



---

# Notice of Meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate, November 28, 1979

*University of California*  
Wednesday, November 28, 1979 at 10:00 a.m.

Faculty Club Library Berkeley Campus  
Luncheon Recess

---

— 1 —

## Order of Business

---

	PAGE
I. 1. Roll Call of Members	
2. Minutes of meeting of June 6, 1979	
II. Announcements by the President. D. S. Saxon	
III. Other Announcements	
Chairman of the Assembly. K. S. Pister. . . .	2
IV. Special Orders: Consent Calendar	
A. Annual Reports. . . .	16
B. Academic Council. K. S. Pister	
Revisions to Divisional Legislation	3
Irvine—Regulations IR 355 and IR 330. . . .	4
San Diego—Regulations 500, 505. . . .	6
Santa Barbara—A20. . . .	7
Davis—A540, A541, 518; School of Medicine—Regulations 70, 60, 80; A540 (C) and A533. . . .	15
Los Angeles—Regulation A314. . . .	
V. Reports of Special Committees. . . .	Oral
Joint Planning Committee Report “The University of California: A Multi-Campus System in the 1980's.” D. T. Cattell	
VI. Reports of Standing Committees	

	<b>PAGE</b>
1. Academic Council. K. S. Pister Election of Parliamentarian. . . . Discussion with Divisional Chairmen. . . .	15 Oral
2. Academic Personnel. J. B. Kester. . . .	Oral
3. Admissions and Relations with Schools W. E. Broen. . . .	19
4. Affirmative Action. D. B. Bugental. . . .	24
5. Educational Policy. R. S. Bringhurst. . . .	Oral
6. Graduate Affairs. R. L. Wild. . . .	Oral
7. Planning and Budget. D. T. Cattell. . . .	Oral
VII. Petitions of Students	
VIII. Unfinished Business	
IX. University and Faculty Welfare	
X. New Business	

V. A. Dearing, Secretary (South)  
M. H. Graham, Secretary (North)  
November 1, 1979

## Schedule of Meetings 1979-80

<b>ALL MEETINGS ON WEDNESDAY AT 10 a.m.</b>			<i>Copy due</i> <sup>1</sup>
Fall	November 28, 1979	Faculty Club Library Berkeley Campus	October 26
Winter	March 12 <sup>2</sup>	California Room Faculty Center Los Angeles Campus	February 5
Spring	May 28	Faculty Club Library Berkeley Campus	April 25

\* Final date on which Secretaries can receive reports to be printed in the Notice of Meeting

\*\* Date changed from March 5, as announced earlier.

Dear Colleagues:

1. Final date on which Secretaries can receive reports to be printed in the Notice of Meeting.  
2. \*\* Date changed from March 5, as announced earlier.

May I extend my personal welcome to each of you through this Notice of our first Assembly meeting this academic year.

You will see some changes in the Notice -

While few items require Assembly action at this time, serious issues are under study and status reports will be made during the discussions at the meeting; and

The Committee Annual Reports are voluminous and weighty in content—to save our limited dollars, we have had them photocopied, rather than typeset.

Increasingly, the Senate's participation in shared governance of the University brings us in direct or indirect contact with various constituencies -

*External* : CPEC (California Postsecondary Education Commission); PERB (Public Employees Relations Board), the Governor and his staff, the State Legislative Committees.

*Internal* : The Board of Regents, the President and his staff, APPRB (Academic Planning and Program Review Board), SBPC (Student Body Presidents' Council), and the Student Lobby—and a host of others concerned with long-range planning, faculty salary structure, faculty retirement policy, collective bargaining, to name but a few.

At the meeting, Divisional Chairmen will report on issues of concern to their Campus. So that the meeting will be truly representative, as the Assembly is intended to be, I urge each of you to make your views known on these issues and others of concern to you—to share your ideas and concerns with fellow Assembly members. All of us—individually, professionally, institutionally—are affected by our Senate deliberations. The Assembly meetings are a singular forum for exchanging ideas, identifying common concerns, maintaining and developing our collegiality and, therefore, its viability is also our individual responsibility.

I am looking forward to an interesting and productive meeting on the 28th!

*Sincerely*  
*Karl S. Pister, Chairman*

## Report of the Academic Council

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

### I. Revisions to Divisional Grading Legislation—approved

I. The following revisions to Divisional Grading Legislation have been approved by the Academic Council and are presented to the Assembly for ratification at this time.

*Academic Council Meeting—July 18, 1979 (Item 5, page 5, Minutes)*

#### Irvine

<b><i>Present Wording</i></b>	<b><i>Amended Wording Recommended</i></b>
IR 355. Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory Grades (Graduate)	IR 355. Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory Grades.
	[No Change]
(A) Provisional Grades	[No Change]

<b><i>Present Wording</i></b>	<b><i>Amended Wording Recommended</i></b>
(B) Authority	[No Change]
(C) Credit  Each Senate Division is authorized to regulate the award of credit for the work described in (B) and (A) when all quarters are not completed.	(C) Credit  When a grade of S or U has been assigned on a provisional basis in accordance with IR 355(A) and the student does not complete all quarters of the course sequence, the instructor may assign a final grade or the grade of I to replace the S or U, or let the grade of S or U stand as a final grade.
	(D) Other Courses  With the specific approval of the Graduate Council, other graduate courses may be graded on an S/U basis provided that students enrolled in such graduate courses receive a grade of S, U, or I, and undergraduates, a grade of P or NP.
IR 330. Quarterly Registration (Graduate)  Unless granted a formal leave of absence, a graduate student in good standing is expected to register every quarter, including the quarter in which the degree is to be awarded, until all requirements for the graduate objective are fulfilled. Summer will be considered as part of the Spring Quarter until a Summer Quarter is formally established.	IR 330. Continuous Registration (Graduate)  A Graduate Division student in good standing must register for each regular academic session until all requirements for an advanced degree or credential have been fulfilled, unless a formal leave of absence has been granted or a petition to pay the Filing Fee in lieu of registration has been approved by the Dean of the Graduate Division.  Note: University policy provides that a graduate student who does not satisfy the continuous registration requirements is presumed to have withdrawn from the University.

## San Diego

<b><i>Present Wording</i></b>	<b><i>Amended Wording Recommended</i></b>
500. Grading Policy	500 Grading Policy
(B) The I Grade	(B) The I Grade
(2) For an undergraduate student, an I grade may be replaced upon completion of the required work by a date agreed upon with the instructor. If not replaced by this date, the I grade will lapse into an F grade. A written record of the agreement between the instructor and the student will be kept on file in the Registrar's office.	(2) An I grade may be replaced upon completion of the required work by the last day of instruction in the following quarter. If not replaced by this date, the I grade will lapse into an F grade.
(3) For a graduate student, an I grade may be replaced upon completion of the required work by the last day of instruction in the following quarter. If not replaced by this date, the I grade will lapse into an F grade.	(3) [Delete]
(D) The P and NP Grades	(D) The P and NP Grades
(1) Consistent with college policy and with the approval of the instructor, an undergraduate student in good standing may elect to be graded on a P/NP basis in a course. No more than one fourth of the student's total course units counted in satisfaction of degree requirements may be in courses taken on a P/NP basis.	(1) Consistent with college policy an undergraduate student in good standing may elect to be graded on a P/NP basis in a course. No more than one fourth of an undergraduate student's total course units counted in satisfaction of degree requirements may be in courses taken on a P/NP basis. Departments may require that courses applied toward the major be taken on a letter-grade basis.
(2) With the approval of the instructor concerned, a graduate student may take course units outside his major on a P/NP basis up to one fourth of his total course units.	(2) [Delete]

<b>Present Wording</b>	<b>Amended Wording Recommended</b>
(3) [No change]	(2) [Re-number]
(4) A grade of P will be awarded only for work which would otherwise receive a grade of C or better.	(3) [Re-number; delete sentence] In any course, the minimum standard of performance for a grade of P shall be the same as the minimum for a grade of C.
(5) [No change]	(4) [Re-number]  (5) An undergraduate student's work in a non-credit course shall be reported on a P/NP basis.
(E) The S and U Grades	(E) The S and U Grades
(1) With the approval of the Graduate Council, departments may offer graduate courses in which graduate students may be evaluated on an S/U basis.	(1).. .graded on an S/U basis, and courses in which graduate students shall be graded only on an S/U basis.
(2) A student's work in a noncredit course may be reported on an S/U basis.	(2) A graduate student's work.
	(3) A graduate students work in a lower-division course shall be reported on an S/U basis only.
	(4) With the approval of the department and the instructor concerned, a graduate student may elect to have his/her work in any upper-division course or in a graduate course outside his/her major graded on an S/U basis.
	(5) With the approval of the department and the instructor concerned, a graduate student who has advanced to candidacy for the PhD degree may take any course on an S/U basis.
	(6) The minimum standard of performance for a grade of S shall be the same as the minimum for a grade of B.
(3) Registration on an S/U basis must take place at the beginning of the quarter.	(7) [Re-number]
505. Repetition of Courses Repetition for credit of courses not so authorized by the appropriate Committee on Courses is allowed subject to the following limitations:	505. Repetition of Courses [No Change]
(A) A student may repeat only those courses in which he received a grade of D, F, NP, or U.	(A).. . . a grade of D, F, NP, or U has been received.
(B) Courses in which a grade of D or F has been awarded may not be repeated on a P/NP or S.U basis. Conversely, courses in which a grade of NP or U has been awarded may be repeated only on a P/ NP or S/U basis, respectively.	(B).. . . [Delete, beginning with "Conversely. .."]
	(C) Undergraduate students may repeat a course in which a grade of NP has been awarded for P/NP or letter-grade, if applicable. Graduate students must repeat a course in which a grade of U has been awarded on an S/U basis only.
(C) [No Change]	(D) [Re-number]
(D) For the first 16 units repeated by an undergraduate only the most recently assigned grades shall be used in grade-point calculations. After the first 16 units repeated, all grades shall be used in grade-point calculations.	(E) [Re-number].. . by an undergraduate student the original grade remains on the transcript, but.

<b>Present Wording</b>	<b>Amended Wording Recommended</b>
A20 (I and IP Grades)	A20 (I and IP Grades)
(B)(4) No change from letter grade to Passed/Not Passed basis or the converse will be allowed.	(B)(4).. . . A grade may be changed to an I only with the approval of the Dean, and the change is subject to the conditions of A20(D)(1).
(D)(1) The grade Incomplete (I) may be assigned when a student's work is of passing quality, but is incomplete. *The student is entitled to have the grade of Incomplete replaced by a passing grade, as determined by the instructor concerned, and to receive unit credit and appropriate grade points upon satisfactory completion of the work of the course by the **end of the next full quarter of the student's registration in regular session in which the course is offered, or by the end of one calendar year from the date of receipt of the grade, whichever date occurs first. If the instructor is unavailable, the chairman of the department in which the course was offered is authorized to supervise the completion of the work and to make the appropriate grade change.***The dean of the appropriate college or school has authority to extend the deadline for completion in the event of unusual circumstances that would clearly impose an unfair hardship on the student if the original deadline were maintained. **** If the work is not completed according to the deadline or authorized extension of it, the Incomplete shall automatically be changed to an F or NP as appropriate. These deadlines do not apply to the following graduate courses: 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599. Incomplete grades in these courses must be replaced by a letter grade or S or U as appropriate by the end of the last quarter in which the student is registered prior to receipt of the master's or doctoral degree.	(D)(1).. . is of passing quality [as defined in Divisional Regulations A20 and A35], but is incomplete. An I grade may be placed on a student's record only if the completed "request for an I Grade" form, with the necessary processing fee paid, is on file in the Registrar's Office, signed by the instructor, and indicating the reason for assigning the I grade, the student's grade to that point, the nature of the course work to be completed, the percentage of the final grade to be based on that work, and the deadline, if any, for submitting the work. Copies will be sent to the student, the instructor, the department chairman, and the dean. In the absence of the form, or of a specific grade other than I, an F or NP grade shall be recorded by the Registrar.  * The student is entitled.  ** end of the term following the term in which the I grade was reported, whether or not the student is registered or the course is offered. Unless the work is completed and a grade reported to the Registrar by the deadline, the grade shall be changed automatically to an F or NP as appropriate.  ***The chairman of the department in which the course was offered also.  **** A copy of each authorization of extension of deadline will be sent to the Dean. These deadlines do not apply.
	(3) An I grade on the student's record at the time of graduation in a course not necessary for fulfillment of degree requirements may be removed only up to the end of the fifth week of the term following the date of graduation. If not removed, it will be changed to an F or NP but will remain an I permanently. At the time of graduation, an I grade in a course taken for a letter grade must be utilized in computation of the grade-point average, in accordance with SR 634.

