

REGULAR MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JUNE 11, 2008

MINUTES OF MEETING

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met by teleconference on Wednesday, June 11, 2008. Academic Senate Chair Michael T. Brown presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Senate Associate Director Todd Giedt called the roll of Assembly members. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of the January 30, 2008 meeting and the February 20, 2008 meeting as noticed.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

- **Robert C. Dynes**

President Dynes distributed his [Report to the Academic Assembly](#) electronically prior to the meeting.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST

- **Wyatt R. Hume**

REPORT: Provost and Chief Operating Officer Hume reported that the Governor's May budget revision restores (if approved by the state Senate and Assembly) approximately \$98 million to UC's budget over cuts that had been proposed by the Governor in January, but it still leaves UC more than \$300 million short of the operating budget proposed by The Regents last fall, a 5% overall cut relative to UC's expectations. UC is mounting a vigorous advocacy campaign, both locally and statewide and in strong partnership with California State University and the California Community Colleges, to promote the importance of higher education. The campaign focuses on the negative effects of disinvestment in higher education on educational opportunity and the California economy. So far, the effort has been successful; indeed, the more favorable May budget should be attributed in part to efforts by the California business community to communicate the potential effect of the cuts on workforce preparation and innovation.

He said the Office of the President is working hard to meet, and exceed if possible, the 10% administrative savings target for UC set by The Regents, by restructuring UCOP to be more efficient and by identifying additional areas of intercampus administrative saving achievable through economies of scale. Campuses are being asked to prepare for additional reductions. Current financial circumstances make implementing a second year of the faculty salary scales plan a challenging prospect, but restoring faculty salary scales to health and competitiveness remains a high priority for the University, along with graduate student support. Finally, the report of the Undergraduate Work Team of The Regents Study Group on Diversity was presented in May to The Regents, who expressed enthusiasm for the report and a sense of urgency about diversity within the University. They asked the Senate and administration to act as aggressively as possible to address the problem.

Questions and Comments:

Question: The recent review of the proposed guidelines for vendor relations highlighted two disparate views, which on the one hand seem to encourage faculty to interact with industry to further the dissemination of their research, and on the other hand, discourage medical sciences faculty from interacting with the pharmaceutical industry. How do we balance these views?

Answer: UC in no way wishes to inhibit interactions with industry that are proper, productive, and defensible under the California Fair Political Practices Act. We also do not want to encourage the acceptance of bribes, free trips, meals, or gifts, or other behavior that endangers the integrity of the research enterprise. UC policies include appropriate incentives and guidelines that ensure a proper way for faculty to benefit from those interactions.

Question: What is the status of the RFP for outsourcing the administration of the UC Retirement Plan (UCRP)? What standard will be used to assess responses, and is the decision to outsource final?

Answer: UC provides excellent service now, but it is also relatively expensive compared to industry standards. The goal of the bid process is to see if we can get an equally high quality of service at a lower cost. This goal is important at a time when we are trying to minimize administrative costs and curtail the re-start of contributions to UCRP. The decision about the bids will involve close consultation with the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW).

Comment: The UCFW Task Force on Investment and Retirement determined that UC provides a lower cost operation than is available elsewhere, and would question the assumption that privatization of benefits administration functions can be done more cheaply at the same level of service. Decentralization of UCOP will not necessarily save money and may create additional inefficiencies in the long run.

Answer: The pressure to lower administrative costs at UCOP will continue and we will decentralize processes if we find they can be administered more cheaply and efficiently at a campus or through a third party without damaging quality. I hope you are right about UCRP, but we may be able to realize \$3 million in permanent savings by outsourcing its administrative processes, which can be put to good use throughout the University.

Question: What is the status of proposed legislation regarding financial aid for undocumented students and protection of animal researchers?

Answer: We are optimistic that the student financial aid legislation will progress without a Governor's veto because there are no state funds involved. The approved animal research legislation was not as strong as we hoped, but we will continue working to strengthen it.

Comment: Thank you Provost Hume for being such a strong and constant advocate for faculty salaries and graduate student support.

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE

- **Mark G. Yudof**

REPORT: President-Designate Yudof said he is looking forward to assuming the UC presidency on June 16, and noted that over time, he plans to visit each campus to meet with faculty, students, and administrators. He said as president of the world's premier public

University system, he sees no higher calling for himself than building upon UC's excellence, fulfilling its mission, expanding its impact, and communicating its importance to the state legislature and the people of California. He said the Office of the President should help facilitate the work of the campuses, encourage systemwide collaboration, and add value to the work of the faculty and staff on the campuses. He will need the support and advice of the faculty to carry through on these goals.

