

II. MINUTES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

REGULAR MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE Minutes of February 28, 2001

I. Call to Order/Roll Call of Members

Pursuant to call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, February 28, 2001 in the Joseph Wood Crutch Theatre Room, Clark Kerr Campus, University of California Berkeley.

The meeting was called to order by Assembly Chair Michael Cowan. Executive Director María Bertero-Barceló called the roll of the Assembly; the meeting attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. Minutes of May 24, 2000

Action: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of May 24, 2000. The minutes were approved as written without objection.

III. Announcements by the President

Report: President Atkinson noted that he would have to leave the Assembly meeting early today, in order to testify on UC's budget before the state Senate and the Assembly.

President Atkinson noted that Assembly members had been given a copy of discussion topics prepared by the President. The President began his remarks by stating that Chair Cowan and Vice Chair Viswanathan have done an excellent job of leading the Senate during the current academic year.

Additional distributions to Assembly members, beyond the President's listing of discussion topics, included:

- *SATI*. Though the President's recommendation that UC no longer require the SAT I for students applying to UC was not slated as a discussion item, he did distribute to Assembly members a copy of his recent speech to the American Council on Education. President Atkinson said that he would be happy to answer questions about the SAT recommendation.
- *Admissions and Outreach*. A letter from the President to Lieutenant Governor Bustamante and the enclosed status report he noted provide an excellent summary overview of UC's role in outreach and K-12 teacher education.
- *Review of the Master Plan*. In letters to Senator Dede Alpert and to CSU Chancellor Reed, President Atkinson addresses the need to maintain and strengthen the mechanisms for offering UC/CSU joint doctoral degree programs.

- *A Five-Year Report to The Regents.* When President Atkinson began his tenure five years ago, he established eight goals, the first of which is to “maintain faculty quality.”

The President also briefly reported on those items listed as formal discussion topics, including:

- *2001-2002 Budget.*
 - One of the issues with the budget is enrollment. UC projected a 3 percent increase in enrollments (an additional 5,700 students). However, because freshmen applications have increased by nearly 8 percent, the University intends to request additional funds for the expected additional 1,400 students.
 - The budget also includes full support for summer session for three campuses—Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara.
 - Expanded support for graduate students, now a top priority for the University, is included in the budget. The Regents have established a special commission on approaches to expand the level of support for graduate students.
 - UC’s budget, of course, is very much dependent on the governor’s May revise.
- *California Institutes for Science and Innovation.* Early last year the governor committed over a 4-year period \$75M in State funds, leveraged by a two-to-one match from participating campuses, for three Institutes and has pledged to seek additional funding for a fourth.
- *DOE Laboratories – Contract Renewal.* In January the Regents approved a modification of the contracts for management of the Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories.
- *Energy Crisis – UC’s Response.* With its wealth of knowledge and expertise, UC plans to move toward energy independence and is working rapidly to explore the feasibility of increasing the capacity of existing co-generation sites and to identify other means by which UC can supply power for itself and for areas of the state.
- *Report on Fall 2001 Applications.* UC had an 8 percent increase in freshmen applications. Applications from California public high school seniors increased 14.9 percent, far outpacing the projected 2.5 percent growth. Applications from underrepresented minorities have increased (by 16.2 percent among Chicanos, 12.4 percent among Filipino Americans, and 11.4 percent among African Americans).
 - *Eligibility in the Local Context Program (ELC).* The ELC (one of the ten academic criteria campuses may use as they evaluate candidates’ files for admissions) has had a great impact on high schools that, in the past, did not usually send students to UC. Over 80 percent of eligible public schools in California submitted transcripts for the ELC program. In total, about 10,000 students were identified as eligible for this new path to freshman admissions. Some of these students were also eligible independent of the ELC criteria. Administration believes that, in the past, many students who met UC requirements never bothered to apply.
- *Chancellors’ Forum.* In April the Chancellors will join the President in Washington, D.C. to discuss UC’s federal policy objective with California’s elected representatives. Several Regents and industry leaders will join UC’s delegation.
- *Commission on the Humanities.* The Humanities Commission will recommend ways to ensure the continued vitality of UC’s humanities programs, and is examining such

issues as undergraduate enrollments, graduate student support, the Ph.D. job market, and funding for individual and collaborative research.

