i>President of the University</i>			
D. S. Saxon	*	*	*
<i>Officers</i>			
D. A. Wilson, Chr. (LA)	*	*	*
W. B. Fretter, V-Chr. (B)	4	*	*
<i>Ex Officio:</i>			

Names of Members	Dates of Meetings 1975-76		
	Dec. 4	March 4	May 25
<i>1. Committee Chairmen</i>			
J. E. DeVay, CCGA (D)	*	*	*
C. W. Fawcett, UCEP (LA)	*	*	*
J. H. Raleigh, UCBIR (B)	*	*	*
<i>2. Chairmen of Divisions</i>			
J. E. Adams (SF)	*	5	*
C. R. Bovell (R)	*	*	*
E. S. Buffa (LA)	*	*	*
R. E. Connick (B)	*	*	*
R. Michaelsen (SB)	*	*	*
H. S. Moyed (I)	*	6	*
S. B. Puknat (SC)	*	*	*
J. W. Rosen (D)	*	*	*
S. Schultz (SD)	*		
<i>Divisional Representatives</i>			
<i>Berkeley</i>			
G. F. Chew	*	*	
J. W. Garbarino	*	*	*
M. H. Graham	*	*	*
R. L. Jones	*		
J. F. Kirsch	*	*	
D. McEntire	*	*	*
H. K. Schachman	*	*	
J. V. Wehausen	*	*	*
<i>Davis</i>			
R. A. Bankowski	*	*	*
R. M. Love		*	
J. R. Owens	*	*	*
K. Thompson	*		*
D. H. Volman	*	*	*

5. A Alternate attended

6. A Alternate attended

Names of Members	Dates of Meetings 1975-76		
	Dec. 4	March 4	May 25
<i>Irvine</i>			
K. Moldave	7	*	*
G. Van Hoven		8	
<i>Los Angeles</i>			
U. Batzdorf	*	*	*
P. M. Bentler	*	9	*
A. E. Coddington	*	*	*
G. G. Laties	10 *	11	*
W. T. Marrocco	*	*	*
B. R. Nevius	*	*	*
R. H. Pruppacher	12	13	
C. R. Viswanathan	*	*	*
R. Vosper		*	*
<i>Riverside</i>			
R. Mankau	*	*	
W. H. Reynolds	*	*	*
<i>San Diego</i>			
S. H. Chodorow	*	*	
C. W. Helstrom	*	*	*
N. M. Kroll	*	*	*
<i>San Francisco</i>			
R. D. Coleman	*	*	*
M. M. Grumbach	*	*	
M. Sokolow	*	*	
<i>Santa Barbara</i>			
D. O. Caldwell	*	*	*
A. S. Lindemann	*	*	*

-
- 7. A Alternate attended
 - 8. A Alternate attended
 - 9. A Alternate attended
 - 10. R Replacement
 - 11. A Alternate attended
 - 12. A Alternate attended
 - 13. A Alternate attended

Names of Members	Dates of Meetings 1975-76		
	Dec. 4	March 4	May 25
<i>Santa Cruz</i>			
M. Kanen	*	*	

A—Alternate attended

L—Leave

- Secretary's Note: A Vice Chairman for UCEP was not appointed for 1975-76.

— xxii —

Appendix: Committees of the Academic Senate, 1976-77

CHAIRMAN: W. B. Fretter

VICE CHAIRMAN: J. S. Galbraith

Academic Freedom

S. R. Barnett (B) (Law), Chm
 I. Feinberg (SF) (Psych)
 M. P. Fleischer (D) (Hist)
 B. A. Hamkalo (I) (Mol Biol; Biochem)
 D. A. Huffman (SC) (Info Scis)
 A. S. Lindemann (SB) (Hist)
 M. B. Nimmer (LA) (Law)
 M. Orans (R) (Anthro)
 C. W. VanAtta (SD) (App Mec & Eng Scis)

Affirmative Action

D. L. Bunker (I) (Chem), Chm
 N. Byers (LA) (Physics)
 M. F. Dallman (SF) (Physiol)
 W. R. Ellis (B) (Arch)
 F. Gaffney (SD) (Drama)
 J. Haywood (R) (Blk St & Hist)
 W. S. Lotter (D) (Phys Ed)
 M. Ramirez (SC) (Psych)
 ----- (SB)

