

II. MINUTES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

REGULAR MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE Minutes of March 12, 2003

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday, March 12, 2003 on the Clark Kerr Campus of UC Berkeley. Assembly of the Academic Senate Chair Gayle Binion called the meeting to order at ten o'clock. Academic Senate Executive Director María Bertero-Barceló called the roll of the Assembly; attendance is listed in Appendix A of these Minutes.

II. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting of May 29, 2002 were approved as written.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

Richard C. Atkinson

Assembly Chair Binion welcomed President Atkinson. Advance distributions included the President's March 3, 2003 letter to the Regents regarding UC's simultaneous enrollment growth and constrained resources, and "List of Discussion Topics..." The President briefed the Assembly on nearly every topic from the list:

1. Budget
2. Classification by Race, Ethnicity, Color, or National Origin Initiative
3. Los Alamos National Laboratory
4. Undergraduate Admissions (Fall 2003) and Enrollment (Fall 2002)
5. State Audit on Accountability Measures in Partnership with Governor
6. Faculty Hiring and Gender Equity
7. Green Building Policy/Clean Energy
8. Library Initiatives
9. Dual Admissions Program
10. Eligibility in the Local Context
11. Commission on the Growth and Support of Graduate Education
12. Retirement Benefits for Domestic Partners
13. Long-Range Enrollment Planning
14. Summer Instruction Expansion
15. UC Merced
16. Accountability Framework for Higher Education
17. California House, London and Mexico City
18. California-Mexico Initiatives
19. Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees
20. Contract and Grant Activities
21. Education Doctorate and Educational Leadership
22. External Debt Study
23. Graduate and Professional School Enrollment, Fall 2000 and Fall 2001

24. Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996
25. Housing Task Force
26. Internet2/CalREN-2
27. Labor Relations
28. Master of Advanced Study
29. Master Plan Review
30. Outreach and K-12 Initiatives
31. Private Support
32. Regents' Committee on Audit Review
33. UC 2010 – A New Business Architecture for the University of California
34. UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching
35. UC Center in Sacramento
36. UC Teaching, Learning and Technology Center
37. UCTV

[A written summary of each of the above listed topics was distributed at the meeting and is available, on the Senate's website--- <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/mar2003/presrpt.pdf>]

Provost and Senior Vice President C. Judson King provided additional information on selected topics.

Student fees were addressed; after holding steady since 1997, fees increased this year in spring quarter. An additional increase is scheduled for next year, pending gubernatorial approval of the budget. UC student fees remain low (\$5,082 for next year) as compared with public institutions within UC's comparison eight institutions (~\$6,694).

Racial Privacy Initiative (now known as Classification by Race, Ethnicity, Color, or National Origin, "CRECNO") and its implications for UC were addressed. The Academic Council voted in January to oppose the Initiative and to call upon the Regents to oppose it on behalf of the University. Reliance on State research databases for University research was cited as a particular concern of UC faculty. The Initiative is scheduled to be on the next State ballot.

Faculty morale concerns were addressed. It is clear that another very early retirement incentive program (VERIP) cannot be justified at this time. Next year is expected to be a very tough year for the University, with respect to the budget situation, budget cuts and morale. The President said the University is challenged to maintain its high standards and attitudes of previous years in the face of these problems.

Budget cuts have been specific and targeted, with the exception of one \$34 million undesignated cut. The present crisis compares with the 1991-92 budget crisis; next year is likely to be worse.

Underrepresented minority enrollment drop appears to be more related to demographic changes that have impacted UC's ability to maintain levels of underrepresented minorities, rather than the passage of Proposition 209. While percentages of underrepresented minority students attending UC have increased, underrepresented minority high school graduates are a growing proportion of that population. UCOP has recently issued a report on the impact on UC of the passage of SP-1.

One member asked to what extent the Regents are informed about faculty gender equity issues in the context of selecting the next University President. Presidential selection criteria have been revised recently, and the Regents are aware of recent testimony and policy changes with respect to faculty gender equity issues. President Atkinson said he is not involved in the recruitment process or selection of his successor.

The President and Provost also addressed comments from Assembly members regarding potential increase in hiring temporary faculty for summer session (response: there is an expectation of having regular rank faculty teach summer session, for comparable instruction), formal policy and institutional effort targeted at dealing with commercial entities on campuses and potential conflict of interest (response: from experience, the University is getting better at this business), and UC Trade Policy regarding divestment of interests [in countries that trade with Israel] (response: the issue has not come before the Regents, and a University stance has not been taken nor is it expected).