The President-Designate noted that he has been a strong proponent of affirmative action and diversity throughout his career – as dean of the University of Texas Law School, and as president of the University of Texas and the University of Minnesota. He will continue that commitment at the University of California. He has been briefed by the General Counsel on the constraints and possibilities for action within the context of Proposition 209. UC needs to work hard to increase both racial/ethnic and socioeconomic diversity on the campuses.

He takes institutional accountability very seriously and believes it is important for the University to view itself as accountable to students, parents, the people of California, and the legislature. UC should be prepared to provide coherent answers to questions about learning objectives and outcomes, and able to identify areas of success and areas that need improvement. He said he is very comfortable with UC's shared governance model and is looking forward to exchanging ideas with the faculty on a number of issues. He also noted the importance of keeping UC faculty salaries competitive with peer institutions for recruitment and retention purposes.

Questions and Comments:

Each division extended a welcome to President-Designate Yudof, and several asked questions.

Question: Do you have any thoughts about the current proposal before the Assembly to revise UC's freshman eligibility policy in the context of your experience with the University of Texas (UT)?

Answer: President Designate Yudof said he had not yet reviewed Council's proposed policy, but the Texas and California situations are very different. At UT, the top 10% of students are admitted through a local context program similar to UC's, but students may choose the campus they want to attend, which drives up the size of the entering class and precludes the use of affirmative action and a more holistic review process. He said he is comfortable with UC's referral system and looks forward to reviewing the proposal.

Question: Many of us are also concerned about a lack of diversity in the faculty. What are your views and have you thought about ways to increase faculty diversity?

Answer: It is vitally important to increase diversity within the context of Proposition 209. Establishing a critical mass of diverse faculty will help attract other diverse faculty. It is also critical for students to see diverse faculty in leadership roles as teachers, researchers, and administrators.

Question: UC Merced's funding model depends on enrollment, a marginal revenue model which does not take into account the high overhead costs associated with a start-up enterprise. What can UCOP do to help this fledgling campus?

Answer: I will be taking a close look at the UCM funding model with Vice President for Budget Patrick Lenz within the context of the current fiscal situation. As an emerging university, UCM has a plausible claim for additional resources, but other institutions do as well.

Question: What are your thoughts on the need to increase graduate student funding support?

Answer: I agree with the goal of increasing graduate funding, but all priorities may not be possible in the current budget climate. We should start by determining exactly where we need and want to be along with the cost of achieving that goal.

Question: UC will be frustrated in its attempts to diversify the student population if we are not more successful in preparing underrepresented minorities for UC. Does UC have a role to play in improving the K-12 pipeline?

Answer: The relationship of the K-12 pipeline to higher education is absolutely critical. We cannot solve the access and diversity problems at UC without looking more closely at K-12. The University of Texas Institute for Public School Initiatives was created for just this purpose. UC needs to think more creatively and innovatively in this area, and I would like a very active role for the campuses and faculty. Whatever UC does should be practical and sensible and include appropriate accountability mechanisms that will measure progress in better preparing students.

Question: I am interested in diversifying faculty, staff, students, and administrators not only in terms of ethnic diversity but also gender diversity. Are all of these priorities on your agenda?

Answer: This is very high on my agenda, and I am glad you raised the gender issue. It is important that we have strong representation of women colleagues at every level on every campus and at UCOP. We should think together about how to better facilitate that process.

Question: You were quoted recently as saying that UC needs to do more with less and that we need to be more of a hybrid university with multiple revenue streams. Since 1990, however, we have already done more with 40% less state funding while increasing contracts and grants revenue and tripling private donations. How can UC avoid doing more and more this time while ending up with less state funding?

Answer: My article on the 'Hybrid University' was more descriptive than prescriptive. I don't like the idea of UC becoming more dependent on higher fees and private endowments, but I am cautious because I see similar national trends facing educational institutions in virtually all 50 states. I will do my best to be more of a presence in the legislature and to secure more state support. We also must do more to appeal directly to the people of California to explain the importance of higher education to the welfare of the state, and the role higher education plays in every aspect of their lives, even if they do not have a child enrolled at UC or any direct connection to a campus. But we may have to do modeling on other funding alternatives to maintain and enhance quality.

