



---

## Record of the Assembly

*University of California Academic Senate*

**Offices of the Secretaries:  
(North) 320 Stephens Hall, Berkeley  
(South) 3125 Murphy Hall, Los Angeles  
December 7, 1976**

---

— i —

## Contents

---

	Page
Addresses by:	
The President. . . .	ii
The Chairman	vii
Divisional Grading Systems	xi
Part I. Berkeley, Irvine and Santa Barbara	
II. Variances to Senate Regulations Davis, Irvine and San Diego	
III. Irvine proposal (Credit/No Credit grade)	
Annual Reports, 1975-76	xii
Academic Council	xiii
Part I. Legislative changes	
II. Proposed change to Semester System	
III. Proposed Memorial to Regents—Senate Membership for Clinical Professors	
IV. Governor's Advisory Committee on selection of Regents—Senate representation	
V. Variances to Senate Regulations	
VI. Secretariat, Academic Senate	
VII. Collective Bargaining	
Committees	xvi
Graduate Affairs	xvi

Part I. Change to By-Law 106. Graduate Councils

II. Joint or Group Graduate Programs

University Welfare

xvi

Social Security Coverage Information

## Appendix

Annual Reports, 1975-76

xx

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools Committee on Computer Policy

— ii —

## Meeting

The Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Tuesday, December 7, 1976 at 10 a.m. in the California Room, Faculty Center, Los Angeles Campus, with a recess at noon.

Present: Professors W. B. Fretter, Chairman, presiding; R. Gerstein serving as Acting Parliamentarian; R. A. Cockrell, Secretary (North); V. A. Dearing, Secretary (South); and 43 voting members as shown in the Attendance Record on page xix of these Minutes.

Present by invitation: Ms. G. Graham, Coordinator of Academic Affairs for the Student Body Presidents' Council.

Professor Fretter announced that members of the press were also present.

## Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of May 25, 1976 were approved as distributed.

## Address by the President: D. S. Saxon

My topic today was developed with some advice from Bill Fretter on what might be of interest to you. I encourage you to let him know your concerns prior to the Assembly meeting this spring as I shall again be seeking his advice concerning appropriate topics for discussion.

I want to make a few remarks about how I view the present state of the University's external relations—with the general public and with state and federal officials.

The University's external relations (like those of other institutions) haven't been particularly good in recent years. As I see it, this is the result of several factors: first, the aftermath of campus disturbances; second, disappointment because of over-expectations about our ability to help solve society's problems; third, anxiety about rising costs and taxes, especially in a period of recession; fourth, concern about “over-education” and the resulting focus on vocationalism instead of liberal education; and finally, confusion of the University's missions and aims of excellence with so-called “elitism.”

These attitudes are partially responsible for what the *Chronicle of Higher Education* last month announced in headlines as a “New Wave of Pessimism Sweeping Some Academics” (a kind of selective sweep, I guess). But I don't share that pessimism.

It seems to me that the pessimism is an over-response to some fairly understandable if unfortunate public reactions to events. In any event, I think the main force of these reactions has subsided except for lingering concerns about elitism and the focus on vocationalism. In addition, there has been a recent, rapidly growing, public

— iii —

reaction to taxes, especially property taxes, and this obviously has consequences for us.

I have spent some time this year in regional visits and other public forums, and note some shift in public attitudes. I sense no longer a great chilling wind of hostility toward the University. There is some hostility toward education, but the target has shifted toward elementary and secondary schools (somewhat unjustly, I assert) for alleged failures to teach basic skills. There is no groundswell of support either, but the newspapers are not unfriendly. We seem to be in a new period of neutral feelings about the University—with a few exceptions I'll turn to shortly.

I was interested to note two articles recently, one in the *Los Angeles Times* dealing with what the *Times* saw as the major issues with which the Legislature will be dealing. First on the list was tax relief and, secondly, school financing, but not a word about higher education. In a similar article in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the major legislative issues were stated to be property taxes, disposable bottles, farm labor, BART and highways. Again there was no reference whatever to higher education in California.

This relatively quiescent period creates a more favorable environment than existed a decade ago for dealing with the merits of academic issues, both within the University and in relations with the Governor, the Legislature, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

It is, of course, easier to work with these smaller groups than having to try to persuade some 20 million people to change their strongly held views. Our efforts are thus somewhat more likely to have significant impact.

A good example of the tenor of the times is the task required by the new eligibility pool study, which will benefit by careful analysis sheltered from excited reactions. It is interesting to note that the original intent was to review the eligibility pool every five years. This plan was followed in 1961 and 1966, but skipped in 1971 for obvious reasons. There has been widespread concern about the outcome of the present study because of the ten-year interval and because of the potential impact of grade inflation. The result of the new study is that the present admissions pool is about 14.8% instead of the upper one-eighth, or 12.5%. These findings show need for some changes but no grounds for great public concern (or private either). Deviations are almost of the same magnitude as those of the two prior studies and will call for the same sorts of adjustments. I hope the University can accomplish these without arousing distracting and unwarranted public charges of:

1. Increasing elitism in selection of student body. This needs to be explained carefully and thoughtfully.
2. Seeking to maintain high enrollments for budget justification. We need to make it clear that we are not seeking to manipulate enrollments to bring in resources.
3. Placing new barriers between the University and outreach to minorities. Special care is needed here.

— iv —

It is noteworthy that previous adjustments produced no significant change in participation rates (which seems to argue for the importance of self-selection).