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Binion requested taking action on the two Consent Calendar items and on Item VI out of agenda order before returning to announcements; no objection was voiced.

Chair Binion acknowledged visitors: Professor Richard Watts, Chair of Professorial Steps Task Force, Professor Robert Post, member of the Course Description Task Force, and Professor Janis Ingham, Vice Chair of University Committee on Research Policy.

Chair Binion announced that the Academic Council would hold its first joint retreat with Executive Vice Chancellors in March. Agenda topics include UCFW's proposed Phased Employment/Phased Retirement, Ethics & Integrity: Faculty-Student Relations, and Shared Governance.

In response to a question about the UC Report on Gender Equity, Chair Binion said the report is on its way to campuses for review and comment. The Senate will also be involved in further discussions of recommendations concerning senior hiring, best predictors of recruitment, and an examination of gender equity in fields where postdoctoral experience is required for faculty appointments.

V. SPECIAL ORDERS

A. Consent Calendar

Chair Binion informed Assembly members that discussion is waived for consent calendar items unless there is an objection to approving the individual item.

1. Variance to Senate Regulation 630 requested by the Irvine Division

Issue: The Irvine Division requested this change to extend to students enrolled in the UC Washington, D.C. program the same exception to undergraduate residence requirements provided to students enrolled in the Education Abroad Program.

Action: No objection was voiced, and the request for variance was approved as submitted.

**2. Variance to Senate Regulation 730 requested by the Davis Division—
Diploma Notation for Undergraduate Minors**

Issue: The Davis Division request for formal notation for undergraduate minors on diplomas-- be notated on a student's diploma.

Action: No objection was voiced, and the request for variance was approved as submitted.

B. Annual Reports (2001-02)

The Assembly received the Standing Committees' Annual Reports as noted in the NOTICE of Meeting.

VI. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES (taken up out of agenda order)
Report of the Senate Task Force on UC Merced
Peter Berck, Chair
Proposed Campus Regents Standing Orders for UC Merced

Issue: UC Merced's request that the Academic Senate review and recommend draft Proposed Regents Standing Order for UC Merced before the Regents' July meeting, and also Proposed Amendments to Standing Orders of the Regents 110.1. Distribution 1 was circulated to replace the background information located on pages 68-70 of the NOTICE of Meeting.

Report: UC Merced Task Force Chair Berck provided an oral report, summarizing the academic structure of existing campuses and the academic structure proposed for UC Merced. Terms "school" and "college" were deemed to be in keeping with other campuses' use of the terms. There was no further discussion.

Action: The Assembly unanimously approved the motion that the Academic Senate advise the Regents to add Academic Schools and Colleges at UC Merced as set forth on pages 71 and 72 of the NOTICE of Meeting, and separate numbered amendments to the Regents Standing Orders.

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council
Gayle Binion, Chair

**1. Nomination and Election of the Vice Chair of the Assembly for 2003-04
(oral report, action)**

Chair Binion requested suspension of the rules to hold election of the next Vice Chair of the Academic Senate and Academic Council at this meeting, rather than the May 28 Assembly meeting. The reason for early action is that the Vice Chair of the Senate is a member of the National Labs oversight committees that require a "Q" clearance from the Federal government, and that takes nearly a year to complete. Assembly members consented unanimously to suspend the election rule and proceed with action. Vice Chair Pitts provided a brief bio on the Council's

nominee, George Blumenthal, Professor of Astronomy and Astrophysics at UCSC and UCSC Division Chair.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to elect Professor Blumenthal by acclamation, and he was elected unanimously. Professor Blumenthal returned to the meeting and received a round of applause.

2. Report from the President's Council on the National Laboratories

Chair Binion, who is an ex officio member of the President's Council on the National Laboratories, apprised members that she had decided to defer the Chair's annual report to the Assembly on the Senate's role with respect to UC management of the DOE National Laboratories to the May 28 Assembly meeting, pending outcome of current investigations of UC's Lab management. She said it would be more fruitful for the Senate to engage in a dialogue after issues concerning the future of UC's lab management are resolved.