Question: You had experience at the University of Texas with the DOE lab bidding process and have some familiarity with the labs themselves. How do you view the transition to the LLC structure, the current fiscal difficulties and downsizing of personnel at the labs, and the shift in direction to an increased nuclear weapons manufacturing component at Los Alamos?

Answer: I am not optimistic that the funding situation will improve in the near term. UC has signed a contract and we will be held to that contract, but I would also be troubled by an

expansion of nuclear weapons manufacturing, which I differentiate from the necessity of safeguarding the nuclear weapons stockpile. I also want to make sure there is integration between the first rate science at the labs and the faculty on the ten campuses. I think that interaction is important and useful to both the labs and the campuses. If we are not doing a good job we need to come up with strategies for more integration.

Comment (from several campuses): We appreciate your comments about shared governance and look forward to working with you in the years ahead.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CHAIR

- **Michael T. Brown**

Chair Brown noted that for questions, comments, and voting in the teleconference format, he would first poll Council members, and then Assembly members located at campus sites by division. He asked divisional chairs to introduce the speakers from their site, and added that Assembly meetings are open to the public, but only Senate member have a right to the floor and only Assembly members may vote or propose a motion. He asked that no Assembly member speak twice until all other members were given the opportunity to speak.

The Academic Assembly uses the *Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure* as its parliamentary authority, except in the case of a motion to divide the question, in which the Assembly uses *Robert's Rules of Order*.

VII. SPECIAL ORDERS

Consent Calendar

1. Santa Cruz Division Regulation 11 – Honors
2. Merced Division Regulation 75

ACTION: The Assembly approved the consent calendar as noticed.

VIII. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES (NONE)

IX. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

- **Michael T. Brown, Chair**

1. Nomination and Election of the University Committee on Committees (UCOC) Vice Chair (member-at-large) for 2008-2009 and Chair 2009-2010

ISSUE: Upon the recommendation of UCOC, Academic Council nominates UCSC Professor of Chemistry Joseph P. Konopelski to serve as the 2008-09 UCOC vice chair and succeed as chair in 2009-2010. In accordance with Senate Bylaw 150.A.1, the Assembly is required to name members-at-large.

ACTION: The Assembly approved the election of Professor Konopelski to serve as the 2008-09 UCOC vice chair and to succeed as the UCOC chair in 2009-10.

2. Ratification of the Oliver Johnson Awards Recipients

ISSUE: The Assembly is asked to ratify the Academic Council’s choices for the 2008 Oliver Johnson Award for Distinguished Service to the Academic Senate: UC Santa Barbara Professor of Political Science Gayle Binion and UC San Francisco Professor of Neurosurgery Lawrence “Larry” Pitts.

DISCUSSION: Chair Brown noted that Oliver Johnson was a UC Riverside professor of philosophy, former chair of the Riverside Senate Division (1963-66), and former chair of the systemwide Senate (1981-82). In 1996, Professor Johnson made a gift to the systemwide Senate to endow the award that bears his name, which is given every other year to honor a UC faculty member or members who have demonstrated outstanding and creative contributions to shared governance at the divisional and systemwide level.

ACTION: The Assembly ratified Gayle Binion and Lawrence “Larry” Pitts as the 2008 Oliver Johnson awards recipients.

3. Proposal to Reform UC’s Freshman Eligibility Policy

- Michael T. Brown, Academic Council chair
- Mark Rashid, BOARS chair

REPORT: Council Chair Brown reported that the Academic Council released BOARS’ original eligibility reform proposal for systemwide Senate review in August 2007. The review concluded in December, when Council asked BOARS to address Senate reviewing agencies’ questions and concerns. BOARS responded in February 2008 with a revised proposal, and in May, Council voted to approve and forward a revised version of that proposal to the Assembly. Chair Brown invited BOARS Chair Mark Rashid to summarize the BOARS proposal.

Chair Rashid noted that admission to UC should be consistent with the following principles: it should be awarded primarily on the basis of academic achievement; assessment of this achievement should be based on multiple sources of evidence and should account for the circumstances in which it occurred; and all of California’s college-ready students, regardless of circumstances, should be afforded the opportunity to have their qualifications fairly and accurately assessed for purposes of admission.

