

MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

June 17, 2009
MINUTES OF MEETING

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday, June 17, 2009. Academic Senate Chair Mary Croughan presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Senate Executive Director Martha Winnacker 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 April 22, 2009 meeting as noticed.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

- Mary Croughan

- Chair Croughan thanked the Assembly members for participating in the Senate’s initiative to conserve resources by distributing the agenda electronically.
- Chair Croughan also noted that a corrected version of the resolution approved by Academic Council to amend Senate Regulations in order to award honorary degrees to students affected by Executive Order 9066 was distributed. She stated that the President’s written report, as well as his proposed plan for furlough implementation, also were distributed.
- Chair Croughan requested permission to amend the agenda by addressing item VII.A.1 (on honorary degrees) prior to the consultation period with the President.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

- President Yudof noted that he released the furlough/salary reduction implementation plans in time for the Academic Assembly to discuss them at this meeting. He noted that he has made changes to SOR 100.4 based on Senate feedback. The SOR is on the Regents’ agenda to be approved simultaneously with the furlough/salary reduction plan at their July meeting. The timing was necessary because the Regents do not meet again until September, which would be too late to implement a viable furlough/salary reduction plan. He noted that it is likely that the SOR will need to be extended or revised; this is not a one-year problem.
- President Yudof stated that the targeted savings under all three furloughs/salary reduction scenarios is \$200 million. Furloughs/salary reductions would be applied to all employees, regardless of funding source (e.g., state funding vs. private grant or contract funding). The plans propose a lower level of reduction for those earning less than \$46K. The staff assembly, the Academic Senate, and other employee groups will have an opportunity to review the plans and propose alternatives.
- President Yudof noted that in addition to the \$200 million saved via a furlough program, the fee increase previously approved by the Regents will provide \$200 million. However, this still leaves an additional \$400 million that must be cut in the next twelve months. He is examining restructuring the University’s debt, as well as making additional cuts to the budget at the Office

of the President; these measures may save up to \$100 million. The campuses will have to absorb the remaining deficit on a proportional basis.

- The President noted that this year, the federal stimulus package offset the state budget cuts. Without these funds, the real budget reduction would have been over \$1 billion. He stated that he is very concerned about the 2010-11 budget, which will not benefit from federal stimulus monies. It is highly probable that a mid-year fee increase will be considered. The Office of the President hopes to achieve future savings through carefully examining enrollment, since personnel costs comprise approximately 80% of the University's budget, and IT costs by sharing systems. He noted that due to the budget cuts, "over-enrollment" is far more than 11,000 students.
- President Yudof emphasized to the EVCs that campus budget cuts should be targeted, and not across-the-board. He noted that EVP Lapp has been in daily contact with the EVCs regarding the budget and campus plans.
- President Yudof stated that in the current version of the proposed state budget, Cal Grants will be continued and these funds will be available for Educational Partnerships/outreach efforts.

Questions and Comments

Q: I want to note that furloughs for faculty are meaningless. Also, it would be better to have a more progressive plan, protecting those with very low incomes.

A: It's a salary cut, whatever we call it. We will look at progressivity, but we need a plan that can be administered without too many complications. The problem is that there are far more middle income earners than high earners, so you need to tax the great middle. My best estimate is that we will be in serious budgetary trouble for at least two years, but we will revisit the furlough program after one year when it expires.

Q: At UCSF, most of our staff members are paid from non-state funds. How will contract and grants funds that are restricted to specific projects make up for the lack of state funds? How can you ensure that the federal government or industry will accept this?

A: These furloughs do not contribute to savings. But I'm concerned about the morale issue. How can you justify having two people with the same title who are funded through different sources, and one is furloughed and the other isn't? We can not privilege certain people over others; we must share the pain. UCOP will write to the funding sources. The savings can be used to extend the grant or hire more people. If a funding agency refuses to do this, we will not ask you to violate the grant. But faculty should approach this in good faith.

Q: I appreciate your transparency. How much flexibility will exist at the campus level and how will it be policed? Also, what will happen if we are in budget crisis for 3 to 4 years? How will we deal with mass desertion of the most talented faculty?

A: We intend not to create exceptions. If the economic crisis continues, the University will have difficulty with retention. But remember that freezes and reductions are happening at universities across the country. We plan to convene a task force on the Future of UC to address the issues in the long-term.