University Committee on Research Policy's Subcommittee on the Relationship between the University of California and the U.S. Department of Energy Laboratories at Berkeley, Livermore and Los Alamos issued its interim report recently to UCORP, which forwarded the report to Council. Chair Binion distributed the report for review to Division Chairs and Standing Committees Chairs, to elicit faculty comments. Chair Binion encourages discussion beyond the usual issues related to whether or not UC should continue to manage the Labs (e.g., academic freedom issues, and employee terms and conditions of employment in hiring contracts; the Academic Senate could have a role in commenting on hiring process). The Academic Council will assemble comments to advise administration on Senate views and concerns.

3. Course Descriptions Task Force (oral report from Robert Post, member of the Task Force)

Chair Binion introduced Professor Post, a faculty member at UC Berkeley's Boalt Hall School of Law. The Task Force was formed at the request of President Atkinson, and in response to concerns raised with respect to the English R1A course section ("The Politics and Poetics of Palestinian Resistance") taught in fall Semester 2002, at UC Berkeley. The Task Force has three charges, which are to review: the experience of English R1A; how (non-standard) courses, such as "umbrella," courses are reviewed for content; and the operant norms for faculty with respect to how they describe their courses. In addressing those questions, President Atkinson noted that the APM 010—Academic Freedom statement did not provide sufficient guidance; he requested that Professor Post, a specialist in First Amendment law, draft a revised statement of academic freedom.

Professor Post briefed the Assembly on philosophy, construction and principles behind the proposed revision of APM 010, the only APM section that directly addresses academic freedom. He noted that the actual text was not ready for release from the President to the Academic Senate for his review.

Language in APM 010 (first drafted in 1934 by President Sproul in response to student riots at UCLA) reflects a “bargain” that UC would keep out of politics, and the State would not interfere with the business of the University. The University’s business—scholarship—was defined as “that which is not political,” and characterized as “disinterested, dispassionate and value neutral,” whereas politics was viewed as a realm in which there is passionate engagement. Professor Post has revised distinctions between scholarship that is interested and that which is disinterested; scholarship is either competent or incompetent. His statement focuses on academic freedom from three perspectives: for an individual faculty member it is freedom to engage in research and to teach; for the Academic Senate it is freedom vis-à-vis Regents and administration to set academic standards. The third perspective addresses constitutional rights, First Amendment rights, and rights under the freedom of speech clause in the California Constitution. The notion of academic freedom derives from the fundamental mission of the University to disseminate knowledge for which freedom of inquiry is a requisite.

A Question and Answer and Discussion session followed. Members discussed a resolution that passed a year ago requesting that administration review the Patriot Act. A Task Force looked at disclosure of records and wrote a report that was said to be “sobering.” Although campuses have not reported significant changes, there are concerns about medical research and publications, restrictions on nonclassified research, campus climate related to outside pressures for restricting speech, and anecdotal evidence of non-native-born faculty and students being treated differently in certain situations (e.g., when traveling). Concerns remain about the next installment of the Act, Patriot II. A representative of the Office of General Counsel, whose specialty is to understand the Patriot Act, has met with the Task Force. Members expressed concern about the impact on foreign graduate students. Professor Post noted that the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has formed a National Task Force on the Patriot Act.

One member asked how the corporate body felt about making a political statement through Council on RPI, in light of the original statement of academic freedom that the University would stay out of politics. The response indicated that the University addresses political issues that may impact its mission, as is the case with the response on RPI.

Discussion topics that were covered briefly included intellectual property rights related to funding from private entities and other external funding sources, classified information and trade secrets and related protections and restrictions, amplified restrictions on biogenetic research, international protocols, and the vagueness of APM language related to faculty privilege on publishing research findings. The University has taken a position not to accept certain kinds of restrictions. Chancellors, who formerly had the authority to permit classified research, have, asked UCOP to take back this power as the matter is viewed as one requiring a more public discussion.

Professor Post expects that the draft statement will be ready for release within days. The goal has been to develop a statement to satisfy all sides and present to the Senate before editing a final statement.

4. Professorial Steps Task Force (oral report from Richard Watts, Chair)

Background to the Professorial Step System: Professorial ranks numbered three steps (I-III) in 1961; additions of Step IV in 1962 and Step V in 1963 did not include a barrier step. Step VI was added in 1969 and APM language was drafted stating that Professor Step V may be of “an indefinite duration,” thus indicating a real barrier step. That language has not changed, and the barrier step concept has remained in place throughout additions of Step VII in 1979, Step VIII in 1988, and Step IX in 2000. Language that describes the standard for reaching Step VI has evolved from a brief 1969 statement, “...great distinction and highly meritorious service” to a lengthy 1999 statement, “...highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, evidence of excellent University teaching. In interpreting these criteria, reviewers should require evidence of excellence and high merit and original scholarship or creative achievement, in teaching and service and, in addition, great distinction recognized nationally or internationally in scholarly or creative achievement or in teaching.”