Now I want to say a word about an administrative action that has been taken regarding the admissions program for advanced standing transfer students. You will recall that the Senate authorized a four-year experiment

allowing students who were not originally eligible as freshmen to transfer from community colleges to the University with a GPA of 2.0 instead of 2.4. The overall plan was to try this experiment for four years with evaluation taking place in the fourth year. This is the fourth year.

The data about student performance on which this evaluation would be based became available this month. The Task Force on Undergraduate Admissions will initiate the evaluation process in connection with its coordinated general review of undergraduate admissions matters. Subsequently, of course, BOARS must complete its own separate evaluation. Clearly this can't be completed until rather late in this academic year.

The outcome of the evaluation may result in a return to the 2.4 GPA level, or it may not. We cannot in good conscience prejudge the evaluation. Nor can we, I have concluded, change the ground rules for community college transfer students without adequate forewarning to the community colleges. Therefore, Systemwide Administration has announced that the community colleges will have at least one year lead time for any policy changes, and that no modifications in current policy will be implemented for Fall 1977.

Professor Fretter has been consulted about this question, and he concurs with this course of action. BOARS was informed and raised no objections. I wanted to notify you of this action. I'm sure you will be informed in due course of the outcome of the BOARS evaluation of this experiment.

Despite the generally subsiding level of public emotion about the University, some issues will inevitably attract public interest, and often hostility. It is important to explain our position as clearly and forthrightly as possible each time so that hostility on specific issues is tempered at least somewhat by understanding, if not agreement, with our actions and, more important, so that hostility is likely to be limited to immediate issues rather than generalized.

## **The Bakke Case**

An example of one such issue is the Bakke case, now under appeal to the United States Supreme Court. The case concerns special admissions to the University and their constitutionality. The case is an important and extremely complicated one, important not only to the University of California but to higher education throughout the country. There is a wide variation of feeling in the matter and broad disagreement on what is morally right, legally permissible, and what is a strategically sound course of action.

I suspect a majority of the general public disagrees with the University's special admissions program and with our carrying the appeal to the Supreme Court. They

— v —

see no need for any further ruling at all. Why not let matters stand as the California Supreme Court has ruled, they ask.

And then, on the other hand, there is intense criticism from many members of the minority community who fear the outcome, who fear that the U.S. Supreme Court will uphold the case because it either cannot, or will not, be well argued. Do not expose the entire country to our disease, they assert.

But we are going forward with the appeal. The case won't go away whether we like it or not. The DeFunis case has been influential for years, beyond even the area of higher education. And this despite the fact that the United States Supreme Court did not rule on it. The Bakke case exists and no matter what the outcome, it will have a decisive influence throughout the country.

A particular point to be made here goes beyond the purely legal aspects. Special admissions programs which are racially insensitive will surely result, at least initially, in some decrease in the number of minority students in the University. No one knows how much or for how long. The only study I know of concerning this matter was at Boalt Hall at Berkeley. It was their opinion that the Bakke decision would lead to a substantial decrease

in the numbers of minority students in the School of Law. I am convinced that any such decrease would place us in an intolerable position with regard to our commitment to equal opportunity.

## **Federal Audits**

Another issue which attracts public comment and criticism is that of Federal audit reports. The University is primarily concerned with research results of federally supported programs. We need to recognize that the general public may not appreciate those research results fully (though we must try harder to convey these). But the public does react to such newsworthy matters as allegations of inadequate accounting. We need to be able to respond to such charges. Many institutions of higher education across the country are currently under this kind of scrutiny—what has happened is that accountants, rather than program officers, are now in charge of federal programs. Of course, care must be given to how and when federal funds are expended. But I assert that, in most cases, expenditures have been and are entirely justifiable. Nevertheless, it is absolutely essential to keep careful records. Criticisms are easily levied against improperly documented expenditures for faculty summer salaries, equipment purchases, charges for computing, staff vacation benefits, and the like. This requires a certain amount of planning ahead. We are experiencing a difficulty in dealing with some agencies of the federal government in that they now seem to view us as a kind of industrial operation providing services to the government which are accountable in the industrial sense. Perhaps with the new Administration in Washington this atmosphere will change. The problem is one which is in turn blamed on Congress, OMB, and HEW. Regardless of who is at fault, we must sharpen up our procedures.

President Saxon then responded to questions from the floor. One question from Professor Caldwell concerned the level within the University at which negotiations

— vi —

with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare are underway. President Saxon replied that such activities are taking place within the President's office but urged that faculty inform campus Contracts and Grants Offices of problems they encounter.

Regarding the Bakke case, the question (Professor Graham) was raised as to whether General Counsel is up to the job of handling the appeal. The President responded affirmatively and added that the General Counsel is being aided by Professor P. J. Mishkin (B) and J. B. Owens, Attorney (law firm of Orrick, Herrington, Rowley and Sutcliffe, San Francisco).

Professor Glassburner wondered if the results of the study to establish the admissions percentages were viewed with surprise. He wondered if the results indicate that there is in fact no grade inflation. The President felt that those persons who enter the University have been preparing for it and are in a sense self-selected. He wondered if those students who found themselves to be at the tail end of admissibility to the University decide by self-selection against attempting their higher educational goals at the University in favor of other institutions. Other high school students may not have prepared themselves for the University through completing the A-F requirements, and thus, despite possible high grade point averages, are not eligible for admission to the University.

Professor Bentler wondered what the minority percentage is in the transfer students whose GPA's were 2.0 to 2.4. President Saxon said that he did not know the answer, that in general the University had found it difficult to obtain data of that sort. Professor Fretter reported that there are some data which will be made available.