The distinctive feature of UC admissions is the concept of “eligibility,” which the state guarantees to the top 12.5% of California high school graduates who complete the required “a-g” course pattern and a pattern of standardized testing, and meet a GPA/test score index. Currently, students gain admission to UC by submitting applications to individual campuses, which conduct a comprehensive review and offer admission to the most competitive students. UC-eligible students who are not accepted to any campus are granted an additional guarantee of referral admission to a campus with space, although in recent years, only UCR and UCM have extended a referral offer, and less than 1% of freshmen accept the offer.

UC grants eligibility on the basis of successful navigation of a complex set of rules and regulations, rather than on the basis of academic performance, which means that UC denies many excellent students a review for technical reasons that have little bearing on academic merit and that often relate to a lack of educational opportunity in individual high schools. Failure to conform to a single rule – for example, missing the SAT II or one course in the a-g pattern –

renders a student ineligible and essentially invisible to UC. Ineligibility alone is not a sound basis on which to exclude students. Each year about 15% of the applicant pool is ineligible; despite the fact that the pool contains many students with GPAs over 3.5. It is notable that students in this pool are more ethnically and geographically representative of the state.

BOARS has proposed a new eligibility pathway – “Entitled To Review” (ETR). All students meeting minimum markers of college readiness would be designated ETR and invited to apply. Their applications would be comprehensively reviewed based on current processes in place on the campuses. A subset of the ETR pool would receive an additional referral guarantee. The proposal also recommends eliminating the SAT Subject test as a strict requirement for admission, based on evidence that Subject test scores do not help predict freshman success; however, individual campuses and programs would still be able to recommend specific Subject tests.

BOARS’ initial proposal called for retaining guaranteed referral only through the Eligibility in a Local Context pathway at its present level of 4%, and eliminating the statewide eligibility pathway. The Senatwide review of that proposal, however, showed that many faculty regard guaranteed referral as important, although few students use it. BOARS’ February revision took this into account by expanding the referral guarantee to a subset of ETR students who are either in the top 5% of graduating seniors statewide, or in the top 12.5% of graduates from their school. BOARS estimates that due to significant overlap, the 12.5x5 index will confer a guarantee of admission to about the top 10% of California high school graduates.

Chair Rashid said the referral guarantee under ETR will not exclude students; rather, it will help increase UC’s presence in high schools throughout the state, emphasize the importance of excelling in the local context, encourage students to prepare for UC, and broaden the expectation, particularly in low API schools, that a UC education is possible. There are concerns that ETR will cause academic quality to decline and leave good students from UC’s top feeder schools without a guarantee, but these concerns are unwarranted. Few good students from top schools use or benefit from the guarantee, and most will still earn ETR status and will be admitted to individual campuses on the basis of their records. In addition, the proposal will enhance student quality by broadening the pool of freshman applicants visible to campuses. UC will receive more applications, some of them from very deserving students, which will increase the selectivity of the entire system. In sum, eligibility as it is currently constructed, is not serving UC well. The proposal before the Assembly is the product of great academic effort. It opens the doors to all college-ready applicants to have their credentials fairly assessed. The evidence is that it will have a positive impact on access, diversity, fairness, and quality.

Chair Brown noted that nine Senate divisions and four systemwide committees responded during the systemwide review. There was general support for BOARS’ goals and broad support for two of the three main features of the proposal: the implementation of ETR and the elimination of the Subject test requirement. There was some uncertainty and skepticism, however, about the proposed referral guarantee structure. Some reviewers worried that the 12.5x5 index was too drastic a departure from current practice. Others requested more data clarifying the possible impacts on student quality and diversity. There were also concerns about the fiscal impact of implementation, the fact that projections were based on 2003 CPEC data, and the difficulty explaining the complex proposal to the public. At its May meeting, the Academic Council voted

12-7 to endorse a compromise proposal that would institute the ETR admissions pathway, eliminate the SAT Subject test requirement, and establish an initial modified admissions referral guarantee structure of 9% within-school and 9% statewide. It would also commit BOARS to annual and five year evaluation of its academic and fiscal impacts.