## Davis

### *Academic Council Meeting—September 19, 1979 (page 6, Minutes)*

<b>Previous Wording</b>	<b>Amended Wording Approved</b>
A540. (A) Except as provided otherwise in Davis Regulations 541, 545, and 548, the work of all students in the Davis Division shall be reported in terms of the following grades: A (excellent), B (good), C (fair), D (poor), F (failure), I (incomplete), and IP (in progress). Grades of A, B, C, and D may be modified by plus (+) or minus (-) suffixes.	A540. Except as provided otherwise in Division Regulations 545 and 548, and in Regulation 70 of the Faculty of the School of Medicine, the following provisions apply to the grading of the work of all students subject to Davis Division Regulations:  (A) The work of each student shall be reported in terms of the following grades: A (excellent), B (good), C (fair), D (poor), F (failure), I (incomplete), and IP (in progress). Grades of A, B, C, and D may be modified by plus (+) or minus (-) suffixes.

Previous Wording	Amended Wording Approved
(B).. .	(B) No change.
(C).. .	(C) No change.
(D).. .	(D) No change.
(E).. .	(E) No change.
(F).. .	(F) No change.
A541. The work of all students in the School of Medicine, Davis, (A) shall be reported only in terms of six grades: H (honors, work of superior quality), S (passing, work of satisfactory quality), U (not passing, work of unsatisfactory quality), I (incomplete, work of passing quality), Y (provisional, work of non-passing quality), and IP (in progress). No grade points shall be assigned. (B) The grade Incomplete shall be assigned only when the student's work is of passing quality but incomplete for good cause determined by the instructor or committee in charge of the course. The student is entitled to replace this grade by a passing grade and to receive unit credit provided he satisfactorily completes the work of the course in a way specified by the instructor or committee in charge of the course within the time limit set for him by the Promotions Board. (C) The grade Y is a non-passing provisional grade that may be assigned to a student and subsequently raised to the passing grade S if the student satisfactorily meets requirements, which may include re-examination, specified by the instructor or committee in charge of the course. The Y grade shall be changed automatically to U if the specified requirements are not met within the time limit set for him by the Promotions Board. (D) For a course extending over more than one term, where the evaluation of the student's performance is deferred until the end of the final term, provisional grades of IP (in progress) shall be assigned in the intervening terms. Provisional grades shall be replaced by final grades if the student completes the full sequence.	A541. Repeal. Replaced by Medical School Regulation 70. (See page 8)

The new School of Medicine grading code is embodied in their Regulation 70, which is herewith reported.

— 9 —

70. *For the Class of 1983 and all subsequent classes*, except as indicated below, the work of all students (A) in the School of Medicine shall be reported only in terms of eight grades: A (excellent), B (good), C (fair), D (marginal pass), and F (failure), I (incomplete, work of passing quality), Y (provisional, work of non-passing quality), and IP (in progress).

*For the Class of 1982 and all prior classes*, performance in courses taken in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Medicine shall be reported only in terms of six grades: H (honors, work of superior quality), S (passing, work of satisfactory quality), U (not passing, work of unsatisfactory quality), I (incomplete, work of passing quality), Y (provisional, work of non-passing quality), and IP (in progress). No grade points shall be assigned.

(B) The grade Incomplete shall be assigned only when the student's work is of passing quality but incomplete for good cause determined by the instructor or committee in charge of the course. The student is entitled to replace this grade by a passing grade and to receive unit credit provided he satisfactorily completes the work of the course in a way specified by the instructor or committee in charge of the course within the time limit (no greater than three quarters) set for him by the Promotions

Board.

- (C) The grade Y is a non-passing provisional grade that may be assigned to a student and subsequently raised to a passing grade if the student satisfactorily meets requirements, which may include re-examination, specified by the instructor or committee in charge of the course. The grade Y shall be changed automatically to F if the specified requirements are not met within the time limit set for him by the Promotions Board.
- (D) For a course extending over more than one term, where the evaluation of the student's performance is deferred until the end of the final term, provisional grades of IP (in progress) shall be assigned in the intervening terms. Provisional grades shall be replaced by final grades if the student completes the full sequence.
- (E) *For the Class of 1983 and all subsequent classes*, for all electives students may, upon approval of the instructor, opt to take courses on a Satisfactory (S) or Unsatisfactory (U) basis.
- (F) *For the Class of 1983 and all subsequent classes*, each special study or directed group study course (i.e., 489, 499) shall be graded on a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory basis.
- (G) *For the Class of 1983 and all subsequent classes*, for courses being undertaken on a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory basis, the grade of Satisfactory shall be awarded only for work that otherwise would receive a grade of C or better. Units thus earned shall be counted in satisfaction of degree requirements.
- (H) Repetition of courses not authorized and/or required by the Promotions Board to be taken more than once for credit is subject to the following conditions:
  - (1) *For the Class of 1983 and all subsequent classes*, a student may elect to repeat only those courses in which he received a grade of Y, D, F, or Unsatisfactory. Courses in which a D or F has been earned may not be repeated on a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory basis.  
  
*For the Class of 1982 and all prior classes*, a student may repeat only those courses in which he received a grade of Y or Unsatisfactory.
  - (2) Degree credit for a course will be given only once, but the grade assigned at each enrollment shall be permanently recorded.
- (I) All grades except Incomplete, Y, or In Progress are final when filed by the Instructor of Record. A grade may be changed only for the correction of a clerical or procedural error. Petition of a student or instructor seeking to have a grade in a professional course changed must be submitted to the Dean of Student Affairs within one quarter after assignment of the grade. Routine, uncontested grade change requests may, under the jurisdiction of the Grade Change Committee, be recorded by the Dean of Student Affairs and reported to the Registrar. Contested petitions for grade changes shall be reviewed and adjudicated by the Grade Change Committee of the School of Medicine. The Grade Change Committee shall review the matter to ascertain whether clerical or procedural error has occurred. The Committee shall report its decision to the Executive Committee within 30 days. The decision of the Grade Change Committee shall be final and without appeal in the Faculty organization of the School of Medicine. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for reporting the decision to the parties involved and to the Dean of Student Affairs who shall report any change in grade to the Registrar.

The official record of professional courses taken and grades received may not be changed except as specifically sanctioned by the Executive Committee of the Faculty of the School of Medicine.

The Representative Assembly of the Davis Division repealed Davis Division Regulation 518, with the matters previously covered by it, now covered in School of Medicine Regulation 60, Requirement for the Degree Doctor of Medicine, and Regulation 80, Disqualification.



This change is not strictly a part of the Davis Campus Grading Code, but the change relates to matters contained in the code, hence it is reported for information.

Previous Wording	Amended Wording Approved
<p>518. <i>Doctor of Medicine</i></p> <p>(a) Minimal requirements for the degree of Doctor of Medicine are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) The candidate must have earned a minimum of 240 units, including 15 units of electives during the first two years, while registered in a medical curriculum of the School of Medicine, University of California, Davis.</li> <li>(2) The candidate must have earned at least a passing grade in each course of the core curriculum of the first three years and electives comprising a total of three academic quarters of the fourth year.</li> <li>(3) The candidate must have taken and passed Part I of the National Board of Medical Examiners' examination before entering the core clerkships of the medical curriculum of the School of Medicine, and must have taken Part II of these examinations.</li> </ol> <p>(b) A student registered in the School of Medicine who receives an Unsatisfactory (U) grade in a required course shall be subject to <i>disqualification</i> for further registration in the School of Medicine. The Promotions Board, upon recommendation of the instructor or committee in charge of the course, may place such a student on <i>probation</i> and specify how the deficiency is to be removed. The Promotions Board upon recommendation by the instructor or committee in charge of the course, may permit a student on probation to register for one or more subsequent terms.</p> <p>(c) Immediately after each Winter term, the Dean of Student Affairs shall report the status of candidates for graduation at the end of the following Spring term to the Executive Committee of the Faculty of the School of Medicine. The Executive Committee, acting as a Committee of the Whole, may in its discretion waive graduation requirements. A list of candidates recommended for graduation by the Executive Committee shall be presented to the Faculty of the School of Medicine for action by the Faculty at its next regular meeting.</p> <p>(d) Any student in the School of Medicine who has been denied registration for one or more terms, promotion, or graduation or who has been disqualified for further registration in the School of Medicine may appeal in writing to the Dean of the Medical School. The Dean shall appoint an <i>ad hoc</i> Board composed of faculty members and students to hear each appeal and recommend action to the Faculty of the School of Medicine.</p>	<p>518. Repeal. Replaced by Medical School Regulation 60, <i>Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine</i>, and Regulation 80, <i>Probation and Disqualification</i>.</p>

Regulations 60 and 80 are herewith reported to the Assembly:

## 60. Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine

(A) Minimum academic requirements for the degree of Doctor of Medicine are:

— 12 —

1. While registered in the medical curriculum of the School of Medicine, University of California at Davis, the candidate admitted to regular status must have completed satisfactorily a

minimum of 240 units plus 15 units of electives to be taken and passed during the first two years. Waiver of the latter requirement of 15 units of electives can only be made under exceptional circumstances as judged by the Promotions Board of the School of Medicine.

2. The above requirements must generally be satisfied within four years of the date of matriculation. With the permission of the Promotions Board, this period can be extended to a maximum of five years in residence.
  3. The candidate must have achieved at least a passing grade in each required course of the first three years and in the required number of elective units.
  4. The candidate must have taken and passed Part I of the National Board of Medical Examiners' examination before entering the required clerkships of the medical curriculum of the School of Medicine and must have taken Part II of these examinations prior to graduation.
  5. The candidate must have completed satisfactorily the required clerkships while registered in the School of Medicine.
  6. The candidate must be eligible for licensure under applicable California law in effect at the time of planned graduation and must be in good standing academically and must have demonstrated ethical conduct that clearly is consistent with the standards necessary for the practice of medicine.
- (B) At least 6 weeks prior to graduation the Dean of Student Affairs shall report the status of candidates for graduation to the Executive Committee of the Faculty. Prior to graduation the Executive Committee shall present the list of recommended candidates to the Faculty of the School of Medicine for action by the Faculty. The Faculty may, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, waive graduation requirements. The action of the Faculty to approve candidates for graduation does not require a mail ballot. Graduation can occur at the end of either the Spring or Fall quarters.

## **80. Probation and Disqualification**

- (A) *For the Class of 1983 and all subsequent classes*, a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Medicine who receives a Y or failing (F) grade in a required course shall be placed on *probation* at the time of receipt of this grade and shall not be promoted to the subsequent year until such a deficiency is removed as specified by the course instructor or committee in consultation with the Promotions Board. A student receiving two D grades or a second D grade without removing the first shall be placed on *probation* and shall not be promoted until such deficiency is removed as specified above. If, in the judgment of the Promotions Board, additional remediation is required, this will be prescribed by the Promotions Board and may include repetition of courses in which the student had previously received a passing grade. If, in the judgment of the responsible course instructor or committee of record and the Promotions Board, the Y or F or D grade can be removed while the student is enrolled in the subsequent year's curriculum, the student can be provisionally promoted but will remain on academic *probation*. If the deficiency is not removed as prescribed with a grade of C or better within one year, the student shall be subject to *dismissal* from the School of Medicine. Upon satisfactory remediation, the student will be removed from *probation*.

*For the Class of 1982 and all prior classes*, a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Medicine who receives a Y or Unsatisfactory (U) grade in a required course shall be placed on *probation* at the time of receipt of this grade and shall not be promoted to the subsequent year until such a deficiency is removed as specified by the course instructor or committee in consultation with the Promotions Board. If, in the judgment of the Promotions Board, additional remediation is required, this will be prescribed by the Promotions Board and may include repetition of courses in which the student had previously

received a Satisfactory (S) grade. If, in the judgment of the responsible course instructor or committee of record and the Promotions Board, the Y or U grade can be removed while the student is enrolled in the subsequent year's curriculum, the student can be provisionally promoted but will remain on academic *probation*. If the deficiency is not removed as prescribed with a grade of Satisfactory (S) or better within one year, the student shall be subject to *dismissal* from the School of Medicine. Upon satisfactory remediation, the student will be removed from *probation*.

— 13 —

For the purpose of the paragraphs of this section, the phrase “remove a grade” shall be taken to mean to remove the deficiency as specified by the course instructor or committee in consultation with the Promotions Board. The official record of the course grade is final when filed, per Regulation 70(H)(2), and shall not be removed from the official record even though the student meets the requirements of the Promotions Board for the removal of the deficiency.