Professor Lofchie asked the current status of open access to personnel files. President Saxon reported that the Governor has issued an Executive Order and that a committee, under the chairmanship of Professor H. W. Horowitz (UCLA), is drafting a policy statement which will meet the spirit of the Executive Order. However, we expect that bills may be introduced which would legislate the outcome. Thus the urgency of the implementation of the University's own code is obvious.

Professor Lofchie inquired about collective bargaining. There are currently three or four bills which we expect will be introduced. The most worrisome bill to the University, according to President Saxon's staff, would extend the Rodda bill to the University and would not take into account the role of the Academic Senate in the shared governance of the University. The President promised that he would work as hard as he can to protect shared governance. He observed that, for various reasons, the pressure to bring about collective bargaining legislation is less intense than three or four years ago. He identified CSEA (California State Employees Association) as one agency which continues to give it high priority.

Professor Osborne asked the current status of the attempt to establish a public policy emphasis for the University, proposed by, among others, State Assemblyman John Vasconcellos. The President responded that that bill, along with one which attempted

— vii —

to shift a portion of the University's budget to the CPEC in the name of support for innovative education, had not passed. The public policy research proposal was one in which a sum of money was identified after which a program for its use was to follow. The President observed that such procedures have historically been ineffective.

Professor Viswanathan asked for the President's opinion of the semester/quarter consideration. The President, who was himself a veteran of the UCLA subcommittee dealing with transfer from semester to quarter system some years ago, replied that while Vice Chancellor at UCLA he had thought there would be strong sentiment from both students and faculty to return to the semester system and was astonished subsequently when he and Chancellor C. E. Young looked into the matter and found students opposed and faculty divided. He noted that there are excellent schools under each of the systems and does not believe that a case can convincingly be made in support of either system strictly on the basis of educational policy. It thus becomes a matter of how strongly people feel about the question. In the absence of broadly based, enthusiastic support, he sees nothing to be gained, and a great deal of hard detailed work, in making such a change.

Concluding the question and answer period, Professor Fretter thanked the President for his presentation.

## **Address by the Chairman: Professor W. B. Fretter**

I call your attention to the Annual Report of the Academic Council and the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents, 1975-76. This report, prepared by David A. Wilson, is printed on pages 30 through 36 of the Notice of this meeting. The report describes the numerous activities of the Academic Council and the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents, many of which are continuing items, carrying over to this year. I shall report briefly on current activities and issues.

### **Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents**

Although Professor Wilson reported general satisfaction as to the nature of this representation, he expressed the opinion that the exclusion of the Faculty Representative from so-called "Regents Only" sessions, which are concerned with certain types of personnel actions, was awkward, and could be important. I can report to you that this situation has now been resolved. President Saxon asked the Regents in September to modify their rules regarding participation of the Faculty Representative, and the Regents agreed, with the result that the Faculty Representative now may attend all meetings of the Board and its committees, and is excluded from none. I am personally grateful to President Saxon for initiating this action.

As Faculty Representative, I have spoken formally to the Board on two occasions, and informally on several others. I spoke at some length at the November meeting on "Preparation for Admission to the University," discussing admissions requirements, remedial courses, and current efforts being made to reduce the amount of

remedial work being offered in the University through cooperation with the high schools, especially in English composition. I also made a brief statement in November on the Conflict of Interest Code.

## **Conflict of Interest Code**

Proposition 9, passed in 1974 as an initiative by the voters of California, requires that all “public agencies” promulgate a conflict of interest code for certain specified officers and members of those agencies. The Board of Regents, acting on advice of its General Counsel, Mr. D. L. Reidhaar, is proceeding to develop such a code and submit it to the Fair Political Practices Committee, a state agency created by Proposition 9 to administer such codes. Several Senate Academic Freedom Committees and one Division expressed concern that administration of such a code by an outside agency might have the effect of diminishing academic freedom in the University. The Academic Council took up the matter, received legal opinion from Mr. Reidhaar and Professor S. R. Barnett (B), Chairman of the University Committee on Academic Freedom, and other communications from faculty members. Discussions in three successive Council meetings resulted in the following statement, which I read to the Board of Regents.

I want to bring to the attention of the Regents the concern felt by some members of the faculty and the Academic Council as to the implications of the administration of the University's proposed Conflict of Interest Code by an agency in Sacramento. Several Academic Freedom Committees and one Division of the Senate, while accepting the need for a conflict of interest code, fear its impact on academic freedom if the code is administered by an outside agency.

There is no discernible disagreement in the Senate about the need for a Conflict of Interest Code for the University that would apply equally to faculty, administration, and Regents. But the concerns about academic freedom have been brought to the attention of the Academic Council, which has discussed the matter in three successive meetings.

The Council has not come to a consensus about the perceived threat to academic freedom. It is deeply concerned, however, that the autonomy of the University, in a broad sense, has been eroded in recent years, and application of Proposition 9 to the University represents a continuation of that erosion. The Council also reached no consensus as to the desirability of resisting this particular proposition. Clearly, major questions of broad public and University policy are involved. But we call on The Regents, working with the Faculty, to resist further attempts to reduce the University's autonomy. When Regents take a stand resisting incursions on the autonomy of the University, they can be assured of the support of the faculty and the Academic Senate.