- *Fee Waivers.* Developed by the University Committee on Faculty Welfare, this proposal aids UC's recruitment and retention efforts by waiving the annual educational fee for dependents of eligible faculty and staff. The proposal was endorsed both by the Academic Council and the Council of Chancellors, and President Atkinson believes that it will come into effect shortly.
- *Housing.* In order to help address the crisis confronting the University, in housing for both its students and its faculty, UCOP is establishing a task force on housing. The task force will study factors influencing the supply of and demand for housing in communities surrounding campuses, in order to identify opportunities for providing additional University-sponsored housing as well as to identify solutions to accommodate current and projected student, faculty, and staff.
- *Private Support.* Private support for the 1999-2000 fiscal year surged to \$1.2B, an almost one-third increase from the previous year's record. All campuses are doing well.
- *UC Merced.* To facilitate the opening of the core campus in 2004, the University has looked at locational options in areas that are not located on wetlands and hence would not require a federal permit. The most viable of these options is land that is currently developed and adjacent to the proposed campus site. If the University develops this site, UC Merced can begin to build the core of the campus in 2002.

The President then responded, as follows, to questions from the floor:

- **Negotiations concluded on the DOE contract** literally days before the change in national administration. The clause granting the DOE additional control over management personnel now is in every new contract issued by the DOE.
- Funding for additional **UC counselors at the Community Colleges** (at least one counselor for every three Community Colleges) was not included in the governor's budget. If UC can't get that kind of support, it may not be able to go forward with the dual admissions program.
- **Capital needs of the University**, its ability to accommodate growth, depends on the next bond issue. Hopefully, the next bond issue will be for four years at \$4 billion, which would mean \$1 billion per segment. Though UC annually would receive \$330 million, the University needs \$500 million per year. However, the intention is to fill the gap with funding from the private sector as well as from federal grants.

IV. Announcements by the Chair

Chair Cowan suggested that, should the Assembly complete its regular business and time allow, a couple of items be discussed as "new business," including:

- Summer session
- Proposals to establish law schools at the Riverside and Irvine campuses
- SAT I as an optional test

Chair Cowan also observed that the Universitywide Academic Senate is confronted with a series of challenges that tax its capacity to offer full, meaningful, and expeditious consultation. For that reason, as well as to help Council leadership prepare a more

coherent and adequate budget for the work of the Systemwide Senate, the Academic Council office currently is conducting surveys of its members. The surveys are intended to both get a sense of how committees wish to conduct their business and to understand the workload confronting chairs of systemwide committees.

V. Special Orders

A. Consent Calendar: Variance to Senate Regulations requested by the Santa Cruz Division

Issue: Should the Variance to Senate Regulations, as requested by the Santa Cruz Division, be approved on the consent calendar, or removed for discussion?

Action: The motion to approve the consent calendar was seconded and unanimously approved.

Discussion Points :

- One member reported that the UCSC students would like further discussion of the matter.
- Chair Cowan responded that, as a courtesy and to allow Assembly members to be aware of the students' viewpoint, relevant e-mails were distributed to Assembly members in advance of today's meeting.
- Chair Cowan noted that students have no formal standing at the Assembly and therefore cannot object either to keeping this variance on the consent calendar or to enter into this body's discussion.

B. Annual Committee Reports

No questions from the floor were raised about the annual committee reports distributed in the Assembly agenda packet.

VI. Reports of Special Committees (none)

VII. Reports of Standing Committees

A. Educational Policy (UCEP)

Manfred Kusch, Chair, University Committee on Educational Policy

Issue: Should Senate Regulation 544 be modified in order to clearly apply not only to simultaneous enrollment (on the home as well as on another campus), but also to sequential enrollment in summer sessions at another campus than the home campus?