- (B) Any student in the School of Medicine who has been denied registration for one or more terms, promotion, or graduation or who has been dismissed from the School of Medicine may appeal in writing to the Dean of the School of Medicine. The Dean shall then request the Executive Committee to appoint an *ad hoc* board composed of five faculty members and two students to review the appeal. Recommended action by this board shall be reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty of the School of Medicine and transmitted to the Dean.

— 14 —

## II. Revisions to Divisional Grading Legislation—pending

The following revisions to Divisional Grading Legislation will be reviewed by the Academic Council at its meeting on November 14, 1979. Both have been reviewed by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and found to be consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate.

### DAVIS

The Davis Division of the Academic Senate presents the following two items for consideration at the November 28, 1979, meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate:

- (1) As a portion of our divisional grading code, and in keeping with Senate Regulation 780(D) which states that “Each Division is authorized to adopt appropriate regulations for the administration of this grade.” [Incomplete], the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate at its meeting of June 4, 1979, approved the following change in Regulation A540(C), for submission to the Assembly:

<b>Present Wording</b>	<b>Amended Wording Recommended</b>
A540(C) The grade Incomplete shall be assigned only when the student's work is of passing quality but incomplete for good cause determined by the instructor. The student is entitled to replace this grade by a passing grade and to receive appropriate grade points and unit credit provided he or she satisfactorily completes the work of the course in a way specified by the instructor before the end of the third succeeding term of the student's academic residence. If a degree is conferred upon the student before the expiration of the time limit for conversion, the time limit for conversion for the graduated student shall be the end of the third regular term succeeding the term in which the Incomplete grade was assigned.	A540(C).. . . If the grade has not been replaced at the expiration of the time limit, and if a degree has not been conferred upon the student, it shall revert to an F grade (or to Not Passed, if the course was taken on a Passed/Not Passed basis).  [Note: The above is to added as the last sentence to present Regulation A540(C).]

(2) Upon recommendation of the Special Committee on Independent Study, and after approval by the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate at its meeting of June 6, 1979, the Davis Division requests that Divisional Regulation A533 now become a permanent addition to the divisional grading code. The present variance, which expired at the end of Spring Quarter, 1979, allowed a student to take up to fifteen units of work in a quarter on a special project, thus exceeding the present limit of five units of special study courses in one quarter specified in SR 764. The wording of Davis Division Regulation A533 reads:

A533. A student registered in the Independent Study Program may enroll for a maximum of 15 units of special study courses in one quarter.

## Los Angeles

<b>Present Wording</b>	<b>Amended Wording Recommended</b>
A314. Repetition of Courses Repetition of courses other than those authorized by the Committee on Undergraduate Courses and Curricula or the Graduate Council to be taken more than once for credit is subject to the following conditions:	A314. Repetition of Courses.
(A) A student may repeat only those courses in which he/she received a grade of D, F, NP or U. Courses in which a grade of D or F has been received may not be repeated on a P/NP or S/U basis.	(A) A student may repeat only those courses in which he/she received a grade of C-, D+, D, D-, F, NP or U. Courses in which a grade of C-, D+, D, D- or F has been received may not be repeated on a P/NP or S/U basis.
(D) In computing the grade-point average of an undergraduate who repeats courses in which he/she received a D or F, only the most recently earned grades and grade points shall be used for the first 16 units repeated. In the case of further repetitions, the grade-point average shall be based on all grades assigned and total units attempted.	(D).. . received a C-, D+, D, D- or F, only the most recently earned.
(E) For a graduate student, all courses attempted and graded A, B, C, F, including repeated courses, shall be used in computing the grade-point average.	(E).. . F, and modifications thereto, including repeated courses, shall be used in computing the grade-point average.

## II. Election of Parliamentarian

On the expiration of the term of Professor W. L. Bostick (I), who has served as Parliamentarian for the past five years, it is necessary for the Assembly to elect a Parliamentarian and to set the term of office (Senate By-Law 60).

At its meeting on October 17, 1979, the Academic Council recommended that Professor Bostick be asked to serve a second term.

Respectfully submitted  
 K. S. Pister, Chairman  
 November 1, 1979

— 16 —

## Appendices

ANNUAL REPORTS		PAGE
I.	Academic Personnel. . . .	17
II.	Admissions and Relations with Schools. . . .	19
III.	Affirmative Action (Summary). . . .	24
IV.	Educational Policy. . . .	26
V.	Graduate Affairs. . . .	27
VI.	Library. . . .	33
VII.	Patents. . . .	34
VIII.	Planning and Budget. . . .	38
IX.	Privilege and Tenure. . . .	40
X.	Research. . . .	41
XI.	Subject A. . . .	52
XII.	Rules and Jurisdiction. . . .	53
	Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes	
	University Extension	
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES. . . .		54
Revised list of 1979-80 Committee Appointments		

— 17 —

# University Committee on Academic Personnel: Annual Report 1978-79

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During an extremely active year, the University Committee on Academic Personnel met ten times and consulted by mail and telephone many times between meetings. Vice President—Academic and Staff Personnel Relations, A. Kleingartner attended most of our meetings; Assistant Vice President—Academic and Staff Personnel Relations, E. Blakely attended all of them, and Chairs of several committees and task forces visited the committee during the year to discuss their specific topic of study. The views and opinions of the committee regularly were reported to the Chairman of the Assembly of the Academic Senate and Academic Council and to the Academic Council by the Chair, who also met during the year with several other Universitywide Senate committees, with a number of groups from Systemwide Administration and consulted frequently, sometimes daily, with Vice President Kleingartner and Assistant Vice President Blakely on matters of mutual concern.

Among the items referred to UCAP by the Academic Council, by Systemwide Administration or by both were:

Policy on Outside Professional Activities of Faculty Members and accompanying Guidelines;

Use of the Faculty Time-Use Survey to obtain information on the time spent on outside professional activities by faculty members;

Policy on Acceptance of Gifts by University Employees;

Development of Guidelines for a Policy on Conflict of Interest for faculty members receiving Federal grant or contract funds;

Policy on Disestablishment of Academic Units and Discontinuance of Academic Programs;

Guidelines for the Faculty Career Development Program;

Guidelines for Intercampus Cooperative Arrangement;

The University Professor title;

Faculty Home Loan Program;

Addition of Step VII to the Professor rank;

Academic salary scales for 1979-80;

The report and recommendations of the Joint Senate-Administration Committee on Faculty Retirement (Miles Committee);

Providing Senate advice to the APPRB Health Sciences Committee's Subcommittee on Health Sciences, Academic Personnel Policies (Solomon Committee);

Providing Senate advice to the Task Force on the Evaluation of Teaching (Outcalt Committee);

The charge for and membership of the Joint Senate-Administration Committee on Faculty Compensation Issues (Templeton Committee);

Review of proposed changes in the Academic Personnel Manual coming from the report of the Eight-Year Rule Committee (Sullivan Committee);

Suggestions for possible revision of By-Law 188 regarding the right to vote in departments and equivalent

units.

In addition, the committee began serious consideration of policies for the appointment and review of faculty members with appointments on more than one campus of the University, and it continued the progress of past committees in comparing

— 18 —

academic personnel procedures on the campuses. With respect to this last item, a major study of the uniformity of academic personnel actions on the campuses for the 1978-79 academic year was begun, and the data from the study will be collected, tabulated and analyzed during the academic year.

The committee members especially appreciate the diligent and competent efforts of Ms. Christine Jones of the Riverside Division Office, who served as secretary to the committee and are grateful to Ms. Patricia Seawell of the Berkeley Division Office and Ms. Jean Strong of the Los Angeles Division Office for their assistance with minutes of the committee's meetings; without their help, we could not have functioned as effectively as we did. We also want to thank Vice President Kleingartner for giving substance to the principle of shared governance and for his interest in working with us to develop more effective consultation between his office and the committee. We leave this positive legacy to our successors, along with a lot of unfinished business.

Respectfully submitted

J. F. Bunnett (SC) [F, S]

M. C. Caserio (I)

M. A. Greenfield (LA), Vice Chair

O. A. Johnson (R)

P. Kenez (SC) [W]

P. C. Kennedy (D)

J. B. Kester (LA)

R. G. Ketcham (SF)

G. J. Larson (SB) [F, W, S]

R. L. Parker (SD)

R. G. Rinker (SB) [Summer]

A. W. Searcy (B)

W. R. Frazer (SD), *ex officio*

S. E. Sperling (R), Chair

November 28, 1979

— 19 —

## **Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools: Annual Report 1978-79**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the last year BOARS has been involved in a number of projects and has made several decisions. The most important are briefly outlined here.

## **Articulation**

Articulation refers to agreements about what college courses are transferable to the University and what high school courses meet A to F requirements.

Some years ago BOARS delegated responsibility for college articulation to the Administration. With the push in the late 1960's and early 1970's for nontraditional courses, articulation lists have expanded and the nature of courses included has changed.

Many of these new courses are academically substandard. There are essentially two reasons for this. First, schools have a strong incentive to put as many of their courses as possible on our articulation lists. Unfortunately, administrators do not have a strong incentive to resist such pressure.

Second, our own house has gotten badly out of order. The basic criteria for accepting credit from another college is that the course corresponds to University level work. We cannot refuse to transfer credit for a course that is at least equal to one offered for credit at the University. Unfortunately that means that we must grant transfer credit for every college course that corresponds to any substandard or remedial course taught for credit at the University. Credit for Subject A or remedial math are outstanding examples.

BOARS can do nothing about the second problem. That will be up to you. We have started to work on the first. As of now, any request to add a questionable course to the college articulation list will be reviewed by BOARS. In addition, if a course is rejected by the administration and that decision is appealed, the issue is decided by BOARS. This will prevent schools from applying pressure to administrators.

BOARS this year will begin to review existing college articulation lists. The review will start with Junior Colleges whose students show the greatest drop in GPA when they enter the University. The objective of this review will be to establish a list of acceptable courses that will provide better preparation for the University.

Currently, certification of high school courses is made by Principals of the high school under guidelines established by the University. This procedure will be reconsidered by BOARS.

As part of our concern about articulation, we also are reviewing transfer credit for Experiential Learning. In 1974, BOARS approved a five year experiment allowing

— 20 —

up to nine quarter units for experiential learning. Unfortunately, the material available to us in 1978-79 was not adequate for making an informed decision. As a result we are extending the experiment for one more year under tighter guidelines and collecting more detailed information about class content. The material will be used to decide whether or not this program should continue.

## **Admission to Advanced Standing**

As a four year experiment, students with 84 transferable units who were not eligible as freshman were admitted in advanced standing, if they achieved a GPA of 2.0 in their transferable courses. After reviewing the experiment in 1977-78, BOARS decided to return to the old rules, a GPA of 2.4 and no more than two omissions in the A to F subject pattern required of freshman. (Subject deficiencies can be made up in college.)

This decision meant that counselors at junior colleges needed a student's high school transcript in order to advise him/her regarding the University. Although they had done this for years before the experiment, many counselors now objected strongly to the new workload.

Even more important, there was considerable concern among some people involved with admissions that many counselors would direct potential University students to State Colleges because of the extra work connected



with preparing him or her for the University.

As a result, BOARS worked with representatives from the Junior Colleges to work out a compromise satisfactory to both sides. The essence of the compromise is as follows. As long as the student obtains at least C's in a math course at least as advanced as we require of freshman and a transferable English course plus transferable courses in all but two of the remaining A to E requirements, we will consider the subject requirements as being completed.

Junior College counselors now can advise a prospective University student without consulting the high school transcript. After taking a given combination of classes, the subject requirements are completed. For our part, we have not reduced our standards. The transferable courses meet the advanced course (F) requirement in the A to F subject pattern. A waiver of two units is still permitted, but now the waiver cannot be in math or English. When this provision is combined with closer supervision of articulation agreements, it should lead to better prepared transfer students.

Since this option theoretically could have been followed even before this path was officially recognized, BOARS did not consult the Assembly before making this decision.

## **Affirmative Action**

Low enrollments for disadvantaged students is not the result of qualified students not going to the UC or some other institution. The basic problem appears to be that only a small percentage of disadvantaged students take the courses that prepare them for university level work.

— 21 —

BOARS is sponsoring the development of a pilot project at UCSB designed to encourage disadvantaged students to take the courses necessary to enter the University. The essence of the program is to identify potential University students in 7th and 8th grades and to promise these students that, if they meet all regular admission requirements as freshman, they will receive full financial support for four years. This commitment of course is contingent on their remaining in good academic standing.

The term “full financial support” is vague and not likely to be very impressive. The promise, which should be legally binding, therefore probably will contain a clause guaranteeing a minimum amount of money per year for four years. The amount of money and other details are still being worked out.

Although the pilot project is at UCSB, the commitment is by the University and the student many attend any campus.