## **Faculty Workload**

A subcommittee of the University Committees on Budget and Interdivisional Relations and Educational Policy has been established to recommend policy on

faculty workload, including teaching—both in classrooms and in individual consultation, as well as research and service. This committee, chaired by Professor Milton Hildebrand (D), has as a starting point a document prepared by Professor Wilson, entitled “Faculty Effort: A Statement of the Problem,” which outlines the issues to be studied. The committee will look into the present procedures for reporting and calculating faculty teaching load, and attempt to enunciate a general policy or a set of guidelines to be followed by departmental chairpersons or others responsible for setting faculty workload. It will report to the two parent committees, which will then report to the Council and to the Assembly. Other members of the subcommittee are: Professors L. Davis (LA), J. M. Ellis (SC), L. Porter (I), D. Templeton (B) and R. Wedding (R).

## **University Policy on Consulting and Outside Activities**

At the request of President Saxon, the Academic Council has nominated two members of the Senate, Professors W. Frazer (SD) and J. Galbraith (LA), to be members of a committee to recommend on policy on consulting and related matters. A similar *ad hoc* committee has been established on the Berkeley campus. Other members of the Systemwide committee are: E. Barrett (D), G. Maslach (B), L. Sammet (Chairman), F. Sherwood (LA), and H. Wellman (B), chairman of the Berkeley committee.

Recommendations of this committee will be submitted to the Senate by the President for advice and comment prior to promulgation of University policy on consulting.

## **Confidentiality of Personnel Records**

In two successive years the Legislature passed bills which would have substantially changed our procedures with respect to confidential personnel records. In 1975, it was the Moscone Bill vetoed by Governor Brown on the grounds of excessive expense in the process, not because of concerns about the effect it would have on University personnel practices. The handwriting was on the wall for all to see, and a committee, under the chairmanship of then University Provost A. E. Taylor, made recommendations on changes in the personnel process which might forestall further legislative action. This was not to be; the Legislature passed the Roberti Bill, only to see it vetoed by the Governor. This time, however, he issued an Executive Order on personnel records, and indicated that he expected the University to comply with it. In the meantime, a committee under the chairmanship of Vice Chancellor H. W. Horowitz (LA) has been working to translate the policy recommendations of the Taylor Committee into language of the Administrative Manual.

The modifications proposed in the academic personnel process, including the handling of confidential documents, are designed to retain the element of confidentiality of source but not of substance, and to establish the rights of a faculty member who is being reviewed for promotion or merit increase. Copies of the proposed Manual changes have been forwarded to the UCBIR and the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure, as well as to members of the Academic Council.

— x —

In addition, copies have gone to all Chancellors, with instructions to consult with the relevant divisional Senate committees. Comments by all these agencies are due by December 31, 1976, and it is hoped that a final version can be adopted by the end of January 1977.

## **Range Adjustment in Salaries**

As has been customary, the Administration has consulted with the Academic Council and the UCBIR on the proposed range adjustment for 1977-78. A small change in the methodology was made to take into account the effects of inflation in a more accurate way, but otherwise, for this year, the methodology of using comparison institutions remains the same. The administrative committee (which has Senate members) is continuing to consider possible changes in methodology to take place in 1978. The Statewide Administration will recommend a 6.77% range adjustment for 1977-78.

## **Academic Program Review**

One of the time-consuming tasks undertaken by Chairman Wilson and myself last year was to participate in the development of a program review handbook, devoted to descriptions of current academic program review processes on all the campuses, comments on their efficacy, and suggestions for improvements. This was a joint Senate-APPRB (Academic Planning and Program Review Board) effort, and the result is a publication which some of you may have seen. It is intended to go to all Senate agencies participating in academic program



review, and will be revised in the summer of 1977 to take into account changes made in the processes during the current year and suggestions made by faculty as to how it can be improved. Academic program review is of vital importance in these days of steady-state budgets, and it is our hope that the booklet will be helpful in the process.

## **Sex Discrimination in Grading**

Federal regulations provide that, with respect to alleged sex discrimination in “any academic, extracurricular, research, occupational training, or any other education program or activity,” the University “shall adopt and publish grievance procedures providing for prompt and equitable resolution of student and employee complaints alleging any action which would be prohibited by this part.” The Academic Council is coordinating activities of the Divisions designed to ensure compliance with these regulations. No attempt has been made as yet to impose a uniform set of procedures systemwide; but as campus procedures are developed, it may be possible to develop systemwide guidelines.

The most difficult aspect that has emerged is the question of how to resolve alleged sex discrimination in grading. Such an allegation could imply violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct and thereby involve Privilege and Tenure procedures. Adequate redress for a student might involve a change in a grade by some agency other than the individual professor, a procedure clearly fraught with danger to academic standards. Several campuses have worked out procedures, others are attempting to do so; and the Council, by providing an information link among the

— xi —

campuses, is assisting in the task. The Council has designated UCEP as the committee to collect information on campus procedures, compare them, determine whether they can be considered to meet the requirements of Federal law, and make recommendations to the Council on appropriate actions to be taken. I hope that, by the end of the Winter Quarter, campus procedures will be in place and the Council will be in a position to report on them to the Administration.

## **Divisional Grading Systems**

### **Part I**

Professor Gerstein, Acting Parliamentarian, ruled that grading proposals do not require Assembly ratification unless variances are requested.

**Thus, the following changes to Divisional Grading legislation were received:**

Berkeley: Regulations A204, A205 and A206 (Passed/Not Passed and Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory grades)  
[Notice, page 3]

Irvine: Regulation 503. Minimum Grade Requirement in the Major [page 6]

Santa Barbara: A20(E). (In Progress grade) [page 8]

A question was asked about inconsistencies in grading on various campuses particularly with respect to grades C and C- when applied to “pass” or “not-pass” grading. Professor Dekker, Chairman of the Committee on Educational Policy, reported that UCEP is collecting materials from all campuses and will look into this question if variation is found.