Action: The motion to adopt the amendments to SR 544, as proposed by UCEP, was seconded and unanimously approved.

Chair Cowan requested that each Divisional Chair engage in a consultative process with colleagues on campus to ensure that appropriate mechanisms and reliable advisory systems, to allow expeditious handling of simultaneous or sequential enrollment, are in place within each academic major on campus.

Discussion Points:

- SR 544 was enacted in May 1999 in order to facilitate simultaneous enrollment on two UC campuses.
- In the context of expanded summer enrollment, the Office of the President brought to UCEP's attention that SR 544 does not explicitly apply to students who may enroll in large numbers in greatly expanded and fully state-funded summer sessions. Such summer enrollment would be sequential, rather than simultaneous, with enrollment on the home campus.
- UCEP proposes that a sentence be inserted in SR 544, paragraph A: "Similarly, a UC student's home campus must also permit a student in good standing to enroll in summer courses offered by another UC campus."
- In order to accommodate both simultaneous and sequential enrollment, two other small clarifications will sufficiently expand SR 544: remove the word "simultaneous" from the last sentence of paragraph A, and remove "simultaneous enrollment" from the first sentence of paragraph C.
- These changes do not in any way change the spirit of the 1999 SR 544 legislation. Indeed, UCR&J—while not objecting to the proposed change—felt that current language encompasses the concepts of both simultaneous and sequential enrollment.
- It is the responsibility of the individual campus to make information available to students.

B. Rules & Jurisdiction (UCR&J)

Issue: Should Academic Senate Bylaw 50 be amended to disallow the chief administrative officer of a small unit (one which is not divided into departments) from serving as the Chair of the Faculty?

Action: The motion to adopt the amendments to SBL 50, as proposed by UCR&J, was approved with two dissenting votes.

Discussion Points: None.

C. Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)

Dorothy Perry, Chair, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools

Issue: What is the rationale behind the dual admissions system, first proposed by President Atkinson, now endorsed with modifications by BOARS and approved in principle by the Academic Council? Professor Dorothy Perry, Chair of BOARS, made a presentation to the Assembly on these issues. The purpose of today's discussion is to help BOARS continue to refine the proposal, as needed, in order to address faculty concerns about and reactions to the dual admissions proposal.

Action: Chair Cowan asked that Assembly members send any further questions or comments directly to Professor Perry, so that BOARS make take all suggestions under advisement. BOARS intends to present its final dual admissions proposal, for formal action, at the May 2001 meeting of the Academic Assembly.

Discussion Points: With the aid of series of overheads, Chair Perry provided Assembly members with the conceptual details of the dual admissions proposal. She noted that a slightly modified dual admissions proposal, dated February 26, 2001, was handed out to Assembly members this morning.

- Dual admissions will benefit high school graduates who are not in the top 4 percent of their class and not eligible by statewide criteria, but who are within the top 12.5 percent of their class. (The proposal does not add to the Master Plan eligibility rate of 12.5 percent, as it does not make additional students eligible as freshmen from high schools.)
 - An anticipated 9,000 – 11,000 graduating seniors would be eligible for the dual admissions proposal. This program probably will yield 1,000 – 3,000 transfer students per year.
 - A dual admission offer would permit these students to enroll at a community college to complete lower division requirements.
 - The focus is on the students' work done at the community college level, as much as what they have done in high school.
 - Students admitted under this dual admissions plan would be offered contingent transfer admission to one or more UC campuses.
 - The admission offer is conditional on the students' fulfillment of campus- and major-specific course requirements and academic performance criteria for transfer students.
- The dual admissions proposal augments eligibility in the local context and reinforces the University's commitment to facilitate the community college transfer function spelled out in the Master Plan.
 - Under the terms of the partnership agreement, UC has agreed to increase the number of transfer students by 15 percent in the next few years, to 15,000 students by 2005.
- As approximately 36 percent of the community college transfer students come from underrepresented populations, the dual admission proposal potentially will increase the diversity in UC's applicant pool.
- With a projected growth of 60,000 additional students coming to UC over the next decade, all campuses—though to varying degrees—will be expanding their enrollment.