## **English Test**

When the Regents approved the requirement that freshman must have 4 rather than 3 years of English in high school, the University reluctantly agreed to establish a way for students to test out of the fourth year of English. Since the requirement becomes effective for freshman entering in the Fall of 1981, the test must be available by the Spring of 1980.

In choosing the test, BOARS consulted a wide range of expert opinion. Meetings on various aspects of the test included representatives from high school and University Departments of English, Subject A, College Board, ETS, and the State Department of Education. This consultation led to two decisions. First, the necessary level of performance should be at least as high as is currently required to avoid Subject A. Second, the test should be based primarily on a writing sample rather than an objective test.

Since a student can avoid Subject A by high scores on appropriate College Board or Advanced Placement tests, BOARS felt obligated to permit students to use those tests to waive out of the fourth year of English. (The CSUC English Equivalency Examination in general is not available to juniors in high school.) However, because of the strong feeling that a test should depend primarily on a writing sample evaluated by University standards, BOARS is working with the systemwide Subject A Committee to develop a University Subject A exam that will be available to all high school juniors in the Spring of 1980. It is the intention of BOARS that this test should be the primary way by which students waive a fourth year of English.

Writing the test, establishing criteria for evaluating tests, and choosing people to read the test will be the responsibility of the Systemwide Subject A Committee. In order to avoid getting the University involved in the administration of the exam, and to provide convenient testing centers, we anticipate that the test will be administered by some professional testing organization such as College Board or ETS.

As a pilot study of this arrangement, a preliminary test was given to about two hundred students in several high schools this Spring. In addition to providing a

— 22 —

trial run, answers from these tests are being used to construct a new Subject A booklet that will explain to high school students and English teachers what the University expects in terms of writing skills.

That booklet should be ready for distribution to high schools by mid-November. At that time the State Department of Education will conduct a survey to estimate the number of students we can expect to take the test next Spring. With that information we can make an initial estimate of the number of locations that will be needed and the cost of the test.

The cost of this program will be recovered (approximately) by charging for the test. Provisions will be made for students who cannot afford the \$15 to \$20 fee.

At this time, the project appears to be developing more or less on schedule.

## **College Level Examination Program**

For some time BOARS has approved transfer credit for tests taken under the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) and Advanced Placement Testing program. In 1977-78, BOARS decided to review this decision.

Preliminary work carried out by Professor Henry Alder at UCD indicated satisfaction with Advanced Placement, but serious reservations about CLEP. In order to provide a more thorough analysis, CLEP tests provided by the College Board were reviewed by relevant departments at Davis. We originally intended to extend this formal review to all campuses. The results from Davis, however, were so negative concerning CLEP that we decided repeating the study on other campuses would not be very productive. Instead, we sent a letter to all relevant departments in the University explaining what we had done and asking if they would have any objections if we dropped credit for CLEP tests.

College Board agreed to supply sample tests and any other appropriate material to departments that wanted to review the test before making a decision. To date, only one department on one campus has indicated support for a test. It is highly likely that in 1979-80 BOARS will confirm its preliminary decision to drop credit for all CLEP tests.

## Evaluation of Current and Alternative Standards

Most studies of admissions standards are deficient in a number of ways. For example, most use only freshman GPA as a measure of success and ignore differences in grading standards between schools and between instructors. This research also does not normally consider additional variables such as outside workload or extracurricular experience, which may provide improved prediction of academic performance.

Working with ETS, the administration, and a special advisory committee headed by Professor Elizabeth Scott, BOARS has launched a major research project designed to evaluate current and alternative criteria for undergraduate admissions. In

— 23 —

this work, success will be measured in several ways including persistence, cumulative GPA, and graduation rates. A serious effort will be made to correct for variations in grading standards between high schools and by different departments within the University. With these and other improvements, we hope to obtain a much better idea of the effectiveness of existing and alternative criteria for admissions.

A major step in the project has been development of a data base. This has been done by matching systemwide admission and performance data on students with information obtained from questionnaires filled out by students when they took the SAT tests. This data will permit us to consider many more possible predictors of student performance than we could from data available in student files. Analysis of systemwide data will begin this year.

In addition to systemwide research, BOARS is encouraging and to some extent coordinating campus research on possible criteria for special admissions. This is being done as part of the Regental mandate to monitor and report on the experiment to increase the percent of special admissions at the freshman level.

## Redirection

The recent agreement between Berkeley and Santa Cruz concerning redirection policies between the two campuses was made without approval by BOARS. This has reignited an old issue. Traditionally, the faculty has viewed redirection as a policy that falls under their jurisdiction with respect to admissions. The Administration takes the position that redirection is an administrative problem.

In the past, conflict over this issue has been avoided by an informal agreement to share responsibility. The Berkeley-Santa Cruz policy broke this informal arrangement. At this point, either another workable compromise will have to be developed or the basic issue of authority over redirection should be settled once and for all. Unfortunately, only the Regents can settle the issue and neither the Faculty nor the Administration wants to fight this out before the Regents. A compromise of some kind, therefore, is very likely.

There should be two primary considerations in any compromise. First, it should in no way jeopardize the Faculty's claim over jurisdiction. Second, responsibility must be effectively shared and BOARS must not become simply a rubber stamp for decisions made by the Administration.

Respectfully submitted

John Pippenger

Chair, 1978-79

October 24, 1979

— 24 —

# University Committee on Affirmative Action: Annual Report Summary 1978-79 <sup>3</sup>

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Within the UC system, affirmative action efforts have led to an improved situation in some areas but not others. On the positive side, both women (22.1% of new hires) and ethnic minorities (14.6% of new hires) entered junior faculty ranks (during 1977-1978) at rates which compare favorably with their availability. Departments should be commended for their efforts in this connection.

Some of the problems which continue are:

- Faculty women are hired at levels which are significantly lower (approximately one-half step) than the levels at which men are hired.
- Faculty minorities tend to be concentrated in ethnic studies programs.
- Faculty women are hired into tenure-level positions at a rate (8.6% during 1977-1978) which is markedly below their availability.
- Both ethnic minorities and women advance through academic ranks at a significantly slower rate than do non-minority males (advancement problems are particularly acute for promotion to tenure).
- There are continued problems of low availability of ethnic minorities for hiring into faculty ranks.

Faculty development programs, recently instituted on all campuses, may offer solutions to some of these problems. Additional recommendations proposed by our Committee include:

- Faculty and administration monitoring of level (step and rank) at which faculty are hired (to insure equity).
  - Faculty and administration rethinking and monitoring of tenure-level hiring (to insure that a balance is achieved between legitimate needs for senior hires and the need to serve affirmative action goals).
- 25 —
- Parental leave for UC faculty (release time from regularly scheduled classes for one quarter).
  - Support for programs and policies designed to increase the availability of suitably-qualified minorities and women for faculty positions.
  - Information-gathering to determine the reasons why women and minorities are promoted to tenure at lower rates than non-minority males.

*Respectfully submitted*  
*D. B. Bugental, Chairman*  
*10.24.79*

\* Copy of the complete report has been distributed to members of the Assembly of the Academic Senate and Divisional Senate Offices.

Additional copies may be requested from the Santa Barbara Senate Office.

— 26 —

---

3. Copy of the complete report has been distributed to members of the Assembly of the Academic Senate and Divisional Senate Offices. Additional copies may be requested from the Santa Barbara Senate Office.

# University Committee on Educational Policy: Annual Report 1978-79

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During 1978-79, the University Committee on Educational Policy considered and acted or commented upon a variety of topics submitted by the Office of the President by the Assembly, Council, and Divisions of the Academic Senate.

In responding to requests from the Office of the President, the UCEP reviewed and commented on a succession of drafts of proposed policy statements or guidelines on: Disestablishment of Academic Units and Discontinuance of Academic Programs, Outside Professional Activities of Faculty, and Creation of Endowed Chairs. The UCEP commented on reports of the Institute of Transportation Studies Review Committee and the Systemwide Study Committee on University Extension. The UCEP prompted liaison between the Health Sciences Committee of APPRB (the President's Academic Planning and Program Review Board) and the permanent UCEP Health Sciences subcommittee created in 1976.

In responding to requests from the Assembly and Council of the Senate, the UCEP reviewed and commented on reports of the Universitywide Affirmative Action Advisory Committee and the President's Special Committee on Constitutional Autonomy. The UCEP developed a policy statement on Part-time Study and a revised senate regulation on Concurrent Courses in Extension, 800(C). The latter was approved by the Assembly in March 1979. The UCEP formed a permanent subcommittee to monitor continuing operation of the Faculty Time-Use Survey.

In responding to Divisions, the UCEP reviewed and negotiated some modifications in Grade Appeals Procedures developed by the Irvine, San Diego, and Berkeley Divisions. It reviewed and recommended approval of an amendment on Course Repetitions on the Berkeley campus, and a variety of changes in Grading Regulations from most divisions.

The UCEP will be receiving a report from its subcommittee formed to study Interdisciplinary Education. It will be reviewing plans for both Undergraduate and Graduate Student Affirmative Action developed in the Office of the President.

Respectfully submitted

John A. Starkweather, Chairperson (SF)

Royce S. Bringhurst, Vice Chairperson (D)

Morton D. Paley (B)

Robert L. Smith (D)

Harold Toliver (I)

Dwaine Marvick (LA)

Henry J. Vaux, Jr. (R)

David K. Crowne (SD)

Sarah E. Archer (SF)

Owen Hanna (SB)

George von der Muhll (SC)

William R. Frazer (SD), ex-officio

James Savage (B), student representative

Margot Tempereau (SD), student representative

September 7, 1979

# Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs: Annual Report 1978-79

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs reviewed 26 proposals for new degrees and programs and informational items, submitted by the Divisional Graduate Councils, and made recommendations concerning initiation of the proposals. Section V lists the reports reviewed by CCGA at the request of the Academic Council and the President's office.

Following is the summary of action taken by CCGA.

*Respectfully submitted for the Committee  
Nadine M. Lambert, Chairman*

Degree	Field	Received	Action Date	Notification to President
I.	<b>NEW DEGREES</b>	—	—	—
II.	<b>NEW PROGRAMS</b>			
	<i>Berkeley</i>			
JD/MJ	Law and Journalism (concurrent)	1.10.79	2.13.79	4.30.79
MA	Latin American Studies	9.15.78	11.14.78	12.6.78
MS, PhD	Earth Sciences	3.20.79	6.12.79	8.8.79
MS, PhD	Statistics	2.16.79	6.12.79	8.8.79
MS	Geography	2.25.79	6.12.79	(deferred)
MA	Foreign Languages and Literature	4.10.79	6.12.79	(deferred)
PhD	Geography	4.3.79	6.12.79	8.8.79
MA	Science Writing	1.26.79	2.13.79	(deferred)
MS	Applied Economics	5.30.79	6.12.79	(deferred)
D PH	Population, Family and Health, new specialization in Public Health		1.16.79	2.5.79
MS	Biophysics, addition of MS degree to PhD		5.15.79	5.25.79
PhD	Education and Work, consolidation in School of Education of Bus. Econ. Educ. & Voc. Tech. Educ.		2.13.79	4.30.79
C. Phil	Geochemistry, addition of C. Phil degree to PhD		11.14.79	12.15.79
C. Phil	Comparative Literature, addition of C.Phil degree to PhD.		11.14.78	12.15.79
MEd	Bilingual/Cross/Cultural Education, new specialization leading to MEd		1.16.79	2.5.79

Degree	Field	Received	Action Date	Notification to President
I.	<b>NEW DEGREES</b>	—	—	—
II.	<b>NEW PROGRAMS</b>			
	<i>Berkeley</i>			
MBA/MLS (concurrent)	Management/Library and Information Science, established concurrent degree		5.15.79	5.25.79
C. Spec	Architecture/Urban Design Program, new specialization to establish Certificate of Specialization		5.15.79	5.25.79
MS	Anthropology, addition of MS degree to MA and PhD		6.12.79	8.8.79
MS	Botany, addition of MS degree to MA and PhD		4.17.79	4.30.79
	Genetics. Extension of existing joint degree between UCB and SDSU to include UCSD		1.16.79	2.5.79
C. Art	New Program, addition of C.Art to department		6.12.79	9.10.79
MS/PhD	Agricultural and Environmental Chemistry formerly Agricultural Chemistry		4.17.79	4.30.79
MS/PhD	Chemistry, Mathematics and Physics formerly MA/PhD		5.15.79	5.25.79
MA	Spanish & Portuguese formerly Program 4 in Spanish		11.14.78	12.15.78
MAT	Near Eastern Studies		11.14.78	12.15.78
	Law and Society		4.17.79	4.30.79

## CCGA Reviews

1. <sup>4</sup>Program Review Process, 10.17.78, 11.14.79, 4.17.79.
2. <sup>5</sup>Normative time to degree, 10.17.79, 11.14.78, 1.16.79, 2.13.79, 5.15.79, 6.12.79.
3. Tuition waivers for out-of-state students, 10.17.79
4. Intercampus Graduate Fellowships, 10.17.79.
5. Resident and non-resident students, 11.14.79, 1.16.79.
6. Disestablishment of Academic Units, 1.16.79, 4.17.79, 6.12.79.
7. <sup>6</sup>Predicting and Evaluating Success in Graduate Education, 1.16.79, 2.13.79.
8. <sup>7</sup>Term of appointment for CCGA members, 4.17.79, 5.15.79.
9. Criteria for Evaluation of New Programs, 4.17.79, 5.15.79.
10. <sup>8</sup>FTEness of Graduate Students, 2.13.79, 5.15.79.