Comment: Regarding competitiveness, we can expect the stock market to recover before the state of California does. So a year from now, the University could see real threats to its competitive position because endowments will recover before the state budget does.

A: I agree, you may well be right; it's a plausible scenario.

Comment: Given that California may recover more slowly than the rest of the country, I suggest using the University's AAA bond rating to borrow money to get through this, temper the salary cuts, and contribute to the retirement system.

A: We will consider borrowing, but be mindful that borrowing is what got the state into trouble. I'm not sure that we can legally borrow for contributions to the retirement fund. Borrowed funds need to be paid back through the operational budget. You can only issue bonds for certain things. We had to absorb \$178

million in cuts in the month of June, and had to borrow to bridge that. And if interest rates go up over time, you lock yourself into higher interest rates.

Q: I appreciate your comment about long-range planning. The legislation to remove the autonomy of the UC Regents is dangerous. Can you give faculty some guidance on how to oppose this?

A: I think we will win that one. We have mounted a massive advocacy effort. In one week, 5,000 letters went to the legislature on this issue. I strongly encourage faculty members to write letters or make phone calls in your capacities as individual citizens. However, be aware that it is illegal to use University resources like letterhead or a computer to engage in advocacy.

Q: Thank you for being forthright. We do ourselves a disservice unless we make clear the impact of the budget reduction. I'm in favor of seeing furloughs in a way that shows the public what that means. Close campuses, reduce the academic calendar. Consider selling property. We need to demonstrate to the people of California the results of a long-term reduction in state support.

A: Selling property provides one-time funding, which does not address operating expenses. I do want to show the pain, but at the same time, I have a loyalty to do the best for our students.

Q: There are a lot of unrestricted funds that you could reallocate to pressing budget needs.

A: The problem is that you are not taking account of the sources in the appropriate way. We need to save money in the general appropriations. If we save money in a contract or grant, it goes back into the grant.

Q: Why don't we just charge students more? There are 220,000 students at UC; charge each of them an additional \$1,000 next year.

A: My concern is that we raised fees 10% last year and 10% this year. The Board of Regents is reluctant to increase fees, so we have to prove to them that we have cut as much as possible on the operational side. I am willing to consider a fee increase in January. We may be on the road to a high fee/high financial aid environment. That may be the best we can do.

Q: The recent total remuneration study says that staff pay is at market, but faculty pay is under-market? Could this be considered in long-range planning?

A: I do not want to draw a sharp line between staff and faculty. Our Chancellors' salaries are 1/3 below market; staff salaries vary by category.

Comment: Few people will be willing to take a cut in their retirement income. The more you can do to ensure retirement, the more loyal people will be. It is imperative to start contributions to the retirement fund. We can tap into contract and grants to invest in the contributions; we can borrow to cover the state portion.

A: It is legitimate to use the savings on research funds to pour into the retirement fund.

Q: UCSD is only 12% state funded. Is it fair that the cuts are uniformly applied. What is fair? Is it that misery loves company? UCSD's morale will be negatively impacted by this policy.

A: I will consider your point.

Q: I appreciate your frankness and leadership. I am principally concerned with public relations. I have been amazed that the administration seems incapable of explaining that the state provides us only a small percentage of our income and that the vast majority of our highly paid professors or doctors generate their own salaries. Finally, executive salaries are outrageous, and this is what the public zeroes in on. The public does not understand why we can not find executives who will accept lower salaries.

A: We do spend a lot of time explaining this. There is a grand narrative in the media about this. Could we explain it better? Surely. The market plays a real role. I eliminated someone from the search for Chancellor of UCSF because they would not move for less than a million dollars. We have suppressed

chancellors' salaries more than any other group. I believe that the compensation scandals were a way to respond to these salary pressures.

Q: Will any of the pay cut funds be routed toward employer contributions to UCRP?

A: There is no plan to route pay reductions to UCRP because we would not realize the savings necessary to balance our budget. I plan to restart contributions in April with 2% employee contributions. I feel that it is symbolically important to restart. I do not want to go back to the Board of Regents with a different plan; it was too difficult to get it through. We continue to fight for employer contributions. I expect that the state will not contribute. We asked for \$96 million. We can not take it out of operating funds, so there will be no employer contributions. This is my highest budget priority, after Cal Grants.