Chair Perry then responded to questions from the floor:

- The projected annual 1,000 – 3,000 dual admission students will not have a great impact on UC's physical plant capacities.
- Dual admission students would not displace current transfer or freshman admits, and would represent an increase in enrollment consistent with UC's long range enrollment plan and the Governor's Partnership with UC.
- The transfer process doesn't really differ from that governing current community college transfers.
- Dual admissions students who have chosen and been admitted to a particular major at a campus would need to meet campus-specific course requirements and academic performance standards for that major while attending the community college. Those who have been admitted without having specified a particular major would need to

identify a major while studying at the community college, but not necessarily at the beginning of their studies.

- BOARS recognizes campus autonomy and wants each campus to have the absolute authority to make sure that the students continue on the academic pathway of these majors to achieve at the same level as current transfer students. (One UC campus currently requires every transfer student to identify and to meet the major prerequisite requirements at the community college.)
 - The creation of lower division sequential courses at the community colleges—particularly in the hard sciences—is necessary in order to allow students to transfer “running.” The dual admissions proposal needs to be implemented in conjunction with the community colleges, so that the course work needed for majors is available for students.
 - Funding, especially at the community college level, becomes a crucial consideration. A committee of faculty members from BOARS, the community colleges, and administrators from both UC and CCC will be discussing implementation and funding requirements. Hopefully, the money will reappear in the May revise of the governor’s budget. Without adequate funding, for this “scaffolding” the program should not be implemented.
- Academic quality is ensured. The dual admissions program is targeted at students not eligible for UC as freshmen, giving them in effect a “second chance” to be admitted to UC, but only after a successful two to three-year experience at the community college. Dual admissions transfer students will be required to meet all the academic requirements of regular community college transfer students.
- BOARS is not aware of any cost-per-student estimates or comparisons made with other forms of outreach. However, the cost of getting the community colleges in position to have the kinds of transfer information available and to develop the courses is several million dollars.
- Data is not available concerning the success of advancement to UC graduate degree programs by community college transfer students.
- Articulation agreements would have to be arranged for all community colleges with all UC campuses.
- BOARS does not have data about what fraction of the current pool of transfer students is in the top 12.5 percent of their local high school. The community colleges do not collect this information.
- BOARS does not see a way to separate, in terms of the resources that UC would be providing at the community college level, the existing and dual admission transfer students. Vice President Saragoza currently is proposing one UC counselor for every three community colleges; the counselor would have to be responsive to any student at a community college who is interested in UC transfer.

D. Research Policy (UCORP)

Henry Abarbanel, Vice Chair of UCORP, member of President’s Council on the National Laboratories

Report: Professor Henry Abarbanel noted that his oral remarks to the Assembly would make up but part of his larger written report distributed this morning to Assembly members. He then offered highlights and a brief summarization of that written report.

Discussion Points: Professor Arbarbanel then offered the following responses to questions from the floor:

- In the fall of 2000, the Department of Energy (DOE) requested a three-year extension of UC's management contract of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) and the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). The DOE request carried a sixty-day negotiation period rather than the usual eighteen months.
 - Because there was not sufficient time to make a serious evaluation of the contracts, UCORP concluded that UC should acquiesce (emphasis added) in the extension of the contracts at the same time as initiating a UC faculty task force to make a thorough investigation of the UC/lab relationship.
 - The Academic Council subsequently endorsed UCORP's conclusion.
 - The formation and execution of the task force has been sent to UCORP to run as a subcommittee with extensive consultation by members of UCOP, faculty at each campus and other stakeholders.
 - The subcommittee's recommendations are expected in time for the next round of negotiations for UC's management of LLNL and LANL (beginning in the spring of 2004).
- The contract for UC's management of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL), which is on a different cycle than contracts for LLNL and LANL, runs through September 30, 2002. If the DOE wishes UC to continue to manage LBNL, it will ask UCOP in March or April 2001 to negotiate a contract. Whether or not UC could manage only LBNL is a matter of speculation.
- Since the fall of 2000, UCORP has not discussed concerns about the labs' morale and their ability to attract and retain excellent people. Recruitment and retention will be one of the issues that will be examined by the subcommittee.
- In order to help better inform and seek opinion from UC's faculty of the issues and benefits surrounding UC's management of the DOE labs, the subcommittee hopes to hold two sets of town meetings at every campus: one for information, the other for discussion.
- One goal of the subcommittee will be to inform the faculty at large, on a regular basis, about the work of the labs and issues involved in UC's management of the labs.