---

4. Further comments regarding these policies follow.  
5. Further comments regarding these policies follow.  
6. Further comments regarding these policies follow.  
7. Further comments regarding these policies follow.  
8. Further comments regarding these policies follow.

11. <sup>9</sup>Review of Individual Programs at the University, 5.15.79, 6.12.79.
12. <sup>10</sup>Policy on Part-Time Students, 4.17.79.
13. <sup>11</sup>Fair and Equal Opportunities to Participate in Undergraduate and Graduate Education, 4.17.79, 5.15.79.

\* Further comments regarding these policies follow.

— 30 —

## **1. Program Review Process**

Through the year, CCGA deliberated about the need for a more systematic review of each proposal for a new graduate program. In addition, the Committee had been requested by the Academic Planning and Program Review Board to provide more evaluative information about its deliberations in the form of a ranking, a statement of need, or desirability of each new program. CCGA proposed a revision in the process for review that was applied to program reviews during the last two meetings of the year. In brief, the review process will involve a detailed evaluation of each proposal by a member of the Committee based on the proposal and the preliminary analysis of the program by staff from the Academic Planning Office in Systemwide Administration. This proposal summary will form the basis for the discussion of the proposal. When a recommendation is made, it will be accompanied by CCGA's summary of the evaluation of the program proposal. By avoiding a ranking based on absolute criteria, that CCGA members felt would be difficult to impose, the qualitative evaluation along with the committee vote was considered to be an appropriate compromise. Further improvements in these procedures will be forthcoming as CCGA follows this plan throughout the 1979-80 academic year.

## **2. Normative Time to Degree**

This was the initial year of the institution of the normative time to degree program. Many questions have been raised by participating graduate divisions, some of which were resolved by an administrative committee of representatives of several graduate divisions chaired by Assistant Dean Thorne from Irvine. Several academic policy matters pertaining to normative time remained by the end of the year. Normative time for part-time students, for those holding teaching assistantships, and establishment of a minimum number of quarters enrolled before eligibility for fee grant status are examples of issues requiring academic policy. CCGA has always maintained that there should be similar procedures on all campuses so that normative time policy for TAs, for example, would be the same at Los Angeles as at Berkeley. A major task for the 1979-1980 CCGA agenda will be to develop academic policy statements regarding these and other issues in the administration of normative time programs.

## **7. Predicting and Evaluating Success in Graduate Education**

The CCGA study "Predicting and Evaluating Success in Graduate Education" received an offer of support of \$40,000 from the Educational Testing Service, but no matching support from Systemwide Administration. Though there was some interest in the study on the part of private foundations, assistance from

— 31 —

them was contingent on a commitment from the University. Without support from Systemwide Administration, the study, therefore, could not proceed.

---

9. Further comments regarding these policies follow.  
10. Further comments regarding these policies follow.  
11. Further comments regarding these policies follow.



## **8. Term of Appointment for CCGA Members**

In order to promote continuity of deliberations of the several policy issues CCGA considers annually, the Assembly of the Academic Senate approved a change in the By Laws pertaining to Committee appointment. CCGA members will now be appointed for overlapping terms of two years.

## **10. FTEness of Graduate Students**

On several occasions during the year CCGA discussed the method for computing graduate student FTE. We recognized that policies on several campuses varied, and concurred in the work of the Council of Graduate Deans to survey practices and to make recommendations. Toward the end of the academic year we learned that the California Postsecondary Education Committee had proposed a methodology for computing Graduate Student FTE. In brief this policy would compute one graduate student FTE as 12 units of graduate level instruction. Computation of FTE on the basis of level of course (graduate vs. undergraduate) rather than level of student was viewed as a serious problem possibly resulting in significant reduction of faculty support for graduate programs, especially those requiring a large number of undergraduate courses in the graduate program. Undergraduate FTE is computed as 17 units of instruction. CCGA informed the Academic Council and the Academic Vice President's office of its concerns, and plans to study the impact of this new policy on the maintenance of level of support for graduate programs as well as on the necessity of designing new types of credit, such as credit for regular graduate student research work that would be reflected in programs averaging 12 units of graduate course credit.

## **11. Individual Programs at the University**

During the year CCGA conducted a review of the Individual Ph.D. program that had been approved in 1974 pending the five year review in 1979. After receiving reports from the individual campuses, CCGA recommended continuation of the Individual Ph.D. program option and the elimination of the annual reports in favor of reports on a five year reporting cycle.

## **12. Part-Time Students**

CCGA has reviewed the issues pertaining to part-time students on several occasions over several years. During the year, a request for the development of policy regarding part-time students

— 32 —

was received and discussed. We received two proposals, very similar in content, one from the Council of Graduate Deans and one from the University Committee on Educational Policy. By the end of the year's work, it seemed reasonable to assume that policy statements on part-time students that would have the support of the Academic Senate committees as well as campus administrations would be forthcoming in the near future.

## **13. Fair and Equal Opportunities to Participate in Undergraduate and Graduate Education**

The Committee received a draft policy statement from President Saxon regarding Fair and Equal Opportunities to Participate in Undergraduate and Graduate Education. Our comments were returned to the President, and the final statement incorporated many of the suggestions that had been forwarded. CCGA noted, however, that the policy to include a variety of biographical information in the admissions review procedure may be vulnerable to subjective and less fair evaluations and suggested that the study "Predicting and Evaluating Success in Graduate Education" could provide empirical support for the kinds of criteria proposed.

— 33 —

# University Committee on Library: Annual Report 1978-79

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Library held its two allotted meetings of the year, both at UCB. In neither case was it possible to arrange a time when more than six of the ten members could be present. It was our general feeling, especially pronounced at the year-end meeting, that the Committee would have marginal usefulness and power if restricted to two meetings a year. The possibility might be explored of conducting the bulk of the Committee's work by correspondence and then using the personal meetings for reaching the more difficult decisions.

Assistant Vice President Stephen S. Salmon and members of his staff attended the first session of each meeting. Most of the time was occupied by Mr. Salmon bringing us up to date on library developments and hearing our reactions. Mr. Salmon agreed to send frequent written reports on library affairs to the Chairs of the campus Library Committees.

Committee members had a good deal to say about plans for the Regional Storage Facilities and Interlibrary Loans. There was great concern that the Facilities might not emerge in a way maximally useful to faculty patrons. Plans for the Facilities are still fluid, itself a disturbing situation when the architect has already started making his decisions. Considerable dissatisfaction was expressed about Interlibrary Loans, especially on the southern campuses.

The Chairman produced and distributed a long report "A Study of an Academic Library. Part I" and a long list of acronyms, "Academic Acronyms", which included those most frequent in library jargon. In addition, various requests were submitted to Library Council. Action on them was postponed to the 1979-80 academic year.

There are great divergences of opinion within the Library Council, the Library Policy Steering Committee, and the University Committee on Library on how the University should implement the **Plan** for its library system. There are no clear messages being sent to University Hall on what should be done. Nevertheless, I imagine we will hold University Hall responsible if things do not go according to our wishes. That bitter remark comes from my depression over the way our library plans are developing. Somehow I wish it were possible for a sufficient number of faculty members to become knowledgeable on the problems of academic libraries, to reach a consensus, and then become the dominant force in seeing that our libraries develop in the best possible manner. Things are drifting, a state for which we cannot avoid all blame.

Respectfully submitted

J. A. Moore (R) Chairman

A. L. Balch (D)

T. E. Daniels (SF)

R. G. Frank (LA)

E. S. Gruen (B) W, Sp

J. M. Hughes (SD)

H. Kirker (SB)

J. I. Kitsuse (SC)

J. E. Rodriguez (I)

G. A. Starr (B) F

B. Kreissman (D), *ex officio*

# Board of Patents: Annual Report 1978-79

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The last report to the Academic Council from its representative on the UC Patent Board was given by my predecessor, Professor Harold Harper in the Fall, 1977. The remaining item of old business since that time deals with the receipt by the University of a copy of a report of October 19, 1977 from the Office of the Auditor General to the Joint Legislative Audit Committee of the Legislature entitled "Patent and Royalty Program of the University of California".

The findings of the Auditor General reported to the Academic Council by Professor Harper, included the following:

"Few other similar institutions have as generous a royalty distribution schedule as the University of California"

Recommendation: "That the University of California reconsider its royalty distribution schedule".

Benefit: "Any reduction in the present distribution formula would make additional funds available to the University for research".

My brief report to the Council today will chronicle events which have occurred subsequent to receipt of this report.

— 35 —

1. President Saxon (November 30, 1977) responded in a letter to the Joint Legislative Audit Committee, that the present patent policy has been in operation for approximately 16 years, and that it was timely to review it at this juncture.
2. A restaffing of the Office of the Board of Patents was undertaken; by Fall 1978, Mr. Roger Ditzel had been employed as University Patent Coordinator, and designated as chair of the UC Board of Patents. This Board is a Regental Board being composed of faculty members representing each of the UC campuses, and an additional member representing the Academic Senate—the latter being my role.

The Patent Board has subsequently held four meetings for the purpose of reviewing the University Patent Policy in the light of the findings of the Auditor General.

Following this review of UC Patent Policy, a comprehensive response to the Auditor General's report was forwarded by Vice President Fretter to the Joint Legislative Audit Committee on June 29, 1979. In this response cognizance was taken of the Audit Report which observed that:

"3 UC faculty members had royalty income equal to or greater than their salaries" and that

"UC had a more liberal division of royalty income than had comparison institutions"

These points were responded to as follows:

"Over the last seventeen years (the life of a patent) the University of California Board of Patents has received 2,900 disclosures (i.e., reports of possibly patentable inventions) from its faculty and staff. As a result of these disclosures, 325 patents have been assigned to The Regents. In 1978, only 59 of these 325 patents earned royalty income, and only 43 of the 59 paid royalty shares to inventors.

During the two years ended June 30, 1977, only 49 inventions resulted in any royalty distribution to inventors, or *less than 2 percent* of the total number of disclosures received over the prior seventeen years. Of those same 49 inventions, 31 (1.1 percent of the total received) paid the inventors an annual average amount of one thousand dollars or less, another 9 (0.3 percent) paid the inventors an average of one thousand to five thousand

dollars annually, and 4 (0.14 percent) paid five to twenty thousand dollars annually

— 36 —

to the inventor. Only 3 (0.1 percent of the disclosures) paid more than twenty thousand dollars annually on the average to inventors.

The major consideration, other than the percent of royalty income shared with the inventor, is whether an institution has a voluntary or a mandatory patent assignment policy. Of the nine institutions studied by the Auditor General, three, namely Stanford, Iowa State, and Wisconsin, have a voluntary assignment program. While they pay from 15 percent to 33 percent of net royalty income to those inventors who choose to assign inventions to the institution, it is far more relevant that those faculty members who wish to retain patent rights in their own name receive 100 percent of any royalty income resulting from an invention arising while employed by the institution, absent a grant or contract to the contrary. Accordingly, Stanford, Wisconsin and Iowa State have royalty sharing with inventors that is far **more** liberal than that of the University of California, not less liberal.”

An underlying assumption of the audit report appeared to be:

“It appears to be an underlying assumption of the audit report that the only benefit to the public from a University-held patent is dollar income to the University, and that the amount of royalty distribution to inventors should be minimized to meet an undefined standard felt to exist among “comparable institutions”. While financial return is welcome and important, the real benefit of a University invention finding its place in the market, through technology transfer, is to the public in general which benefits from the availability of a new product. It is to this technology transfer process that a university patent program should address itself as an integral part of the overall University research effort.”