Comment: On the equity issue, cuts for non-state funded employees do not benefit the University, and may be detrimental to the retirement system because there will be a lower salary base. When clinical income declined a decade ago as a result of managed care, some categories of employees had to take salary cuts. The other faculty did not share in that pain. When you lose grants, you lose income. There has been no effort to equalize the pain as a result of reductions in grant funding. Now this category has to share the pain of those people who have had guaranteed increases in their salaries. We have to think about the history of equity.

A: We will consider your points.

Q: Would you consider taxing athletic salaries?

A: The coaches salaries are being cut around the country. We are considering taxes on auxiliary enterprises to raise general funds. Auxiliary services succeed because of their association with the UC name.

Q: How will the cuts be assigned to the campuses? Can you offer guidance to the chancellors to take cuts in higher-level administration, particularly those that have increased greatly relative to instructional expenses?

A: I will address this subject with the chancellors and ask them to consider combining administrative units, reducing vice chancellors, etc. Chancellors are expected to engage in widespread consultation. I think consultation with the divisional Senates will be important. I will see all of the campus budget plans and will discuss them with the Chancellors.

Comment: When I mention to people that my office phone has been cut, it gets their attention. What other stories can make an impact on the public?

V. SPECIAL ORDERS [NONE]

VI. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

1. Amend Senate Regulations to grant a Special Honorary Degree to students affected by Executive Order 9066. The proposal to grant a special honorary degree to Japanese-American students who were unable to complete their degrees due to Executive Order 9066 during World War II requires Regental approval. The Executive Order created a hardship for a discrete group of people. Recently, the federal government recognized the injustice imposed on this group in the form of legislation. In addition, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals held that if the government had fully informed the Supreme Court, it would have decided differently in *Hirabayashi v. U.S.* In 1943, there were approximately 700 students of Japanese descent enrolled at the UC (454 at UCB, 175 at UCLA, 54 at UCSF, and 15 at the College of

Agriculture, which became UCD). Some earned degrees at colleges in the Midwest or east Coast, but still were not awarded UC degrees; some never completed their educations. UC administrators have identified most of these students. In April, the Academic Council endorsed changing Senate Regulations in order to grant honorary degrees. Today, we ask the Academic Assembly to approve this change, and to request that the Board of Regents change their bylaws to permit awarding such degrees. The proposed honorary degree is unique, and is a University of California degree, not a specific degree (such as a BA) from a particular campus (the diploma will reflect the name of the campus at which the student was enrolled). It will be awarded posthumously, if appropriate. It does not create a precedent that affects the policy of the University with respect to the moratorium on honorary degrees. It does make a statement about the University's core values.

ACTION: The Assembly unanimously approved amending the Senate Regulations in order to grant a special honorary degree to students affected by Executive Order 9066.

2. Amend Senate Regulations regarding eligibility. BOARS Chair Sylvia Hurtado thanked former Chair Mark Rashid for his assistance, as well as UC Admissions Director Sue Wilbur. The purpose of the amendments was to align regulations with policy and practice. The regulations were antiquated; minor changes made over the years, in addition to the eligibility reform passed by the Regents in February, have not been incorporated. The campus Admissions Directors opined on the changes. Chair Hurtado also thanked all of the campus committees for doing such a thoughtful review. The enclosed document details BOARS' response to every change suggested.

A member objected to the addition of SR 464 on admission by exception, which codifies Regents' policy 6160, approved in 1991 and amended in 1996. In 2005, the implementation guidelines were reviewed at President Dynes' request by BOARS and Council. However, the policy, itself, has not been vetted fully systemwide. Inclusion of Regulation 464 presumes that the Senate has endorsed the policy, which is not accurate. It should not be part of this package of amendments; it requires further examination. BOARS chair Hurtado responded that the 2005 systemwide review of the implementation included a detailed summary of the policy. It was not forwarded to the Academic Assembly at that time because it was seen as an implementation issue, not a policy issue. She also noted that there is a provision of Admission by Exception in the Master Plan, as well as in documentation from the 1880s when the Senate was given responsibility for admission. A member objected to changes to the proposed Regulations since they were reviewed systemwide. Parliamentarian Berck noted that the Assembly can approve changes to the Regulations without returning the wording to the campuses. If the changes are germane and within the scope of the notice, amendments are can be made to the document. The only requirement is that Assembly members must know in advance through proper notice that the issue will be addressed. A divisional chair stated that BOARS did an excellent job of incorporating Council's comments, and is prepared to endorse it. A member suggested the following friendly amendments: wording in several regulations suggests that BOARS is the ultimate policymaking authority, but BOARS actually *recommends* changes and the Academic Council and Academic Assembly approve or concur. The member suggested that the following regulations follow the model terminology in Regulation 419: Regulation 450, Regulation 466, and Regulation 462. BOARS' Chair Hurtado accepted these amendments.