E. Privilege & Tenure (UCP&T)
George Blumenthal, Chair

Issue: What is the rationale for the changes UCP&T has proposed to Senate Bylaws governing Privilege and Tenure standards and procedures? What is the status of the effort to revise APM-015? Professor George Blumenthal, UCP&T Chair, made a presentation to the Assembly on these issues.

Proposed revisions to Senate Bylaws are before the Assembly for preliminary discussion, in preparation for action to be taken at the May meeting of the Assembly.

Parallel proposed revisions to the Faculty Code of Conduct, which resides in APM 015, are still a work in progress and not yet ready to release for final review.

Action: Chair Cowan noted that all divisions currently are reviewing the proposed revisions to Bylaws. He asked all Assembly members to either directly contact UCP&T Chair Blumenthal or forward comments through the appropriate divisional chairs.

Discussion Points:

- Three possible cases may come before divisional Privilege and Tenure Committees, including faculty grievance, faculty discipline, and faculty early termination. Senate Bylaw 335 currently governs all three actions. Proposed revised Bylaw 335, 336, and 337 will each deal with only one category of cases.
- A statute of limitations is incorporated into proposed Bylaw 335. Cases cannot come before P&T later than three years after events leading up to the grievance or disciplinary action become known, or should have become known, to the grievant or administration, respectively.
- In the event that there is a disagreement between the Chancellor and the divisional P&T committee, then the Chancellor is required to meet with the Chair of P&T. Also, at the discretion of the P&T Chair, the Chancellor may be required to meet with the full committee before issuing any decision contrary to the recommendation of P&T.
- Proposed modified Bylaw 195 would oblige divisional P&T committees to supply information about the nature and disposition of cases that occur on campuses. This information would be disseminated in a form that would preserve confidentiality.
- The procedural timetable for early termination of non-Senate faculty needs to be enhanced; one division will forward UCP&T some written suggestions.
- For disciplinary matters, local procedures differ for determining probable cause. Some campuses use a subset of P&T members to determine probable cause; other campuses utilize charges committees.
- The confidentiality of data gathered can be insured by the removal of identifiers, including name, campus, and dates.
- Though UCP&T believes that, ideally, the person who originally filed charges for a disciplinary action should know its final outcome, state privacy laws act as a constraint.

VIII. Petitions of Students (None)

IX. Unfinished Business (None)

X. University and Faculty Welfare Report

Judith Gruber, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare

Report: Professor Judith Gruber, UCFW Chair, provided the Assembly with a roundup of issues UCFW has been working on this year:

In January 2001 The Regents approved significant improvements to the UC Retirement System:

- *Age Factors:* effective January 1, 2001, the maximum age factor is now 2.5.

- *Summer salary*: 7 percent contribution (3.5 percent as a payroll deduction, 3.5 percent as employer contribution. This enhancement to retirement income based on faculty summer salary—one of UCFW’s initiatives—will be implemented this summer.
- *Ad Hoc Cola*: a one-time 85 percent ad hoc COLA adjustment became effective January 1, 2001.