The Patent Board needs and would welcome the advice of the Council and Senate on issues which continue under discussions relating to the University patent policy, and which include the following:

— 37 —

1. Should there be an upper limit or sliding scale to royalty income payable to faculty. This might be applicable in the case of some highly unlikely, but extraordinarily successful invention.
2. Another tentative policy change which continues under discussion includes a revision of the preamble to the patent policy which will provide a broad statement of what the UC patent policy hopes to achieve. One version of which is the following: “ In recognition of the need for and desirability of encouraging the greatest possible utilization of the results of university research not only by scholars but in practical application for broad public benefit as well, and in recognition of the importance of the patent system established by the Constitution of the United States in bringing innovative research findings to practical application, the Regents of the University of California are disposed to encourage and assist members of the faculties and employees of the University in the use of the patent system with respect to their inventions, for the ultimate benefit of all, and in a manner that is equitable to all parties involved”.
3. Another purpose in revising the patent policy is to increase the flexibility so that all legitimate interests of the University and faculty may be met. For example, a continuing problem has been with the short-term appointment of visiting lecturers from industry who may be precluded from signing the conventional University patent agreement, and hence be unavailable to the University.

These changes in the present patent policy will be recommended to the Regents at the time of their November meeting.

Respectfully submitted

M. S. Blois, M.D., Chairman

## University Committee on Planning and Budget: Annual Report 1978-79

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The primary charge of the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) is to advise the President on behalf of the Academic Senate concerning matters of resource allocation, planning, and budget. The role of the Academic Senate in advising the President on these matters has been regularized only in the last few years, and communications between the Administration and UCPB are still being worked out. In respect to resource allocation during the last year, UCPB was asked by the President to review and give its advice concerning the campus contingency plans based on overall cuts for the University as a whole of 150 faculty FTE over the next two years, and a reduction of \$20 million from the support budget for 1979-80. UCPB expressed its displeasure that it had not been apprised beforehand of the President's call for contingency plans or consulted on the guidelines issued for the drafting of the contingency plans. UCPB, however, did, at a two-day meeting December 15-16, review the campus contingency plans and made recommendations to the President, most of which were accepted. UCPB was particularly concerned that the divisional Senate planning committees had been consulted by the campus Administrations in drafting their proposed cuts, and where they had not been consulted reported this to the President and urged that the matter be referred back to the campus Administration, and that the divisional Senates be consulted before the final cuts were approved.

Other resource matters on which UCPB made recommendations to the President were the proposed agreement between the President and the Santa Cruz campus to stabilize resources for a period of five years, the special fund to support faculty recruitment and retention, the Guidelines for an Intercampus Program Fund, and specific proposals for intercampus cooperation between the Riverside and Irvine campuses.

In respect to future planning, UCPB has, during the last year, been active in working with the Administration in establishing the planning process for developing a University plan for the 1980's. On UCPB's initiative, a Joint Planning Committee with Administration was formed to draft the guidelines for campus planning, to point up the crucial issues for the 1980's, and to make some recommendations for a Universitywide plan. The committee was composed of W. B. Fretter, Chairman, Vice President of the University; D. C. Swain, Academic Vice President; D. T. Cattell, Chairman of UCPB; R. J. Doedens, Member of UCPB; R. A. Zimmer, Student Representative. The Joint Planning Committee worked throughout the spring and summer developing its report, "The University of California: A Multi-Campus System in the 1980s," which was published in October 1979. In developing the report, the two UCPB members referred back and made available to UCPB the various chapters and drafts for discussion and advice. The report of the Joint Planning Committee is the first step and a preliminary statement on planning, and in the next year UCPB will continue to work with the Statewide Administration in reviewing the campus plans and developing a Universitywide plan for the 1980's.

As in previous years, the Committee was consulted in the spring about the priorities for preparing the budget to be sent to the Regents for 1980-81. That, however was the only input which the Committee had into the 1980-81 budget, as it was not further consulted and did not receive the draft of the budget presented to the Regents in time to make any serious recommendation. Likewise, UCPB was only belatedly consulted on the proposed response by the University to the

Department of Finance's request for a list of the University's low-priority programs equal to 10 per cent of the

University's State appropriation. Overall, in matters concerning the University's budget, the Committee still has to work out with the Statewide Administration a timetable for making the Senate's advice and interests known to the Statewide Administration during the drafting process.

In addition to advising the President on financial and resource matters during the past year, UCPB drafted a proposal for the conduct of Statewide Program Reviews which it has passed on to the Statewide Administration and to the Academic Council for their consideration. In a period of steady or declining resources, systematic program reviews need to be carried out by the campuses and by Universitywide Senate and Administration.

Respectfully submitted  
D. T. CATTELL, Chairman  
October 25, 1979

— 40 —

## **University Committee on Privilege and Tenure: Annual Report 1978-79**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Privilege and Tenure was asked to advise on several matters:

- 1) A question of proposed guidelines for relations of faculty members with intelligence agencies. The Committee took the position that the proposed guidelines were inappropriate and recommended that such guidelines not be adopted.
- 2) The persistent and still unresolved question of interpretation or revision of By-Law 188 (who votes in department meetings on various personnel matters). The Committee commented on a proposed draft, suggesting that voting rights on Tenure appointments not be extended to assistant professors; that (with less internal agreement) assistant professors not vote on new appointments; and that Departments not be given the right to extend voting privileges at their discretion.

The University Committee on Privilege and Tenure does not have appellate jurisdiction in particular P&T cases. Campus P&T Committees are required by By-Law to send a copy of each decision to University P&T. There are no permanent files of cases, however. It seems desirable to establish a permanent file so that the variety of problems arising on different campuses can be more easily studied and understood.

Respectfully submitted  
J. Tussman, Chairman  
October 24, 1979

— 41 —

## **University Committee on Research: Annual Report 1978-79**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Research met twice during the 1978-79 academic year and addressed itself to a number of issues related to research at the University of California. The following are summaries of the most important of these issues:

## 1. **Allocation of Faculty Research and Travel Funds for Individual Campus' Committees on Research**

The consensus of the University Committee on Research was that Faculty Research and Travel funds should be augmented **at least** to match the level of funding per faculty FTE in the fiscal year 1968-69 after adjusting for inflation. These funds provide extremely valuable seed money that leads to our faculty's generating new extramural funds, once research projects are launched.

For fiscal year 1968-69, State 19900 fund contribution to Faculty Research and Travel was \$2,404,075. According to the 1978 Edition of U.S. Statistical Abstract entitled "Higher Education Price Indexing", which reflects prices paid by colleges and universities (including personnel compensation and services, supplies and equipment), the annual percent of inflation for the period 1967-77 was 8.9% (over this same period the consumer price index rose 9.1% annually). Extrapolating from the 1968-69 figure, the 1978-79 State 19900 contribution, corrected for inflation, then should have been \$4,543,702 (\$554/FTE). In fact, the amount was only \$3,132,994, or \$1,410,708 short.

Professor Kenyon presented these arguments to the Academic Council on June 18, 1979. Subsequently, Professor Frazer, Chair of the Academic Council, made a plea to the Regents for increased funds for Faculty Research and Travel (see NOTICE, Vol. 3, No. 5, dated August 1979, page 3).

A breakdown of funds by individual campuses is in Appendix I.

## 2. **Overhead (Indirect) Costs**

Overhead (indirect) costs rates on grants are negotiated periodically between the University and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW). In May 1979, Professor Frazer requested that UCOR become involved in discussions of the proposed increase in overhead rates from 31% for all campuses to a range of 39.7% to 86.7% for individual campuses (this is equivalent to an average of 55.7% for all campuses). These figures had been proposed by the University after the results of a time and effort survey made in 1977 had been analyzed.

On June 4, 1979, UCOR met with representatives of Associate Vice President Thomas Jenkins' staff. As a result of that meeting, UCOR emerged strongly supporting a single overhead rate adjusted to a common base for all UC campuses. UCOR members feel that having individual rates would create competition and artificial differences among the campuses. The campuses have traditionally had "missions" and many aspects of the educational process, such as the libraries which have intercampus loan systems, and many intercampus programs, have become integrated.

— 42 —

UCOR strongly recommended that systemwide administration should try to persuade the DHEW to extend the current accepted rate of 31% until more reliable data for time and effort reporting can be obtained.

Subsequently, Associate Vice President Jenkins recommended an extension of the existing overhead rate of 31% until 1982. At the time of this writing, it is our understanding that DHEW has agreed in principle to this proposal, and that the proposal is currently being considered by the Regents.

## 3. **A-21 Task Force on Faculty Time and Effort Reporting**

A new set of principles governing time and effort reporting will go into effect on July 1, 1980. These were presented to the University in "Principles for Determining Costs Applicable to Grants, Contracts, and other Agreements with Educational Institutions" (Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-21, Revised). Professors Kenyon and Intriligator, as Chair and Chair-Elect of UCOR, respectively,

were both asked by Associate Vice President Jenkins to serve on the A-21 Task Force, which is charged with devising a form for quarterly time and effort reporting by faculty. Efforts have been made in a series of meetings of this Task Force both to simplify the form and to clarify the instructions for completing it.

Faculty are urged to fill these forms out with considerable care since retroactive penalties by DHEW may otherwise occur. Also, data from these forms will be used to determine future overhead rates (see Item 2 above, Overhead ((Indirect)) Costs).

#### **4. Questionnaires Concerning Activities of Individual Campus' Committees on Research**

UCOR wanted to find out about certain questions and activities such as: funds available; functions other than distribution of funds; who, besides Academic Senate members (if any) were eligible for funds; average and maximum awards, etc. A summary of these findings may be found in Appendix II.

#### **5. Continuity of UCOR Membership and Activities**

The problem of continuity on the University Committee on Research was discussed, and the following solutions were recommended:

— 43 —

- a. The University Committee on Committees was requested to appoint each year a Vice-Chair (Chair-Elect) to the University Committee on Research.
- b. The University Committee on Committees was requested to make two-year appointments for a greater proportion of the membership of UCOR with the provision that the members appointed also be members of their individual campus' COR.
- c. The Academic Senate Council and Assembly were requested to authorize an additional meeting of UCOR each year.
- d. The University Committee on Research should file an Annual Report with the Assembly of the Academic Senate.

#### **6. The Media and Reports of Research Results of the University of California**

UCOR discussed various media available for reporting the results of significant research in the UC system. The following devices are available through the University Relations Office: U.C. Clip Sheet, Audio-News Service, "The University Explorer" radio program, and "The Science Editor" radio program.

UCOR recently learned that "The Science Editor" transcripts as weekly mail outs are in the process of being phased out due to Proposition 13-induced budgetary cuts. UCOR sent a letter to David Wilson, Executive Assistant to the President of the University, urging that rather than discontinuing the mail out service, it be continued with perhaps higher rates. UCOR urged that these and other steps be taken to continue and even to expand this service and other related services that explain to the people of California what they are receiving from their investment in UC research and why they should be supporting and even expanding this investment.

#### **7. APPRB's Committee to Investigator Organized Research:**

Professor Intriligator, as Chair-Elect of UCOR, has been asked by Vice President Donald Swain to serve on the Academic Planning and Program Review Board Committee to Study Organized Research Units. This committee, chaired by Chancellor W. D. McElroy, will report on its findings soon.

*Respectfully submitted*



*George L. Kenyon (SF), Chair*  
*Michael D. Intriligator (LA), Chair-Elect*  
*Alexis T. Bell (B)*  
*Don W. Brown (R)*  
*Robert Erickson (SD)*  
*Daniel Morse (SB)*  
*Harry F. Noller (SC)*  
*A. Dinsmoore Webb (D)*  
*Daniel L. Wulff (I)*  
*August 28, 1979*

Appendices I and II follow.