### **Part II**

The following variances to Senate Regulations were then presented.

Davis: A533 (Independent Study program), variance to SR 764 [page 5]

**The motion to approve the variance carried without dissent.**

Irvine: Variance to SR 800(C) (1) [page 5], effective Fall 1976

The proposal to permit instructors on less than half-time appointments to teach concurrent courses was presented by Professor Hubert and her motion to approve was seconded. In the discussion, a question was raised as to the justification for the variance. Professor Dekker noted that it would provide consistency in the grading of registered and non-registered students taking concurrent courses. Professor Volman commented that this is a broad Senate issue to be dealt with systemwide and moved that the motion be tabled, which was seconded; but when put to vote, failed to carry.

Professor Kreith moved an amendment, which was seconded and passed, that the variance be granted for one year, contingent upon formulation of a systemwide policy by UCEP.

**The motion to approve the variance, as amended, carried without dissent.**

— xii —

San Diego: Regulation 600(G). Subject A Requirement [page 6] [Variance to Senate Regulation 636]

Professor Miles moved approval of the Variance, effective Fall 1976, which was seconded.

**When put to vote, the motion carried without dissent.**

### **Part III**

Irvine: (proposed) Regulation 348 (Credit/No Credit grade) [page 6]

Professor Hubert asked that the proposed addition to the Irvine Grading System be withdrawn until the Division could respond to questions raised by UCEP, and it was so ordered.

## **Annual Reports**

Professor Fretter asked that the Annual Reports, printed as Appendix I to the Notice of Meeting and those of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools and the Committee on Computer Policy, be received on the Consent Calendar which had been inadvertently omitted from the Agenda. The BOARS and Computer Policy Reports were distributed separately to Assembly members and are printed as an Appendix to these minutes.

Professor Cockrell, Secretary (North), called attention to disestablishment of the School of Criminology (B), noted in the UCEP Annual Report (page 41). He explained that those students enrolled in the School are being accommodated under Berkeley's provision for temporary programs.

Professor Orbach requested that the Report of the Library Committee be removed from the Consent Calendar and it was so ordered.

**When put to vote, the Consent Calendar was approved.**

### **Library Committee—Annual Report, 1975-76**

Professor Orbach expressed concern about the first sentence of the Report (Notice, page 43) which reportedly found that Committee at a comparative disadvantage in advice to the Administration. He also wondered what

had happened as a result of the Committee recommendation that contrary to the Wedding Report (Special Committee on Long Range Educational Objectives and Academic Planning, Assembly Minutes, May 29, 1975), more funds be spent on acquisitions than on service. Professor Frost suggested that discussion of the second paragraph, concerning support for the Berkeley and Los Angeles libraries, also ought to be amplified.

Professor Fretter reported that the first draft of the long-awaited Library Plan has been received and will be made available. He will invite Professor A. Wright (SD), Chairman of the Library Committee, to address the next meeting of the Assembly, scheduled for March 3, 1977. It was suggested that Mr. S. R. Salmon, Executive Director of Library Planning, also be invited to address the Assembly at that time.

Professor Graham suggested a similar address by the Chairman of the Committee

— xiii —

on Computer Policy. Professor Fretter said that he will extend the invitation when he meets with that Committee.

**The motion to receive the Annual Report of the Library Committee carried.**

## **Academic Council**

### **Part I. Proposed establishment of a Standing Committee on Planning and Budget and related By-Law changes**

Professor Galbraith, Vice Chairman of the Assembly, took the chair, following the luncheon recess, while Professor Fretter presented the Report of the Academic Council (page 8, Notice).

Professor Fretter described the circumstances leading to presentation of modifications in existing legislation, enactment of By-Laws 91 and 110, and deletion of present By-Law 94. He noted further that these changes have the coincidental effect of changing By-Laws 50 and 80. He then moved, and it was seconded, that the legislative changes, as proposed, be approved.

Professor Cockrell, as Secretary of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and in the absence of Professor Ruibal, Chairman of CCGA, moved an amendment to the proposed change to By-Law 104 (page 11), to reflect concerns of CCGA and the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, as follows:

104. Graduate Affairs, Coordinating Committee on

(A) Membership

This Committee consists of the President of the University and one member from each Divisional Graduate Council and two members at large who shall be former, but not present, Divisional Graduate Council Chairmen or members, appointed for two-year staggered terms. Each at large member would serve as Vice Chairman in the first year and succeed to the Chairmanship in the second year of the two-year term. No more than four members of the Committee shall be Deans or other corresponding officers of Graduate Divisions. No Dean or corresponding officer of a Graduate Division may be appointed Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Committee.

**The motion to amend was seconded and approved.**

Professor Olmsted moved, and it was seconded and passed, that the Secretaries be authorized to make the necessary changes in By-Laws 50 and 80, as noted earlier by Professor Fretter and, particularly, to provide *ex officio* membership of the Chairman of the newly established Committee on Academic Personnel on the Assembly and the Academic Council.

**The vote was then taken on the main motion, as amended, and it was passed, approving the following legislative changes:**

By-Law 91. Academic Personnel (enacted)

It was noted that this By-Law supersedes present By-Law 94. Budget and

— xiv —

Interdivisional Relations; however, those now serving as members of UCBIR will comprise the new Committee on Academic Personnel.

By-Law 96. Committees (amended) Correct typographical error to read, “where specified in the By-Laws”.