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools

A. Parducci (LA) (Psych), Chm
 R. Barrutia (I) (Span & Port)
 T. M. Christie (SF) (Oral Biol; Dent)
 J. P. Euben (SC) (Politics)
 G. Herman (D) (French & Ital)
 J. Pippenger (SB) (Econ)
 D. Pirtz (B) (Civ Eng)
 A. R. Stralka (R) (Math)

A. Wagner (SD) (Drama)

Board of Patents

H. A. Harper (SF) (Biochem)

Budget and Interdivisional Relations

¹⁴ D. L. Olmsted (D) (Anthro), Chm

H. B. Fairley (SF) (Anesthesia)

N. M. Kroll (SD) (Physics)

D. E. Kaun (SC) (Econ)

C. P. Nash (D) (Chem)

C. B. Spaulding (SB) (Sociol)

S. E. Sperling (R) (Psych)

L. A. Sullivan (B) (Law)

E. J. Weber (LA) (Hist)

----- (I)

Ex officio : Chairman, Assembly W. B. Fretter (B)

Computer Policy

J. A. Howard (SB) (EECS), Chm

E. R. Berlekamp (B) (EECS)

K. L. Bowles (SD) (App Phys & Info Sci)

J. H. Clark (SC) (Info Scis)

A. L. Comrey (LA) (Psych)

S.-Y. Fung (R) (Physics)

G. A. E. Gall (D) (An Scis)

D. L. Rector (I) (Math)

J. A. Starkweather (SF) (Med Psych)

Editorial

E. C. Carterette (LA) (Psych), Co-Chm

R. Ornduff (B) (Bot), Co-Chm

C. R. Adrian (R) (Pol Sci)

S. P. Atkins (SB) (German)

R. J. Baskin (D) (Zool)

E. F. Colson (B) (Anthro)

J. Conlisk (SD) (Econ)

D. J. Crowley (D) (Anthro)

M. G. Grene (D) (Philos)

G. W. Hilton (LA) (Econ)

R. H. Kellogg (SF) (Physiol)

U. C. Knoepfelmacher (B) (Engl)

R. D. Lehan (LA) (Engl)

J. R. Primack (SC) (Physics)

R. L. Regosin (I) (French)

I. Scheiner (B) (Hist)

J. W. Wilkie (LA) (Hist)

Ex officio: Dir, Univ Press A. Fruge

Education Abroad Program

Senate appointees:

R. I. Frank (I) (Hist & Class) 1978 ¹⁵, Chm
L. W. Bowden (R) (Geog) 1978
H. W. Clarke (SB) (Comp Lit) 1977
G. N. Schrauzer (SD) (Chem) 1978
----- (SC)

Appointed by the President:

W. A. McCormack (B) (1 year)
----- (SF) (1 year)
----- (D) (2 years)
----- (LA) (2 years)

— xxiii —

Educational Policy

¹⁶ C. A. Dekker (B) (Biochem), Chm
E. H. Clinkscale (R) (Music)
R. H. Doi (D) (Biochem)
J. R. Gusfield (SD) (Sociol)
C. V. Harris (SB) (Hist)
G. G. Laties (LA) (Biol)
J. L. Palmquist (I) (Math) F
J. A. Starkweather (SF) (Med Psych)
S. Ushioda (I) (Physics), W, Sp
S. M. Williamson (SC) (Chem)
M. Wolins (B) (Soc Welf)
Ex officio: Chairman, Assembly, W. B. Fretter (B)

Gov. BD., UC Ret. Systems

Y.-P. Chen (LA) (Econ) (June 1978)
R. C. Goshay (B) (Bus Ad) (June 1977)

Graduate Affairs, Coordinating Committee on

¹⁷ -----, Chm.
F. H. Bauml (LA) (German)
M. M. Clark (SF) (Anthro)
R. W. Dutton (SD) (Biol)
O. T. Hanna (SB) (Chem Eng)
N. M. Lambert (B) (Educ)
M. Morello-Frosch (SC) (Span Lit)
J. S. Semancik (R) (PI Path)
P. I. Yahr (I) (Psychobiol)
Y. C. Zee (D) (Vet Microbiol)
Ex officio: Pres Univ, D. S. Saxon

Library

15. Terms of office end August 31 of year indicated

16. *Ex officio* member of the Academic Council

17. *Ex officio* member of the Academic Council

A. Wright (SD) (Lit), Chm
R. D. Campbell (I) (Devel & Cell Biol)
W. J. Deal (R) (Chem)
H. L. Fields (SF) (Neurol & Physiol)
D. L. Foley (B) (CRP)
W. R. Hitchcock (SC) (Hist)
H. Kirker (SB) (Hist)
R. N. Schwab (D) (Hist)
R. R. Sonnenschein (LA) (Physiol)