# Appendix I

University of California: Faculty Grants and Travel—July 1 Adjusted Budget												
Campus	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
	\$/Faculty	\$/Faculty	\$/Faculty	\$/Faculty	\$/Faculty	\$/Faculty	\$/Faculty	\$/Faculty	\$/Faculty	\$/Faculty	\$/Faculty	\$/Faculty
Berkeley	\$732,136	\$759,265	\$737,623	\$687,654	\$688,061	\$690,096	\$690,505	\$595,156	\$636,163	\$663,008	\$758,385	\$761,463
	418	435	422	420	420	422	420	361	386	401	456	456
Davis	240,784	272,293	305,516	319,847	322,847	341,041	349,478	386,509	426,829	442,207	456,319	472,079
	340	359	373	355	350	351	335	356	385	396	406	418
Irvine	138,629	153,974	163,739	176,841	176,841	184,341	184,977	184,953	186,066	231,566	231,566	193,054
	368	379	384	393	371	379	331	320	314	375	366	302
Los Angeles	593,339	605,645	605,715	563,795	564,599	607,203	608,487	663,601	714,361	735,195	772,512	935,870
	323	315	317	307	304	322	305	325	347	355	371	450
Riverside	123,348	128,217	147,747	149,142	149,142	149,142	149,142	179,038	183,936	183,977	184,066	184,502
	398	409	415	416	433	446	473	438	440	433	425	417
San Diego	120,326	151,288	170,818	178,065	178,142	188,333	188,333	235,308	299,999	298,141	328,538	307,817
	378	401	407	398	372	375	343	391	420	420	450	417
San Francisco	123,626	139,649	141,044	121,993	132,122	133,031	167,878	183,252	288,691	398,241	311,732	312,542
	311	332	328	286	281	274	326	339	516	525	651	530
Santa Barbara	258,869	276,122	280,772	271,472	272,492	274,028	275,996	287,923	300,919	302,635	303,907	329,317
	364	387	386	384	411	419	408	402	420	416	419	459
Santa Cruz	73,018	90,077	97,052	87,052	96,152	87,052	152,474	151,802	153,674	154,239	156,738	156,738
	424	445	446	366	361	298	486	460	455	454	463	472
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Total	\$2,404,075	\$2,576,530	\$2,650,026	\$2,555,861	\$2,580,398	\$2,654,267	\$2,767,270	\$2,867,542	\$3,190,638	\$3,409,209	\$3,503,763	\$3,653,382
	365	376	376	366	363	366	364	360	391	405	426	438

## Appendix II

CAMPUS	Funds COR Distributes:	Other Functions:	Those Eligible to Receive COR Funds:	Personnel Support:
Berkeley	Faculty Research Funds Faculty Travel Funds Endowment Funds	Five year reviews of Organized Research Units	Academic Senate Members Graduate Students (for intercampus travel)	1.00 FTE
Davis	Faculty Research Funds Faculty Travel Funds Computer Funds (starting in 1979-80) Searles Funds Earle C. Anthony Fund Opportunity Funds	Policy on Committee on Research Faculty Development Awards Junior Faculty Fellowships	Academic Senate Members Acting Assistant Professors Lecturers without Security of Employment Graduate Students (for Intercampus Travel only)	.50 FTE
Irvine	Faculty Research Funds Faculty Travel Funds Computer Funds	Focused Research Program	Academic Senate Members	.75 FTE
Los Angeles	Faculty Research Funds Faculty Travel Funds Searles Fund Health Sciences Research Fund Health Science Travel Fund Opportunity Funds (Intercampus Exchange Program)	Advises Chancellor and informs Division concerning (1) campus budgetary needs for support of research (2) policies concerning acceptance of extramural subsidies (3) informs Division concerning policies which guide the COR in awarding research grants.	Academic Senate Members	2.00 FTE

CAMPUS	Funds COR Distributes:	Other Functions:	Those Eligible to Receive COR Funds:	Personnel Support:
Riverside	Faculty Research Funds Faculty Travel Funds Earle C. Anthony Fund Scarles Fund		Academic Senate Members Non-Academic Senate Members In-Residence, but not Instructor-in-Residence Lecturers without Security of Employment Acting Assistant Professors Visiting Professors Graduate Students Advanced to Candidacy (intercampus only)	.35 -.50 FTE
San Diego	Faculty Research Funds Faculty Travel Funds Earle C. Anthony Funds Preparation of Material Computer Funds Intercampus Exchange Funds		Academic Senate Members	.75 FTE

CAMPUS	Funds COR Distributes:	Other Functions:	Those Eligible to Receive COR Funds:	Personnel Support:
San Francisco	Faculty Research Funds Faculty Travel Funds Endowment Funds: Alexander Fund Barclay Fund Beatty Fund Cohn Fund Cook Fund Fine Fund Henderson Fund Koenigsburger Fund Norcross Fund Rice Fund Ryan Fund Searles Fund Gifts: Beagles Fund Hamilton Fund Hull Fund Steinhart Fund Strauss Fund	Selection of Faculty Research Lecturer	Academic Senate Members Non-Academic Senate Members Lecturers without Security of Employment Acting Assistant Professors	1.00 FTE
Santa Barbara	Faculty Research Funds Faculty Travel Funds Patent Funds Searles Fund	Advise Dean of Research Development, and Administration on status of research, research funding, and means of enhancing same	Academic Senate Members Non-Academic Senate Members with co-sponsorship	1.00 FTE
Santa Cruz	Faculty Research Funds Faculty Travel Funds Earle C. Anthony Fund Intercampus (Travel) Funds	Policy on Research	Academic Senate Members Non-Academic Senate Members Acting Assistant Professors Visitors	.60 FTE

<b>CAMPUS:</b>	<b>Source of Personnel Salary:</b>	<b>Hours Spent Per Month Per COR Member:</b>	<b>Administration Countersignature Required?</b>	<b>If so has grant ever been vetoed?</b>	<b>Maximum Amount of Research Funds Awarded 1978-79:</b>	<b>Maximum Amount of Research Funds Awarded 1978-79:</b>
Berkeley	Research Funds	4 hours	No		\$ 750 <sup>12</sup>	\$ 750
Davis	Federal Contracts & Grants	10 hours	Yes	Yes, once	2,500	950
Irvine	Contracts & Grants Office	3 hours	No		4,990	2,000
Los Angeles	General Research & A/S Office, Operating Funds	4 hours (8 hrs. for travel, 12 hours for Chair)	No		8,900	1,583.
Riverside	Academic Staff Salary & S&E	10-14 hours	Yes	No	1,100 (intercampus) 1,000 (intramural)	455 (intercampus) 709 (intramural)
San Diego	A/S Office	3-4 hours	No		3,700	1,308
San Francisco	Faculty Research & Travel	5-6 hours (10 hours for Chair)	No		17,977	4,220.
Santa Barbara	Faculty Research & Travel	10 hours	Yes	Not exactly <sup>13</sup>	3,500	900
Santa Cruz	Senate: Research Funds	4 hours (10 hours for Chair)	Yes	No	2,500	838

\* Recommendations have served to advise the committee leading to changes in its actions sometimes.

\*\* \$4500 maximum awarded for equipment.

12. \*\* \$4,500 maximum awarded for equipment.

13. \* Recommendations have served to advise the committee leading to changes in its actions sometimes.

<b>CAMPUS</b>	<b>Maximum for Subcategories:</b>	<b>Peer Review Process:</b>	<b>System of Priority Rating:</b>
Berkeley	None	Applications are reviewed by staff	Only equipment funds are awarded on merit.
Davis	None	Applications are assigned to Committee members on the basis of their expertise. Outside help may be solicited if needed.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New faculty</li> <li>2. Merit</li> <li>3. Faculty with limited research support and/or few opportunities for extramural and other sources of support</li> <li>4. Research representing new problem areas for the applicant</li> </ol>
Irvine	None	In-depth review by 2 people, consideration by whole committee. Outside opinions sought sometimes.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Merit</li> <li>2. Seed money</li> <li>3. New faculty</li> <li>4. Unavailability of other funds</li> <li>5. Multiple use of equipment</li> <li>6. Other</li> </ol>
Los Angeles	General Assistance-1/2 time on 12 month basis	6. two-member subcommittees—Humanities, Physical Sciences, Professional Schools, etc. The use of ad hoc expertise is encouraged.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New faculty</li> <li>2. Merit</li> <li>3. Unavailability of other funds</li> <li>4. Professorial rank</li> <li>5. Seed money</li> <li>6. Multiple use of equipment</li> </ol>
Riverside	None	Applications distributed to committee members by broad area of expertise for review. Full committee meets to consider recommendation of each member for each file reviewed by him/her.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New faculty</li> <li>2. Seed money</li> <li>3. Those with substantial extramural or ORU funding.</li> </ol>
San Diego	None	Subcommittees for Health Sciences, Marine Sciences, and General Campus—members review relevant applications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New faculty</li> <li>2. Assistant Professors</li> <li>3. Unavailability of other funds</li> <li>4. Seed money</li> <li>5. Merit</li> <li>6. Multiple use of equipment</li> </ol>
San Francisco	\$2,100 for General Assistance	Review by two members according to discipline, consideration by committee as a whole. Outside opinions sometimes sought.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New faculty</li> <li>2. Significance of research</li> <li>3. Scientific merit</li> <li>4. Extent investigator established on campus.</li> <li>5. Previous funding of project &amp; effective use of funds</li> <li>6. Alternate funding sought</li> <li>7. Amount of funds available to applicant</li> <li>8. Potential to obtain extramural funds</li> <li>9. Probability of success</li> <li>10. Multiple use of equipment</li> </ol>

CAMPUS	Maximum for Subcategories:	Peer Review Process:	System of Priority Rating:
Santa Barbara	None	First review by members or consultants in appropriate discipline, then consideration by full committee	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New faculty</li> <li>2. Seed money</li> <li>3. Merit</li> <li>4. Unavailability of other funds</li> <li>5. Multiple use of equipment</li> </ol>
Santa Cruz	\$1,300 for General Assistance; \$25 per day per diem	All members of committee participate on all requests, paying particular attention to those in their own discipline.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New and junior faculty</li> <li>2. Merit</li> <li>3. Unavailability of other funds</li> <li>4. Multiple use of equipment</li> </ol>



<b>CAMPUS</b>	<b>How often are funds disbursed?</b>	<b>Policy on Opportunity Funds:</b>	<b>Policy on Publication Costs:</b>
Berkeley	Once a year	Used for intercampus travel	\$50 per year
Davis	Twice a year	Used for consultation and research on other campus or UC facilities and field stations	Not paid
Irvine	Several specified periods	Used for: ORU support Focused Research Program Replacement of Research Equipment Support of Faculty Research for urgent, unforeseen needs	Page charges—no established policy but committee is extremely reluctant to fund Book publications—same as above
Los Angeles	Twice a year	Restricted to intercampus travel	No support except in rare extenuating circumstances
Riverside	Twice a year	Used for intercampus travel (Broadened to include other non-UC facilities)	Do not support publication costs with the exception of typing. For typing, the College of Humanities and Social Sciences provide matching typing funds.
San Diego	4 to 5 times a year plus emergencies	Used for intercampus research and to bring in others (lecturers) to the campus	Typing of manuscripts in final form for submission to publishers. No reprint or publication costs are paid.
San Francisco	Three times a year	Used for research grants	No policy.
Santa Barbara	Three times a year	Administered by Dean of Research and Chancellor	Page costs, Xeroxing, or typing permitted Publisher's fees for books generally not provided.
Santa Cruz	Four times a year	Used for intercampus travel and research	Treated with low priority; no official policy in guidelines.

1

<b>CAMPUS</b>	<b>Travel Frequency:</b>	<b>Difference for domestic and foreign travel.</b>	<b>Criteria:</b>	<b>Amount Awarded:</b>
Berkeley	1 trip per year	None	Scholarly meetings with invitation or acceptance to present papers	\$510 maximum
Davis	1 trip per year	None	1. Present paper or have an initial showing 2. Chairs and discussants are reviewed separately 3. No per diem allowed	2/3 fare for Health Sciences Full fare for general campus
Irvine	No limit	None	Scholarly meetings with invitation or acceptance to present papers	No fixed amount
Los Angeles	1 trip per year	Foreign travel permitted every fourth year	Scholarly meetings with invitation or acceptance to present papers	Full coach fare for domestic travel 14-21 day excursion fare maximum for foreign travel
Riverside	1 trip per year	Foreign travel eligibility after 3 fiscal years have passed.	Scholarly meetings with invitation or acceptance to present papers—although discussants and chairs are funded also	90% of domestic fare 90% (maximum of \$500) for foreign travel
San Diego	1 trip per year	None	Scholarly meetings with invitation or acceptance to present papers	Air coach fare only to maximum of \$500 <sup>14</sup>
San Francisco	1 trip every two years or \$350 every two years	None	Scholarly meetings with invitation or acceptance to present papers	Maximum of \$350 every two years
Santa Barbara	1 domestic trip every year	Foreign travel permitted every three years	Scholarly meetings with invitation or acceptance to present papers	Minimum practical fare—no per diem
Santa Cruz	1 trip per year or \$450 maximum	Foreign travel permitted every three years	Scholarly meetings with invitation or acceptance to present papers and other forms of active participation	\$450 domestic travel \$500 European travel \$800 Asian travel

\*\* Full support for Plenary Address

14. \*\* Full support for Plenary Address

## Annual Report of the University Committee on Subject A 1978/1979

1. **Status of Subject A** Between 30% and 70% of incoming freshmen on various UC campuses (excluding UCSF) take a "Subject A" course. As many as 50% are required to do so on some campuses. (On some campuses, a large number of freshmen voluntarily enroll.) In 1979/80, all campuses will allow some credit for composition work done by students held for Subject A. This typically occurs by giving some credit for non-remedial work or by simply requiring the students to take the equivalent of freshman composition (Eng. 1, etc.).
2. **High School Composition Examination** In April, the Committee decided to develop a Subject A-related exam for high school juniors as suggested by John Pippenger of the BOARS Committee. This will be used as a diagnostic examination to determine if some high school students may be excused from the recently required senior year courses in composition. An ad hoc committee composed of a few Committee members and Subject A Supervisors has done a substantial amount of work on this already. A pilot exam has been given and graded. The old Subject A Booklet is being revised. A relatively final form of both the exam and booklet should be available by October 10 when the ad hoc committee will meet to develop final details. Much of the remaining work involves administration and funding. Various University and high school administrators will join the October 10 meeting to provide advice on these matters. The first state-wide exam of this type will be given in Spring 1980.