By-Law 102. Educational Policy (amended)

By-Law 104. Graduate Affairs (amended)

By-Law 110. Planning and Budget (enacted) Members to be appointed.

Note: These changes will be printed separately for inclusion in the Manual of the Academic Senate.

## Part II. Proposed Change to the Semester System

Professor Fretter asked that the Order of Business be revised to accommodate a member of the UCLA faculty; however, dissent was voiced so discussion proceeded according to the Agenda in the Notice of Meeting. Professor Bovell then moved the Resolution “That the effectiveness and quality of teaching will be enhanced by returning to a two-semester system” (page 12, Notice), which was seconded. Each campus then reported briefly on its activities concerning the proposed return to the Semester system.

Semester versus Quarter System: Tabulation by Division					
SEMESTER					NUMBER VOTING
Division	Early	General	Late	Quarter	Remarks
Berkeley		2:1			Action by Representative Assembly, June 1976; 80 members attending, but no count taken
Davis	41%		13%	46%	836 of 1200 Senate members
Irvine		15		14	Vote taken by Representative Assembly
Los Angeles:					
Faculty		59.7%		38.1%	Vote taken last year; at Town Meeting Fall 1976 strong sentiment against Semester system
Students		1800		5000	± 7000; 10:1 in favor of 4-course load
Riverside	39%		12%	47%	75% of membership voted concerned about effect on science courses; copy of Division's statement filed with Secretary's papers
San Diego	7:4	46%		54%	Interest on campus is low.

Semester versus Quarter System: Tabulation by Division					
SEMESTER					NUMBER VOTING
Division	Early	General	Late	Quarter	Remarks
San Francisco				46:1	Concerned about effect on courses shared with Berkeley
Santa Barbara		60%		40%	Vote taken Spring 1974
		65%		35%	Vote taken 1976; shift toward Early Semester
Santa Cruz:					
Faculty		45%		55%	If return to Semester, then overwhelmingly for Early Semester
Students				81%	

— xv —

Professor Fretter welcomed Ms. G. Graham, Coordinator of Academic Affairs, speaking for the Student Body Presidents' Council. She summarized pros and cons of both systems, but strongly endorsed retention of the Quarter system, based on the arguments of course diversity and depth, small-class size, potential for greater concentration on fewer classes per term, flexibility of multi-quarter courses. (A copy of her remarks is filed with the Secretary's papers of this meeting.)

It was suggested that discussion be terminated because of the wide variety of opinion and the President's declaration to pursue the matter with The Regents only if based on strong faculty and student endorsement. Professor Galbraith moved that action on the main motion be deferred until the June meeting of the Assembly, which was seconded. Professor Bovell supported this motion, noting that there is no uniformity in the questions posed to the various Divisions. He also suggested that a common statement of issue be posed to all campuses. Professor Volman commented that the voting has not been based on the effect the proposed change would have on educational quality. He then moved that the Academic Council amend the motion in line with Professor Bovell's remarks when the motion is presented at the June meeting.

**Professor Raven moved to terminate debate on the amendment, which was seconded and passed.**

**When put to vote, the amendment failed.**

Professor Orbach urged that the matter be kept open to allow the Los Angeles Division to complete its study.

**Professor Helstrom then moved the previous question, which was seconded and passed.**

**When put to vote, the motion to defer action on the Resolution to the June 2, 1977 meeting of the Assembly was approved.**

### **Part III. Proposed Memorial to Regents concerning Senate membership for Clinical Professors [page 21]**

Reports from various Divisions were negative and others requested additional information. Professor Grumbach, speaking for the San Francisco Division, indicated that the purpose of presenting the proposed Memorial had been to obtain the larger University viewpoint. He then moved that the proposed Memorial be

returned to the San Francisco Division for further study and resubmission at a later date, which was seconded.

**When put to vote, it was agreed to defer consideration of the proposed Memorial to the next meeting of the Assembly.**

#### **Part IV. Senate Representation on the Governor's Advisory Committee on Selection of Regents [page 21]**

Professor Fretter presented the nomination of Professor A. A. Maradudin (I) to continue in this capacity, with a term ending June 30, 1977 and Professor Glassburner moved approval, which was seconded.

**When put to vote, the motion passed.**

— xvi —

#### **Part V. Action on Variances to Senate Regulations**

[page 22, Notice; page xi, Minutes]

#### **Part VI. Secretariat of the Academic Senate [page 22]**

Professor Fretter informed the Assembly of the appointment of Professor V. A. Dearing (LA) as Secretary (South) of the Academic Senate for a five-year term, ending with the Fall 1981 meeting of the Assembly.

#### **Part VII. Collective Bargaining, Special Committee of the Academic Council [page 22]**

Professor Fretter asked for continuance of the Committee. Professor Vosper then moved approval, which was seconded.

**The motion, when put to vote, passed unanimously.**

### **Committee on Committees**

Professor Cockrell, as Secretary of the Committee and in the absence of Professor O. A. Johnson (R), Committee Chairman, presented the supplementary Senate Committee Appointments for 1976-77 [page 22] for the information of the Assembly.

### **Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs**

Professor Cockrell, as Secretary of CCGA and in the absence of Committee Chairman, Professor Ruibal, presented the Report [page 23, Notice].

#### **Part I. Revision to By-Law 106. Graduate Councils**

Professor Cockrell presented the proposed amendment to By-Law 106, and moved its approval, which was seconded. The amendment reads:

106(B). Duties

...

11. regulates in other ways the graduate work of the Division with a view to the promotion of research

and learning, especially through its regular reviews of current graduate programs for their quality and appropriateness.