History of Review of the Professorial Step System:

An informal agreement in 2000 between UCFW (Chair Robert May) and UCAP (Chair Donka Minkova) formed a work group to review the Step System and the number of career/academic personnel reviews that take place once a faculty member has reached the Professorial Series (I-IX steps plus above scale), and the standard three-year review period. UCFW and UCAP jointly recommended a longer period between reviews, fewer steps in the series [Steps I-VI with a barrier at IV], consolidation to five-year review periods. They also made recommendations on full salary increases and salary increments. No change was recommended for the barrier step review itself, although the barrier would appear at a different level. This working model required administrative input; a joint Senate-administrative committee was charged to review the step system more extensively (although its focus was on the time period that one step would cover, and on the barrier step itself). Four Senate members (Robert May--Chair, UCFW, Barbara Doshier--Chair, UCAP, Gayle Binion--Chair, UCPB, and Jeffrey Gibeling--Davis Divisional Chair) and four administrative representatives studied the UCFW-UCAP working model and made four basic recommendations: 1) additional criteria for advancing to Step VI should be eliminated; 2) additional criteria for promotion to Professor above-scale should be retained; 3) “continuous meritorious performance” should be the standard for merit advancement on the professorial scale, once an individual passes from Associate Professor to Professor (the original standard), and 4) Professorial Step IX should be eliminated, and the normal period of Professor V-VII should be normalized to four years (with Professor VIII being an indefinite step, eliminating a barrier step prior to above scale, and movement from VIII to above would be the barrier step—the only one within the Professorial rank), coupled with consolidation of steps VIII and IX.

In addition to Task Force Chair Richard Watts—UCSB, current Task Force members are: Faye Crosby—UCSC, Joel Dimsdale—UCSD [Division Chair], Ramon Gutierrez—UCSD [UCAP Vice Chair], Robert May—UCI, and Deborah Nolan—UCB [UCAAD Chair]. The focus of the Task Force has been narrowed to: 1) review of the placement of the barrier steps and the number of barrier steps that would be involved in the Professorial ranks; 2) the number of years at step that we should continue to have; and 3) career length access to merit increases. The latter is considered to be a major problem at the barrier step, where a significant number of faculty who

do not pass the barrier and remain at Step V have less career length access to merit increases. The Task Force will thus consider ways to make merit increases available throughout a career.

A Q & A session followed. One member asked whether there would be room in a new step system for considering step promotion during retirement, when many faculty achieve national or international recognition that has been delayed. Professor Watts commented that the consideration had not been discussed. A previous model precisely considered was not to eliminate the barrier step, but to move it higher, so faculty could move further up the scale before encountering it. This would reduce the number of faculty who are stalled in mid-career (how the current Step VI is handled by the various campuses appears to vary demonstrably).

The Assembly and UCOP will ultimately make decisions on the barrier step and on [faculty/career] review. One member pointed out that because Lecturers with Security of Employment are reviewed every two years, and Professorial series every three years, a former Lecturer SOE could, at some point, surpass a full Professor in terms of actual salary increments, following favorable review. Professor Watts responded that the Task Force is aware of such equity issues. Proponents of five-year review intervals see benefits not only in terms of diminishing workload for review committees, but also of ample time for portfolio building by faculty before the next step increase.

In response to a question about the decision to recommend removing the barrier at Step VI, Chair Binion reported that composite data by campus, gender, field, age and years in the Professorial series (different markers and rates of success of tenure) indicate that a growing number of younger professors are held back at Step IV relatively early in their careers. Concerns about the effect on career pattern and faculty morale and impact on retirement income by not proceeding up the scale are among the faculty welfare issues.

There is no proposal on the table; however, a former recommendation stipulates a period of four years normative time from Step VI up through Step VIII, and eliminating Step IX, which accounts for three years to become qualified for above scale. The Task Force is also considering whether the definition of continuing meritorious service is sufficient for merit steps (addressing a UCAP concern that too many faculty could move up without having sufficient merit). Recognizing UCAP concerns and campus variations, the Task Force will address certain standards of performance that must be at every step until one gets to above scale.