Other improvements to the UC benefit packages include:

- *Child care programs*. UCFW has been working hard for the past several years on an initiative to expand UC’s child care programs—for faculty, students, and staff. President Atkinson announced in February that UCOP matching funds now are available for construction of new child care facilities on the campuses. Campuses that raise \$1M will receive \$750,000; \$1.5M will be matched by \$1M; and \$2M will be matched by \$1.25M from UCOP.
- *Educational Fee Waiver Program*. UCFW has been working on this program for a number of years, and the program is on track to go into effect this fall. The educational fee waiver program is available for children of faculty, staff, and domestic partners of UC faculty and staff.
- *Improvements in Faculty Sabbatical Policy*. UCFW’s has urged that three improvements be made in sabbatical policy. The first already is in place, and the second two are about to go through systemwide review.
 1. *Outside income while on sabbatical*. This change is now in effect and allows faculty to earn outside income while on sabbatical, subject to the same limits as when in active service.
 2. *“Topping up” of sabbatical pay*. If UCFW’s recommendations are adopted, faculty who go on sabbatical at a percentage of pay less than 100 percent could earn compensation, not to exceed 100 percent of their UC salary, from other institutions for research.
 3. *Sabbatical in residence*. UCFW has recommended that significant service be substitutable for some or all of the instruction requirements for faculty on sabbatical leave in residence.

UCFW also is grappling with a series of challenges that face the University.

- *Faculty housing*. The cost of housing in the communities surrounding most UC campuses poses a significant difficulty to faculty recruitment, especially as UC looks to the need to hire upward of 7,000 faculty in the next decade. Existing UC housing programs help, and there have been some improvements to those programs, but the basic problem is that there is a disconnect between the cost of housing and the size of faculty salaries, particularly for junior faculty. UCFW has been working with UCOP administration in order to develop new financial instruments and new sources of funds in order to ease the housing crisis now confronting UC.
- *Health care*. UC is faced with a growing number of conflicts between health care providers and insurers as well as with rapidly escalating health care costs. UC’s health care budget may not be able to completely cover future increases; and cost sharing, in the form of increased premiums and/or increased co-pays, may be inevitable. UCFW and its Task Force on the Future of UC Health Plans are trying to develop ways to negotiate this very difficult terrain.

- *Summer session/year-round operations.* While a lot of work concerning summer sessions and the move toward year-round operations has been directed at student affairs, UCFW is concerned about the possible impact of these operations upon faculty. UCFW is looking at a variety of issues, including faculty compensation, space, teaching, and research—all of which have significant implications not only for faculty welfare but for the future of UC as a premier research institution.

Chair Gruber responded to questions from the floor:

- *Opposite sex health care benefits.* Phase 1 of the implementation of the Senate/UCFW request for domestic partner benefits took place several years ago with the extension of health care benefits to same-sex UC domestic partners and adult dependent relatives. Two years ago UCFW brought forward a proposal for equity in domestic partner benefits--extension of retirement benefits to both same- and opposite-sex UC domestic partners, and health care benefits to same-sex UC domestic partners. UCFW is lobbying for implementation and carefully negotiating to that end with UCOP administration, who have assured UCFW of their commitment to advance domestic partner equity in benefits.
- *Health care costs.* A funding source, in order to have a further augmentation of the UC's health care budget, is not readily apparent. Health care costs are dramatically increasing throughout the nation. UC's co-pays currently are lower than comparison institutions.
- *Ed fee waiver.* The educational fee waiver proposal is intended for all faculty and staff with five years of University service. For purposes of recruitment and retention, the Chancellor can waive the five-year requirement.

XI. New Business

Issue: Summer session. Assembly members agreed to add to today's agenda a discussion of summer session.

Action: Chair Cowan urged Assembly members to continue conversations on their campus about summer session at both the departmental level and in Senate bodies. The Academic Council and appropriate systemwide Senate committees will continue to examine the issues of summer session.