**When put to vote, the amendment was approved without dissent.**

## **Part II. Joint or Group Graduate Programs**

Professor Cockrell stated the report had been presented orally at the May 25, 1976 meeting of the Assembly by Professor J. E. DeVay (D), Chairman 1975-76, and was printed in the Notice for information of the Assembly.

Professor Orbach raised a question about funding for these programs and Professor Fretter suggested that this is a matter appropriately addressed to the newly established Committee on Planning and Budget and agreed to refer it to that Committee when the members have been appointed.

— xvii —

## **University Welfare**

In the absence of the Committee Chairman, Professor S. J. Maisel, and at the request of Vice President A. Kleingartner (Academic Staff and Personnel Relations), Professor Cockrell read the following statement:

### **Social Security Coverage Information**

All University employees who are members of the University Retirement Plan *without Social Security* will be given a second opportunity to coordinate with Social Security in April 1977.

Full details are contained in an Official Notice which each eligible UCRS (University of California Retirement System) member will receive in January 1977. A Social Security Request Card for a statement of Social Security covered earnings and quarters of coverage will be enclosed with the Official Notice. UCRS members who have had previous Social Security coverage, or who have current Social Security coverage through self-employment or concurrent non-University employment, should use this card to receive a statement of their covered earnings and quarters of coverage under Social Security. This statement will be necessary to estimate future benefits on which a decision about joining Social Security through UCRS will be based, in part.

Because of the time required by Social Security to respond to these requests, Social Security Request Cards *must be mailed before the end of January 1977*, to assure receipt of statements in time to participate in Social Security coordination counseling programs that are scheduled for February-April 1977.

University employees who did not obtain statements of Social Security covered earnings in 1976 should request them as soon as possible. University employees who received earnings information from Social Security in 1976 need not request another statement if they have records of outside earnings covered by Social Security for 1975 and 1976.

Campus and Laboratory Benefits Counselors will have a limited supply of Social Security Request Cards on hand after December 15, 1976, for eligible UCRS members who wish to request Social Security statements before receiving cards with the Official Notice in January 1977.

**Adjourned.** 2:55 p.m.

Attest:

R. A. Cockrell, Secretary (North) V. A. Dearing, Secretary (South)

— xix —

# Attendance Record

Names of Members	Dates of Meetings 1976-77		
	Dec. 7	Mar. 3	June 2
PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY			
D. S. Saxon	*		
OFFICERS			
W. B. Fretter (B), Chm	*		
J. S. Galbraith (LA), VChm	*		
EX OFFICIO			
1.COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN			
D. L. Olmsted (D), UCAP	*		
C. A. Dekker (B), UCEP	*		
R. Ruibal (R), CCGA			
2. CHAIRMEN OF DIVISIONS			
J. E. Adams (SF)			
C. R. Bovell (R)	*		
J. B. Glassburner (D)	*		
R. R. Hubert (I)	*		
R. Michaelsen (SB)	*		
R. L. Orbach (LA)	*		
S. B. Puknat (SC)	*		
J. H. Raleigh (B)	*		
H. York (SD)	1		
DIVISIONAL REPRESENTATIVES			
<i>Berkeley</i>			
D. Blackwell	*		
J. W. Garbarino			
M. Graham	*		
E. C. Halbach			
M.-H. Huet	*		
D. McEntire	*		
J. V. Wehausen	*		

1. A —Alternate: J. W. Miles for H. York



Names of Members	Dates of Meetings 1976-77		
	Dec. 7	Mar. 3	June 2
<i>Davis</i>			
J. R. Goss			
J. W. Kendrick	*		
K. Kreith	*		
R. M. Love	*		
D. H. Volman	*		
<i>Irvine</i>			
K. Moldave	*		
C. K. Whalen	*		
<i>Los Angeles</i>			
H. S. Astin	*		
P. M. Bentler	*		
M. F. Lofchie	*		
Y. Mintz	*		
B. R. Nevius	*		
A. E. Osborne	*		
B. H. Raven	*		
C. R. Viswanathan	*		
R. Vosper	*		
<i>Riverside</i>			
D. C. McCollum	*		
W. H. Reynolds	*		
<i>San Diego</i>			
S. H. Chodorow			
C. W. Helstrom	*		
H. Stern	*		
<i>San Francisco</i>			
M. M. Grumbach	*		
V. L. Olesen	*		
M. Sokolow	*		
<i>Santa Barbara</i>			

Names of Members	Dates of Meetings 1976-77		
	Dec. 7	Mar. 3	June 2
D. A. Caldwell	*		
W. Frost	*		
<i>Santa Cruz</i>			
J. F. Bunnett	*		

A—Alternate

J. W. Miles for H. York

*Secretary (North): R. A. Cockrell*

*Secretary (South): V. A. Dearing*

*Parliamentarian: W. L. Bostick*

— xx —

## Appendix: Assembly of the Academic Senate

### Minutes—December 7, 1976

#### Annual Reports 1975-76

		Page
1.	Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools. . . .	<a href="#">xxi</a>
2.	Committee on Computer Policy. . . .	<a href="#">xxii</a>

— xxi —

#### Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools: Annual Report 1975-76

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) was instructed by the Assembly to consider and report its recommendations on two specific issues:

- (1) processing of student applications; and
- (2) validity of present A-F requirements.

After study by a subcommittee and input from various sources, it was the sense of BOARS that it did not have practical suggestions for changing the processes by which student applications are evaluated and admission decisions are made in the University. Within current policy constraints, the admission process appears to be working reasonably well. In particular, no one favors a single point of receipt of applications. The redirection process is a matter of continuing administrative review, and we are impressed that this process has been much improved in recent years.