ACTION: A motion to accept the friendly amendments to SR 450, 466 and 462 described above passed unanimously.

Another member spoke in favor of removing SR464 from the guidelines and addressing it separately. He argued that one of the aims of broadening the pool of those eligible to review is to avoid the stigmatizing label of Admission by Exception. The Senate should subject the idea of Admission by Exception to more scrutiny, for example, defining the conditions under which someone would be eligible for Admission by

Exception. Chair Hurtado stated that the current guidelines on Admission by Exception explicitly state that it can be used in various ways and for various purposes. For example, UC Riverside uses it to admit homeschooled students. BOARS gathers information on how the campuses use Admission by Exception. A member stated that the changes in eligibility rules do not broaden access by the rural poor, who do not have access to Advanced Placement courses. The Admission by Exception policy allows this group to be considered by UC.

A motion was made that the revised Senate Regulation 464 be deleted from the document under consideration and that BOARS be directed to study the current Admission by Exception policy in the context of UC's new eligibility policies, and provide a proposed regulation change by the end of the 2009-10 academic year.

A member asked if there were implications for next year's admissions by removing Regulation 464 from the document. BOARS Chair Hurtado stated that the policy would stand. Members spoke in favor of and against directed BOARS to examine the Admissions by Exception policy.

A member asked what would have to be adjusted in the Admission by Exception policy to align with eligibility reform. BOARS Chair Hurtado stated that she did not think that the policy would change significantly. A member clarified that the purpose of the motion was to ensure that the Senate explicitly endorses or rejects the Regental mandate.

ACTION: The Academic Assembly voted against the motion to remove Regulation 464 (8 in favor, 26 opposed, 3 abstentions).

ACTION: The Academic Assembly voted in favor of accepting the regulations as written, with the exception of the previously approved amendments made to SRs 450, 466 and 462 (36 in favor, 4 abstentions).

B. Budget Planning discussion

1. Presentation on Budget Planning Principles

- **Mary Croughan**, Academic Senate Chair and Co-Chair, Advisory Group on Budget Strategies
- **Pat Conrad**, UCPB Chair and Member, Advisory Group on Budget Strategies
- **Steve Plaxe**, UCAP Chair and Member, Advisory Group on Budget Strategies

Professor Plaxe stated that the Advisory Group on Budget Strategies is systematically examining a list of options for cutting costs and raising revenues, and is paying particular attention to possible unintended consequences. The final product of the Advisory Group will be sent out for systemwide Senate review. The Advisory Group reviewed Budget Planning Principles written by UCPB and endorsed by the Academic Council and derived a similar set. The Advisory Group is staffed by the Institutional Research Unit. An Assembly member stated that the faculty wants alternatives to furloughs and salary cuts. To what level would the University have to raise fees in order to avoid furloughs and salary cuts? He noted that UCPB has advocated that every unit must have a sustainable funding model, including existing units, and that comparable units should be funded comparably. The University should not begin any new endeavors if it can not fund existing ones. A member emphasized that if a choice must be made between quality, affordability and accessibility, quality must not suffer. A member objected to a tension in the Budget Principles between campus autonomy and systemwide solutions. For example, should different schools or campuses be able to charge different fees? But at the same time, should the systemwide office pay for seismic retrofitting at other campuses? Are we one UC? A member noted that the Senate is on record against the stratification of campuses. UCPB Chair Conrad stated that this year, her committee

focused on budget cuts, not long-range planning. Next year UCPB will focus on how to pay for benefits and keep the retirement system healthy. UCAP Chair Plaxe added that CAP has focused on the retirement system because it is concerned about recruitment and retention. So it is being addressed in a variety of Senate venues. Chair Croughan also stated that the president has agreed to examine the campus funding models in the next six months to a year.

VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT (none)

UCFW/TFIR Recommendation for Adequate Funding of UCRP (information)

- **Bob Anderson**, TFIR Chair
- **Shane White**, UCFW Vice Chair

TFIR Chair Anderson and UCFW Vice Chair White presented the data behind their committees' recommendation for adequate funding of UCRP. The following is a summary of the presentation. All benefits accrued to date will be paid; the University is legally obligated to do so. Both the US and state constitutions contain an "impairment of contracts clause." The state can not through legislative or constitutional action renege on contracts it has made for bonded debt or pension payments to employees. The University may be able to reduce the future accrual of benefits by current employees, but such an effort likely would result in litigation. The University clearly can reduce benefits of newly hired employees. However, this may create less savings than expected. There are a lot fewer younger employees to support the retirement system, and cutting benefits for new employees does not save money in the short-term. Also, savings associated with replacing older faculty with younger faculty are not guaranteed because of the inversion of the salary scales. In the past, the University would save money when a faculty member retired and was replaced. Now, it is unclear.

UC has been subsidizing its budget by promising benefits, paid for by drawing down the UCRP surplus. That surplus is now gone, and the University must begin contributing to cover the ongoing accrual of benefits. UCRP was funded 100% on June 30, 2008. This means that it had just enough money to pay for the benefits accrued in the past (assuming a 7.5% return and normal life expectancy).

What is the value of the additional liability that is incurred each year? This value is "normal cost" and is approximately 17% of covered compensation. So the pension system requires contributions equal to normal cost to be fully funded (adjusted upward or downward depending on whether there is a surplus or deficit).

In September 2008, the University's actuary recommended and the Regents passed, a plan that would have required an 11.5% contribution (9.5% employer and 2% or 4% from the employee) beginning on July 1, 2009. If there is a deficit, the employer amortizes over 15 years; surplus amortizes over 30 years (until you reach 200% of funding). If one applies this policy to the last year, the pension system would have required 11.5% contributions beginning on 7/1/09. It would have required a contribution in excess of 20% beginning on July 1, 2010.

In November 2008, the Regents reduced the planned employer contribution to 4% because the Department of Finance made it clear that the state would not contribute 9.5%. In February 2009, the governor put only \$20 million in the budget, so the Regents deferred contributions to 4/15/10. We are currently uncertain whether contributions will resume on 4/15/10. This morning the president said that he intended to begin employee contributions, even if there is no funding for the employer contribution. But the Regents would have to rescind its policy. The University has long said that the employee contribution would be no more than the employer contribution.

The Regents are considering (but have not adopted) a slow ramp-up of contributions, whereby the employee portion would rise by 1% each year up to 5%, and the employer contribution would rise 2% each year until the pension system reaches 200% funded.

The slow ramp-up of contributions is completely inadequate because of the dramatic decline in market value (it does not meet the assumed 7.5% annual return). At this point, the slow ramp-up would not enable contributions to the funding plan to be level for 20 years, at which point contributions in excess of 50% of covered compensation would be required. It is important to note that UCRP has been well managed, but employees have not made contributions for 18 years, and the market has dropped precipitously.

Deferring contributions means that we forego the 7.5% earnings on the contributions. Deferring \$1 now will require over \$4 in contributions 20 years from now. Deferring \$1 now for state-funded employees results in the loss of \$2 in contributions from other fund sources (the University can not charge federal grants and contracts more than the employer charges). If we do not collect from the other funding sources now, we will not be able to charge them retroactively. This represents a significant amount of money because 2/3 of University salaries are not state-supported. Also if in the future, contributions are in excess of 50% of covered compensation are required to maintain the pension system, UC researchers may not be competitive for grants. The University may see a dramatic decline in grants due to onerous pension requirements. Hospitals will experience a similar situation; they may not be able to compete for insurance contracts.