Discussion Points:

- Though, as originally announced, summer session at UCLA, UCSB, and UCB was to begin in 2002, in October 2000 that date was advanced to summer 2001.
 - One of the problems faced at UCSB is the shift from a summer session that was essentially self supporting to a summer session that now has to be integrated into academic departments.
 - At UCSB, each FTE counted in summer session is a new FTE. Last year the campus had approximately 400 new FTE for the full academic year. This summer UCSB will have more than twice that number just for summer session. The influx of resources from enrollment is roughly twice as much in this one summer session than it was for the full academic year.

- Faculty at UCSB will be paid one-ninth for a regular academic course, rather than one-twelfth (which has been the practice for summer session), plus an incentive of \$1500.
- UCOP has set out criteria that will justify continued state funding of summer session, including (a) a 50 percent increase in the fraction of courses taught by ladder faculty during the summer; and (b) a 20 percent increase in summer session enrollment.
- Before implementation of summer session at these three campuses, systemwide Senate consultation was not extensive.
- UC is responding to political as well as demographic pressures for expanded enrollment.
- Dialogues between faculty and local administration need to be more fully formed, in order to carefully address issues rising from the new summer sessions.
 - In order to receive compensation for a full student FTE, 120 student contact hours will have to be generated.
 - Care needs to be taken to insure that short-term pressures not create long-term default positions that possibly could threaten the core of UC's academic enterprise.

The meeting was adjourned at 3 p.m.

Distributed at the meeting:

- *President Atkinson's discussion topics for the February 28 meeting of the Academic Assembly*
- *Standardized Tests and Access of American Universities, lecture delivered by President Atkinson to the American Council on Education, 2/18/01*
- *Atkinson/Bustamante, re UC outreach programs, 2/13/01*
- *Atkinson/Alpert, re Master Plan review, 2/7/01*
- *A Five-Year Report to The Regents, President Atkinson, 1/01*
- *Report on UC/DOE Contracts, UCORP Vice Chair Abarbanel*
- *Dual Admissions Proposal accepted by BOARS, 2/26/01*

APPENDIX A
2000-2001 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of February 28, 2001

President of the University:

Richard Atkinson

Academic Council Members :

Michael Cowan, Chair
C.R. Viswanathan, Vice Chair
David Dowall, Chair, UCB
Jeffery Gibeling, Chair, UCD
David Brant, Chair, UCI
Stephen Yeazell, Chair, UCLA
Irwin Sherman, Chair, UCR (--)
Douglas Magde, Chair, UCSD
Lawrence Pitts, Chair, UCSF (A)
Maria Pallavicini (Alt., Pitts)
Richard Watts, Chair, UCSB
Roger Anderson, Chair, UCSC
David Hoy, Chair, UCAP
Clifford Brunk, Chair, CCGA
Manfred Kusch, Chair, UCEP
Dorothy Perry, Chair, BOARS
Judith Gruber, Chair, UCFW
Gayle Binion, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (7)

Steven Beckendorf (--)
Suzanne Fleiszig
Ervin Hafter (--)
Judith Innes
Richard Packard
Theodore Slaman
Daniel Melia
David Cuderback (alternate)

Davis (6)

Lester Ehler
Dallas Hyde
Jerry Powell
Wendy Silk
Victoria Smith
Jessica Utts

Irvine (3)

Madeleine Pahl
James Danziger
William Sirignano

Los Angeles (10)

Robert Blattner
James Spar (- -)
Alan Garfinkel
Donald MacKay
Paul Torrens
Frank Heuser
Vickie Mays (- -)
Kathryn Atchison
Jose Moya
(1 TBA)

Riverside (2)

Bajis Dodin (--)
Jose Wudka

San Diego (4)

Gary C. Jacobson
Jane R. Stevens (--)
Kim R. MacConnel
Donald F. Tuzin

San Francisco (3)

Mary Croughan-Minihane
Mary Castle White
Martin Shetlar

Santa Barbara (3)

Charles Akemann
John Doner
Dan Little

Santa Cruz (2)

Susan Schwartz
Carla Freccero (A)
John Tamkun (alt., Freccero)

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Peter Berck (substitute)