Privilege and Tenure

C. M. Brodsky (SF) (Psych) 1978¹⁸, Chm
N. Abrams (LA) (Law) 1979
A. F. Bennett (I) (Devel & Cell Biol) 1979
R. J. Berger (SC) (Biol & Psych) 1978
E. Bodenheimer (D) (Law) 1978
E. J. Fantino (SD) (Psych) 1977
R. Hanna (R) (Engl) 1978
G. Leitmann (B) (Mec Eng) 1977
G. Wade (SB) (EECS) 1977

Research

A. J. Trevor (SF) (Pharm), Chm
P. B. Blair (B) (Bact & Im)
W. Z. Hirsch (LA) (Econ)
M. Marcus (SB) (Math)
W. A. Mason (D) (Psych)
J. S. Miller (SC) (Astron)
C. L. Perrin (SD) (Chem)
A. Starr (I) (Med)
M. O. Woodburne (R) (Geol)

Rules and Jurisdiction

Members at large:

R. Gerstein (LA) (Pol Sci), Chm
I. M. Hall (R) (Insect Path)
T. N. Tozer (SF) (Pharm Chem)

Chairmen of Divisional Committees:

A. B. Manaster (SD) (Math)
R. L. Wiegel (B) (Civ Eng)

Subject A

B. T. Clark (SC) (Russian), Chm
A. F. Charwat (LA) (Mec & Struct)
J. J. Duggan (B) (French)
E. Evans (SB) (Engl)
T. O. Pelzel (R) (Art Hist)

E. T. Schell (I) (Engl & Comp Lit)
J. F. Shackelford (D) (Mec Eng)
D. T. Wesling (SD) (Lit)

Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes

E. C. Pauling (R) (Biol), Chm
S. Bates (LA) (Engl)
R. E. Garrett (D) (Ag Eng)
P. R. Gray (B) (EECS)
M. M. Levin (SC) (Psych)
R. G. Linck (SD) (Chem)
M. Orton (I) (Math)
C. T. Peng (SF) (Chem & Pharm Chem)
M. L. Weiss (SB) (Math)

— xxiv —

University Extension

C. A. Gooding (SF) (Radiol; Pedi), Chm
J. R. Arnold (SD) (Chem)
H. H. Aschmann (R) (Geog)
N. J. Bershad (I) (EE)
B. O. Phinney (LA) (Biol)
M. D. Roger (B) (Libr)
P. Shapiro (SB) (Econ)
D. J. Swanger (SC) (Educ)
----- (D)

University Welfare

S. J. Maisel (B) (Bus Ad), Chm
W. D. Morgan (SB) (Econ)
M. O'Brien (D) (Ag Eng)
R. H. Ruby (SC) (Physics)
V. H. Rumsey (SD) (App Phys & Info Scis)
R. Schinzinger (I) (EE)
H. A. Steiner (LA) (Pol Sci)
L. D. Tuck (SF) (Chem & Pharm Chem)
C. G. Uhr (R) (Econ)
Ex officio: Senate member of UCRS—R. C. Goshay (B) (Bus Ad)

Interim Planning

(A Special Committee of the Assembly)
J. S. Galbraith (LA) (Hist), Chm (V-Chm, Assem)
C. A. Dekker (B) (Biochem) (Chm, UCEP)
D. T. Cattell (LA) (Pol Sci) 1978 ¹⁹
W. B. Fretter (B) (Physics) (Chm, Assembly)
----- (Chm, CCGA)
K. Moldave (I) (Biolog Chem) 1977
D. L. Olmsted (D) (Anthro) (Chm, UCBIR)

19. Terms of office end August 31 of year indicated

* Terms of office end August 31 of year indicated

+ *Ex Officio* members of the Academic Council

Committee on Committees, 1975-76

D. J. Angelakos (B)

A. C. Helmholtz (B)

D. S. Hobbs (LA)

M. D. Jendresen (SF)

T. P. Jenkin (R)

J. C. Lave (I)

D. McClellan (SC)

J. E. Myers (SB)

S. J. Singer (SD)

K. Thompson (D)

D. A. Wilson (LA), *Ex officio*

O. A. Johnson (R), Chairman