Submitted by  
J. F. Shackelford, Chairman  
9/5/79

## University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction: Annual Report 1978-79

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction spent much of its time this past year reviewing changes in Senate and Divisional legislation for consonance with the Senate Code, and in giving advice to various Senate agencies. It also conducted a review of Title IX legislation. In addition, the Committee conferred with the Academic Council on a number of issues on which it had commenced study, and on which review will continue through the next year. These include a study of the Legislative Rulings, By-Law 188, and Senate Regulation 696.

Respectfully submitted  
T. N. Tozer, Chairman  
10.23.79

## **University Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors, and Prizes: Annual Report 1978-79**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

In the interests of economy, the Committee conducted its business by mail and phone.

The policies and procedures for awarding honors on several campuses were approved by the Committee and these were included in the Consent Calendar of Assembly. Several campuses are not yet in compliance with Senate Regulations concerning the award of honors.

Regulation 640 was revised to clarify the Committee's jurisdiction over graduation with honors as well as Dean's list.

During the next academic year the Committee plans to gather information about the emerging honors programs for talented students on the various campuses. While no policy issues are anticipated, some of the problems and needs of these programs may become evident.

Respectfully submitted  
Max M. Levin, Chairman  
10.26.79

## **University Committee on University Extension: Annual Report 1978-79**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

I was appointed Chair of this Committee late in the year. During the period of my tenure no business was referred to the Committee so a meeting was never convened.

Respectfully submitted  
Richard W. Gable, Chairman  
9.26.79

— 54 —

## **Committees of the Academic Senate, 1979-80: Revised 10/26/79**

CHAIRMAN: K. S. Pister (B)

VICE CHAIRMAN: B. Aaron (LA)

### **Academic Freedom**

R. L. Crouch (SB Econ), Chm.

D. M. Donlan (R Educ)

K. W. Dumars (I Pedi)

R. W. Dutton (SD Biol)

A. Meadow (D Psych)

J. A. Motto (SF Psych)

I. Scheiner (B Hist)  
S. Shiffrin (LA Law)  
K. V. Thimann (SC Biol)

**Academic Personnel**

J. B. Kester (LA Art), Chm.  
L. G. Clubb (B Comp Lit; Ital), V-Chm.  
J. Conlisk (SD Econ)  
I. Zabin (LA Biol Chem)  
R. G. Rinker (SB Chem & Nuc Eng)  
M. Morello-Frosch (SC Lit)  
V. L. Olesen (SF Soc & Behav Sci)  
M. S. Poster (I Hist)  
P. F. Pratt (R Soil & Env Sci)  
A. W. Searcy. (B Mat Sci & Min Eng)  
W. A. Williams (D Agron & Range Sci)  
*Ex officio* : Chm, Assembly, K. S. Pister

**Affirmative Action**

D. B. Bugental (SB Psych), Chm.  
D. F. Bainton (SF Path)  
J. N. Brune (SD Geol Res Div)  
~~J. Dizikes~~ (SC Hist)  
L. F. Kumagi (D Int Med)  
R. Parades (LA Engl)  
E. Rodriguez (I Dev & Cell Biol)  
T. Shapiro (R Lits & Langs)  
D. H. Calloway (B Nut Scis)

**Board of Patents**

M. S. Blois (SF Med Info Sci)

**Board of Admissions and Relations with School**

W. E. Broen (LA Psych), Chm.  
H. L. Alder (D Math)  
M. J. Warren (SC Lit)  
D. Blackwell (B Stat)  
P. H. Borer (I Chem)  
J. M. Costello (SB Speech Path)  
M. E. Friedkin (SD Biol)  
R. D. Gibson (SF Pharm)  
B. Manard (R Sociol)

**Computer Policy**

W. J. Karplus (LA Engin), Chm.  
A. Bork (I Physics)  
W. H. Geoghegan (B Anthro)  
C. E. McIlwain (SD Physics)  
R. C. Millikan (SB Chem)  
B. C. Shen (R Physics)

D. W. Simborg (SF Ambu & Commun Nurs)  
W. T. Wipke (SC Chem)  
R. M. Yager (D Physics)

**Editorial**

C. R. Adrian (R Pol Sci)  
G. H. Brieger (SF Hist of Hlth Scis))Co-Chm.)  
H. G. Baker (B Bot)  
C. M. Cipolla (B Econ)  
J. M. Dillon (B Classics)  
K. C. Liu (D Hist)  
R. G. Swift (D Music)  
D. H. Volman (D Chem)  
R. L. Regosin (I French)  
M. S. Gordon (LA Zool)  
W. O. Bright (LA Linguis; Anthro)  
R. S. Kinsman (LA Engl)  
R. H. Pearce (SD Lit)  
C. W. Hollister (SB Hist)  
A. C. Spaulding (SB Anthro)  
T. A. Vogler (SC Lit)  
R. A. Wasserstrom (SC Philos)  
*Ex officio* : Dir, UC Press J. H. Clark

— 55 —

**Education Aboard Program**

Senate appointees:

A. J. Bauer (D Hist 1980<sup>15</sup>), Chm.  
R. N. Campbell (LA Engl 1980)  
R. A. Scalapino (B Pol Sci 1981)  
Z. Webb (I Span & Port 1981)  
C.J.A. Halberg (R Math 1981)

\* terms of office end Aug 31 of the year indicated

Appointed by the President:

H. Halkin (SD 1 year)  
A. Yaqub (SB 1 year)  
**S. B. Puknat** (SC 2 years)  
**A. L. Meleis** (SF 2 years)

**Educational Policy**

R. S. Bringhurst (D Pomol), Chm.  
S. E. Archer (SF Mtl Hlth & Commun Nurs), V-Chm.  
H. J. Vaux, Jr. (R Rsrc Econ)  
L. Iannaccone (SB Educ)  
L. J. Sham (SD Physics)  
D. Marvick (LA Pol Sci)

R. L. Owen (SF Med)  
E. Smith (D Human Physiol)  
G. VonderMuhll (SC Pol)  
M. L. Norrie (B Phys)  
L. M. Hill ((Hist)  
*Ex officio* : Chm, Assem K. S. Pister

**Gov Bd, UC Retirement Systems**

D. E. Feller (B Law June 1981)  
W. D. Morgan (SB Econ June 1982)

**Graduate Affairs, Coordinating Committee on**

R. L. Wild (R Physics), Chm.  
A. Binder (I Soc Ecol), V-Chm.  
C. R. Adrian (R Pol Sci)  
R. O. Collins (SB Hist)  
M. H. Green (SD Biol)  
K. Moldave (I Biochem)  
J. S. Pearse (SC Biol)  
S. L. Robe (LA Span & Port)  
J. S. Manning (D Bact)  
A. J. Trevor (SF Pharm)  
G. H. Trilling (B Physics)  
*Ex officio* : Pres of UC, D. S. Saxon

**Library**

J. E. Rodriguez (I Hist), Chm.  
D. E. Atkinson (LA Chem)  
D. W. Brokensha (SB Anthro)  
E. A. Dratz (SC Chem)  
E. S. Gruen (B Hist)  
J. O. Hayden (D Engl)  
B. G. Katzung (SF Pharm)  
N. M. Kroll (SD Physics)  
J. A. Moore (R Biol)  
*Ex officio* : Univ Libr; Chm, Libr Cncl, M. D. Abell (SD)

**Planning and Budget**

D. T. Cattell (LA Pol Sci 1980<sup>16</sup>), Chm.  
F. E. Balderston (B Bus Ad 1982<sup>17</sup>), V-Chm.  
R. E. Attiyeh (SD Econ 1981)  
R. L. Bell (D Chem Eng 1980)  
W. E. Brownlee (SB Hist 1982)  
R. J. Doedens (I Chem 1980)  
B. L. Highley (SF Fam Hlth Care Nurs 1982)  
V. L. Perkins (R Hist 1981)  
M. B. Smith (SC Psych 1981)

---

16. terms of office end Aug 31 of the year indicated

17. terms of office end Aug 31 of the year indicated

*Ex officio* : Vice Chm, Assembly, B. Aaron (LA)

\* terms of office end Aug 31 of the year indicated

**Privilege and Tenure**

F. N. Spiess (SD Marine Phys Lab 1982<sup>18</sup>), Chm.  
F. M. Carney (R Pol Sci 1981)  
M. N. Diaz (SC Anthro 1981)  
R. K. Josephson (I Dev & Cell Biol 1982)  
L. Letwin (LA Law 1982)  
A. H. Mines (SF Physiol 1980)  
D. L. Olmsted (D Anthro 1981)  
G. Wade (SB EECS 1980)  
\_\_\_\_\_(B 1980)

\* terms of office end Aug 31 of the year indicated

— 56 —

**Research**

M. D. Intriligator (LA Econ), Chm.  
A. D. Webb (D Vit & Enol), V-Chm.  
R. E. Garrison (SC Earth Scis)  
D. W. Brown (R Pol Sci)  
I. Finnie (B Mec Eng)  
S. A. Kernell (SD Pol Sci)  
D. Morse (SB Biol Scis)  
W. Sadee (SF Pharm)  
D. L. Wulff (I Mol Biol & Biochem)

**Rules and Jurisdiction**

Members at large:

A. B. Manaster (SD Math), Chm., W, Sp  
D. A. Brant (I Chem)  
J. E. Moore (SB Pol Sci), Chm, F

Chairmen of Divisional Comms.

D. G. Daviau (R German)  
R. L. Wiegel (B Civ Eng)

**Subject A**

J. F. Shackelford (D Mec Eng), Chm.  
L. S. Brown (R Engl)  
C. Cooper (SD Lit)  
E. Evans (SB Engl)  
E. L. Jones (LA Engl)  
T. F. Parkinson (B Engl)  
H. H. Wang (SC Biol)  
\_\_\_\_\_(I)



**Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes**

M. M. Levin (SC Psych), Chm.  
J. R. Murdoch (LA Chem)  
J. S. Dewald (I Hist)  
Y. S. Kim (SF Med)  
P. J. McCarthy (SB Engl)  
H. G. Nerjes (D German & Russian)  
T. O. Pelzel (R Art Hist)  
J. O. Sawyer (B Linguis)  
K. R. Wilson (SD Chem)

**University Extension**

H. H. Aschmann (R Earth Scis), Chm.  
E. L. Biberstein (D Vet Microbiol)  
C. Grobstein (SD Biol)  
M. I. Mendel (SB Speech)  
H. Koopowitz (I Dev & Cell Biol)  
P. N. Stern (SF Nurs in Biodysfunctions)  
L. L. Tyler (LA Educ)  
R. S. Muller (B EECS)  
\_\_\_\_\_(SC)

**University and Faculty Welfare**

L. H. Lofland (D Sociol), Chm.  
S. M. Arfin (I Biochem)  
H. E. Frech (SB Econ)  
A. C. Helmholtz (B Physics)  
T. L. Jacobs (LA Chem)  
A. R. Margulis (SF Radiol)  
J. B. Michaelsen (SC Econ)  
J. W. Miles (SD Geoph & Plan Physics)  
S. Stewart (R Engl)  
*Ex officio* : Senate members of UCRS, D. E. Feller (B Law) W. D. Morgan (SB Econ)

**Committee on Committees, 1978-79**

N. A. Halasz (SD)  
R. S. Kinsman (LA)  
L. LaPorte (SC)  
J. C. Lave (I)  
C. P. Nash (D)  
A. G. Pickerell (B)  
P. C. Pothier (SF)  
R. K. Soost (R)  
H. Votey (SB)  
T. L. Allen (D), Member at large  
W. R. Fraser (SD), Ex officio  
B. R. Nevius (LA), Chairman

**Committee on Committees, 1979-80**

M. Adelson (LA)

E. R. Arquilla (I)

J. L. Hodges, Jr. (B)

L. LaPorte (SC)

A. E. McGuinness (D)

P. C. Pothier (SF)

G. Wade (SB)

R. S. White (R)

\_\_\_\_\_(SD)

J. H. Raleigh (B), Member at large

K. S. Pister (B), Ex officio

T. L. Allen (D), Chairman