The A-F requirements were clarified for high school principals but without changing the course names. In English, BOARS specified that the required six semesters contain “substantial, recurrent practice in

writing expository prose compositions of some length"; minimum performance objectives were also specified. Although not ruling out drama, speech and journalism, such courses must meet the same objectives as English. Performance objectives were also described for foreign language, with increased emphasis on oral expression and conversation. In mathematics, courses containing significant material in such areas as arithmetic, shop, consumer or business mathematics were ruled not acceptable.

The 1975-76 BOARS also recommended that greater emphasis be placed on the use of standardized tests in the selection of freshmen. This proposal for modifying admission procedures was seconded by the University Committee on Educational Policy and presented to the Academic Council. Further action by the Assembly has been delayed until completion of an eligibility survey of high school seniors. Results of this survey will almost certainly require redefinition of the pool of eligible seniors to reduce it to the 12.5% specified by the Master Plan. Although this is expected to have only marginal effects on overall enrollments, it will be a splendid opportunity to insure a selection of students better prepared for University work. BOARS will probably be forwarding recommendations for admission changes to the Assembly at a later meeting this year.

Respectfully submitted

R. Barrutia (I) L. J. Faulkin (D) D. C. Gunnell (SF) P. C. Laris (SB) D. Pirtz (B) A. R. Stralka (R) W. B. Thompson (SD) A. Parducci (LA), Chairman  
November 29, 1976

— xxii —

#### **Committee on Computer Policy: Annual Report 1975-76**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Computer Policy Committee was initially appointed by the Academic Senate during the 1974-75 academic year and retained as a standing committee during 1975-76. Its membership includes one representative from each campus, as noted below.

The Committee met five times during 1975-76, alternating meeting sites between the Los Angeles and San Francisco airports. At least seven campuses were represented at all meetings and, on two occasions, each campus sent a member or delegate. The meetings over the initial two allotted by the Senate were approved by Professor D. A. Wilson, Chairman, Academic Council, as necessary in view of the many items requiring immediate attention by this group.

The chief role of the Committee during 1975-76 was to provide academic support for the administrative Computer Policy Board. This support was officially provided by the ex officio membership on the Board of the Committee's chairman. In addition, however, the Committee provided in many instances key supplementary information and counsel with respect to several important issues. Some of the issues requiring treatment were:

1. PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF THREE COMPUTER CENTERS IN THE BAY AREA (UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA COMPUTER CENTER: UC<sup>3</sup> FORCE). This study, submitted to the Policy Board early in the academic year, proposed consolidation of the Berkeley, San Francisco and Information Systems Division computer center to be physically housed in Evans Hall in Berkeley and to serve the needs of these campuses, as well as serving as a model for future centralization plans. Initially accepted in principle by the Policy Board, the plan was finally rejected when it became clear that the funding necessary to support this consolidation would exceed current funding requirements of individual centers until a significant increase in dollar volume could be projected. In view of ISD's requirement for immediate supplemental funding and the absence of support for that request, the entire proposal was deferred, then tabled indefinitely. The Committee assisted in this study in several key ways: the chairman of the Task Force was a Committee member. Supplemental information was provided by the Committee, who also gave the report careful critical review. The Committee supported

tabling the concept in view of the lack of wholehearted enthusiasm for the merger, especially on the part of the Information Systems Division, whose cooperation would have been essential to the effective operation of such a center.

2. DEVELOPMENT OF COMPUTER POLICY AND COMPUTER PLAN. The University has been under pressure by the Legislature to submit a policy and plan for computing for its consideration. Failure to do so would delay approval of new mainframe computers for the University, in accordance with terms of enabling legislation for University Funding. Earlier drafts of the policy, prepared by the Policy Board and its staff, had been received with some misgivings. A final

— xxiii —

policy, approved by the Board and submitted to the Legislature, followed in most particulars the draft submitted by the Committee. A plan, intended to implement the policies approved earlier, was submitted for Board approval, but did not receive final approval before the end of the academic year owing to major changes in the administrative systems computing requirements resulting from special studies initiated by the Board.

3. MINICOMPUTER POLICY. The Committee assisted in the selection of membership for a committee on Minicomputer Policies and made suggestions to the Board regarding the final version of this policy.
4. DATA COMMUNICATIONS STUDY. Following acceptance by the Board of a Task Force report on data communications requirements, the Committee undertook to prepare a more comprehensive report on that topic for the Board's consideration. This report was submitted to the Board in May 1976 for review and discussion at a subsequent meeting.

The Committee initiated a number of suggestions for Board consideration with respect to these and other items, reviewing major topics as they arose and providing assistance to special studies initiated by the Board as well as initiating some studies themselves.

In a report to the Academic Senate, the Chairman of the Committee presented a number of issues that the Committee considered important for discussion. This report was favorably received but, as no specific recommendations were put forth, no action was taken.

The Committee feels that it served an important function during the first two years of its existence, shaping fundamental policies and providing necessary background information to the Policy Board. During the coming academic year, it is the hope of the Committee that it can turn to more fundamental questions involving academic use of computers and the implications of that use on educational policies.

Respectfully submitted

E. R. Berlekamp (B) K. L. Bowles (SD) C. P. Hensler (LA) J. A. Howard (SB) W. M. McKeeman (SC) T. H. Payne (R) J. A. Starkweather (SF) S. H. White (I) R. F. Walters (D), Chairman

December 2, 1976