Chair Rashid added that BOARS still considers the 12.5x5 index optimal, but accepts 9x9 as a reasonable compromise. He read a resolution passed by BOARS: “BOARS unanimously endorses 9x9 as a compromise in the interest of gaining faculty support for advancing the principles embodied in BOARS’ eligibility reform proposal.” He also said the claim that 9x9 is unfavorable to African-American students deserves close scrutiny. While it is true that the number of African-Americans receiving a referral guarantee is predicted to decrease by 37% versus 24% overall, that decline represents only about 12 students who would still be guaranteed a review under ETR. In addition, many students who were previously invisible to UC, including African Americans, will now have a chance to be admitted under ETR.

DISCUSSION: Chair Brown opened discussion on the main motion to endorse the following Academic Council recommendations:

1. Implement ETR and eliminate the Subject-exam requirement for Fall 2012 freshman admission;
2. For Fall 2012 admission, implement an initial, modified guarantee structure based on 9% within-school and 9% statewide criteria (yielding an approximately 9.7% guarantee rate overall);
3. Commit BOARS to annual and five-year evaluations and reporting of academic and fiscal impacts; and
4. Based on the results of these ongoing studies, BOARS should periodically consider recommending adjustments to the guarantee structure.

Question: Chair Rashid, how does the proposed policy improve on what you termed the “arcane” aspects of the current system?

Answer: Two inflexible aspects of the current policy – failure to take the SAT subject test and a deficiency in the a-g requirements – create problems for students, particularly students who get off the a-g track early in high school. ETR calls for completion of 11 of 15 a-g requirements with a 2.8 or better GPA by grade 11. ETR students would still be expected to complete the full set of 15 required a-g courses prior to enrolling, and failure to do so would be grounds for cancellation of admission, but that would not be automatic as it is now.

Question: At a time when UC is expanding its dependence on the local context, it seems ironic that we would not ask for more Subject tests. Also, how will 9.7% be received by the public who are used to seeing 12.5%?

Answer: After taking other factors into account, the Subject tests contribute negligibly to our ability to predict who will do well at UC. 9.7% is the proportion of California graduates who would receive guaranteed referral under the proposal. It has nothing to do with yield and does not take into account the additional ETR pathway by which students can apply and be admitted.

Question: How does ETR’s GPA requirement take into account the Honors GPA “bump”?

Answer: Currently, the GPA bump counts up to eight semesters of Honors level coursework for purposes of eligibility. ETR sets a 2.8 unweighted GPA as the minimum qualification that

entitles the student to a review. BOARS feels comprehensive review is the more appropriate context in which to consider Honors course taking patterns.

In response to other questions, Chair Rashid noted that he expects students in the top 14 or 20% of good feeder schools would likely be admitted under comprehensive review in the current manner. Chair Brown noted that the five-year evaluation would be a more comprehensive overview of implementation than the annual evaluation.

UC Riverside Divisional Chair Cogswell introduced a motion to adjourn the teleconference and schedule an in-person Assembly meeting at a later date to discuss the proposal. He also requested a more detailed proposal with certain predictive data about 9x9 that had been distributed to Academic Council at its May meeting, but which had not been distributed to the Assembly. There was a request for Professor Cogswell to clarify intent. It was also noted that tabling the motion to adjourn would allow the rest of the Assembly meeting to continue. Chair Brown noted that *tabling* the discussion would still allow the proposal to be brought off the table at a later point in the meeting under new business; he said another option would be to *move to postpone* the discussion to a specific date and time. Professor Cogswell said his intent was to postpone discussion to a later date. The motion was restated as a motion to postpone the discussion to the next in-person meeting of the Assembly. The motion was seconded.

Those in favor of the motion noted that the controversy around Council's action and the critical nature of eligibility policy requires face-to-face discussion. There were also concerns that the data in question show poor outcomes for URM populations relative to others. Professor Rashid said the data was a 9x9 simulation based on 2003 CPEC data, which characterized the guaranteed referral pool only, not admitted students. It was noted that hard copies of the proposal and all relevant links, including data seen by Council, had been sent by express mail to Assembly members prior to the meeting. One member noted that it could be difficult to schedule a Special in-person Assembly meeting, with a quorum, before the end of the year. There was concern that meeting in 2008-09 would involve a new set of Council and Assembly representatives and without the accumulated expertise of the current members. Council Vice Chair Croughan noted that The Regents are adamant about improving diversity and are looking forward to reviewing the Senate's proposal at their July meeting. It was noted that 2007 CPEC data will not be available until Fall 2008.