What should the University do? There is no good option, but the least bad option is to raise UCRP contributions as soon as possible to the full recommended contribution under the Regents' Funding Policy. UCFW recommends that this should occur no later than July 1, 2011. President Yudof has forwarded UCFW/TFIR's recommendation to the Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits. President Yudof also endorsed the recommendation and has asked TFIR Chair Anderson to make a presentation to the Regents' Finance Work Group in July 6. While the recommendation calls for a great deal of investment now, it will avoid great pain later. A member asked about the impact of contributions on total remuneration. Chair Anderson responded that once faculty contribute 5%, UCRP is not competitive with the Comparison 8 retirement plans. A member asked whether UC could sell property and allocate the money to UCRP. The answer was affirmative. A member asked if the University has ever experienced a problem of this magnitude historically and if so, what happened. Chair Anderson responded that the pension was less than 100% funded for most of its existence. It only began in 1960. The lowest funding ratio was around 1982. However, at that time, contributions were being made to amortize liability, until 1990. Since then, the Regents' policy has been not to contribute at all as long as it has been funded 100%. CalPERS and CalSTRS also have not been 100% funded.

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolution on UC Constitutional Autonomy

State Senator Leland Yee introduced SCA 21, a companion to ACA 24, which would strip the Board of Regents of constitutional autonomy, giving the legislature greater oversight of the University. Many members of the Academic Assembly spoke in favor of taking a strong against the bills. They emphasized that ceding budgetary authority to the state would devastate the University. UC Irvine's divisional chair reported that the UCI Senate cabinet voted to endorse a resolution opposing the bills.

ACTION: The Assembly unanimously endorsed a motion approving a resolution that opposes the removal of the Board of Regents' constitutional autonomy.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Attest: Mary Croughan, Academic Senate Chair

Minutes Prepared by: Clare Sheridan, Academic Senate Analyst

Attachment: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of June 17, 2009

Appendix A – 2008-2009 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of June 17, 2009

President of the University:

Mark Yudof

Academic Council Members:

Mary Croughan, Chair

Henry Powell, Vice Chair

Daniel Melia, UCB representative (alternate for Mary Firestone)

Robert Powell, Chair UCD

Jutta Heckhausen, Chair, UCI

Michael Goldstein, Chair, UCLA

Martha Conklin, Chair UCM

Anthony Norman, Chair, UCR

Richard Attiyeh, UCSD representative (alternate for Dan Donoghue)

David Gardner, Chair, UCSF

Henning Bohn, Vice Chair, UCSB (alternate for Joel Michaelson)

Quentin Williams, Chair, UCSC

Sylvia Hurtado, Chair, BOARS

Farid Chehab, Chair, CCGA

Francis Lu, Chair, UCAAD

Steven Plaxe, Chair, UCAP

Stephen McLean, Chair, UCEP

Shane White, Vice Chair, UCFW (alternate for Helen Henry)

James Carey, Chair, UCORP

Jim Chalfant, UCPB representative (alternate for Patricia Conrad)

Berkeley (5)

Steven Beissinger

Paula Fass (alternate for Pablo Spiller)

Suzanne M.J. Fleiszig

Matthew Francis (alternate for Anthony Long)

Miryam Sas (alternate for Ralph Catalano)

Davis (6)

Brian Morrissey

Krishnan Nambiar

John Oakley

Donald Price

Birgit Puschner

Daniel Simmons

Irvine (4)

Hoda Anton-Culver (absent)

Jone Pearce

Sheryl Tsai (alternate for Kenneth Chew)

Jeffrey Wasserstrom (alternate for Shawn Rosenberg)

Los Angeles (9 - 1 TBA)

Paula Diaconescu
Robert Frank, Jr.
Jonathan Grossman
Margaret Haberland
Jody Kreiman
Purnima Mankekar (absent)
James Miller
Natik Piri

Merced (1)

Jan Wallander

Riverside (2)

Frances Sladek (alternate for Manuela Martins-Green)
Mart Molle

San Diego (4)

Salah Baouendi (absent)
Stephen Cox
Joel Dimsdale (absent)

San Francisco (4)

Dan Bikle
Deborah Greenspan
Wendy Max (absent)
Sandra Weiss

Santa Barbara (3 - 1 TBA)

Richard Church
Volker Welter (absent)

Santa Cruz (2)

Mark Carr
Lori Kletzer

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Peter Berck