Vice Chair Croughan moved to divide the main motion so that recommendations 1, 3, and 4 could be considered separate from recommendation 2. She noted that the debate centers around Council's recommendation 2 for a specific guarantee structure, while recommendations 1, 3, and 4 are more broadly supported. It was noted that the motion to divide the main question on the floor takes precedence above all other motions on the floor. The motion to divide was seconded.

ACTION: The motion to divide the question failed by a vote of 19 in favor and 29 opposed, with 1 abstention.

A motion was introduced and seconded to close debate on the motion to postpone. The motion will need 2/3 vote to pass.

ACTION: The motion to close debate on the motion to postpone carried by a vote of 49 in favor, 1 opposed, with 1 abstention.

ACTION: The motion to postpone debate on the main question failed by a vote of 13 in favor and 37 opposed, with 1 abstention.

Members speaking in favor of the main motion noted that ETR and the elimination of the SAT Subject test requirement are the most important elements of the proposal and broadly supported, while the 9x9 referral guarantee construct is the least important. That said, 9x9 represents an excellent compromise between those who favor the 12.5x5 index and those who want to proceed more cautiously. BOARS and the Senate will be able to revisit the construct and readjust as necessary. Those speaking against the motion noted concerns about the uncertain effect the proposal will have on entering classes, particularly on ethnic and socioeconomic diversity, concerns that ETR will create a two-tier admissions system, and concern that student quality will suffer, at least on some campuses.

ACTION: The main motion to endorse the Academic Council recommendation carried by a vote of 38 in favor and 12 opposed.

4. Apportionment of Representatives to the Assembly, 2008-2009 (information)

5. Assembly Meeting Schedule, 2008-2009 (information)

B. University Committees on Committees (UCOC)

- Jerry Powell, chair
Appointments of the 2008-2009 systemwide Senate Committee chair and vice chairs.

ACTION: Members received items 4 and 5 as information.

VII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT (none)

VIII. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS (none)

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (none)

X. NEW BUSINESS (none)

The meeting adjourned at 2 p.m.

Attest: Michael T. Brown, Academic Senate Chair

Minutes Prepared by: Michael LaBriola, Academic Senate Analyst

Attachment: Appendix A –Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of June 11, 2008

Appendix A - 2007-2008 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of June 11, 2008

President of the University:

Robert C. Dynes

Academic Council Members:

Michael T. Brown, Chair
Mary Croughan, Vice Chair
William Drummond, Chair, UCB
Linda F. Bisson, Chair, UCD
Timothy Bradley, Chair, UCI
Elizabeth Ligon Bjork, Chair, UCLA
Shawn Kantor, Chair UCM
Thomas Cogswell, Chair, UCR
James W. Posakony, Chair, UCSD
David Gardner, Chair, UCSF
Joel Michaelsen, Chair, UCSB
Quentin Williams, Chair, UCSC
Mark Rashid, Chair, BOARS
Bruce Schumm, Chair, CCGA
Pauline Yahr, Chair, UCAAD
James Hunt, Chair, UCAP
Keith Williams, Chair, UCEP
James Chalfant, Chair, UCFW
James Carey, Vice Chair, UCORP (alt. for Jose Wudka, Chair, UCORP)
Christopher Newfield, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (6)

Steven Beissinger
Tom Bruns (alt. for Ralph Catalano)
Paula S. Fass
Mary Firestone (alt. for Suzanne M.J. Fleiszig)
Stephen Mahin
Theodore Slaman

Davis (6)

Matthew K. Farrens
Donald Price
Birgit Puschner
Margaret Rucker
Daniel L. Simmons
Jeffery Weidner

Irvine (4)

Gian Aldo Antonelli
Calvin Morrill
Alka Patel

Los Angeles (8)

Christopher C. Baswell
Paula Diaconescu
Arvan Fluharty
Robert G. Frank, Jr.
Margaret Haberland
Jody Kreiman
Steven Loza

Merced (1)

Jian-Qiao Sun

Riverside (2)

Leonard (Len) Nunney (alt. for Carol J. Lovatt)
Mart L. Molle

San Diego (4)

Richard Attiyeh
Joel Dimsdale
Charles Perrin
Andrew T. Scull

San Francisco (4)

Dan Bikle
Barbara Gerbert
Deborah Greenspan
Lawrence Pitts

Santa Barbara (3)

Richard Church
Barbara Prezelin
Volker Welter

Santa Cruz (2)

Kathy Foley
Lori Kletzer

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Jean Olson (alt. for Peter Berck)