5. Report on Proposed Policy on Faculty-Student Relationships (discussion)

Chair Binion briefed the Assembly on development of the proposed draft policy (pp. 74-75 of the Call). A 1983 Academic Assembly statement of principles about the inappropriateness of a faculty member having sexual relations with a student for whom the faculty member had supervisory responsibility was never codified in APM 015--Faculty Code of Conduct. In response to regental concern over the lack of a Faculty-Student Relations policy, the Universitywide Privilege and Tenure Committee drafted a policy which with minor revising has been endorsed by Academic Council.

There was considerable discussion of items 6 and 7 of “types of unacceptable conduct,” including enforceability and consequences for violating policy. Anecdotal ethical dilemmas and hypothetical situations were discussed, and also suggestions for supplemental language explaining what is understood in this policy. While some members expressed dissatisfaction with the policy as being “too explicit,” others expressed confidence in the ability of peers in UCP&T to exercise common sense and rule wisely on cases involving breach of policy. One member recommended that discussion be documented and that supplemental language include a reassurance to faculty that this is a reasonable standard, and perhaps advice for UCP&T for the future.

Other related concerns were expressed:

- A faculty member who is involved with a graduate student in a small program might expect to have some supervisory or recommendation role in future, and would thus be putting the student in a vulnerable position with respect to future career or award;
- Other relationships between students and others having supervisory authority, e.g., medical students and residents need to be considered. (UCOP intends to issue within the APM a similar document to cover all teaching personnel with parallel kinds of rules.)

Action: Discussion of this item will continue at the May 28 Assembly meeting.

6. Ad Hoc Committee on Bylaw Revisions (discussion)

George Blumenthal, Chair

Distribution 2—Working Draft Proposed Bylaw revisions (Suggestions from the 02-03 Academic Council Bylaw Ad Hoc Committee) were distributed for members to read at leisure. Chair Blumenthal noted that the draft had not been seen/approved by Council and was not for distribution beyond Assembly.

In fall 2000 Council Chair Michael Cowan invited Senate committees to examine their own bylaws and recommend changes; in 2001 Council Chair Viswanathan formed an ad hoc committee to review proposed bylaw changes. Not all committees proposed changes, and last year the ad hoc committee did not complete its work. This year the ad hoc task force consists of Chair Blumenthal, Council Chair Binion, Professor and Assembly Parliamentarian Peter Berck and UCR&J Chair Jean Olson, who worked on the Draft.

Two categories of changes were proposed: 1) General changes regarding Senate operations and 2) changes regarding Committee membership and charges. The first category includes allowing Assembly meeting agenda to be distributed electronically; changing from 15 to 10 calendar days for giving notice of meeting; allowing electronic voting for mail ballot; adding the Chair of UCORP as a member of the Academic Council, and removing the Vice Chair of UCEP as an ex officio member of the Academic Assembly. With respect to Committee bylaw changes, there is an attempt to standardize committee membership—undertaken by the Task Force. The committees suggested many modifications to charges. The Task Force also recommends that the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Council be nonvoting ex officio members of all Senate committees except UCR&J and UCOC (on the latter would be voting members).

The Task Force has proposed the following: committee chairs shall be at-large committee members, all committees shall have vice chairs; chairs will serve a one-year term, with exceptions, as a divisional representative, (e.g., BOARS Chair serves for two years), and continuous committee service by one member would be limited to four years. Chair Blumenthal provided statistics on committee membership turnover: this year 70% of committee members are serving their first year; 20% are serving a second year, and 5% are serving a third or fourth year. Allowances have been made for more campus flexibility.

The Task Force decided against changing the composition of UCR&J because this bylaw change would require action by a mail ballot of the entire UC faculty.

The Task Force has considered eliminating the Student Affirmative Action committee, which has not met or been staffed for the past 10 years. The Task Force is still looking at individual Committee charges.

A Question and Answer session followed. UCSF is also undergoing bylaws revisions. Members discussed the need for cultural change at the division level to accommodate membership terms. Most campus committee membership is limited to 3 years. The Task Force is not advocating for, but limiting, terms to four years.

A member asked about a recommended change for the Chair of UCAAD to be an ex officio member of UCAP. The response was that UCAP had supported the change, since UCAAD was not represented at Council as is UCAP, and issues of hiring are related to issues of affirmative action and gender equity.

The draft document was distributed to Assembly members for suggestions, comments or objections, which may be forwarded to Assembly Chair Binion [or to Task Force Chair Blumenthal]. The final draft will go to Council for approval.

B. Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) (discussion)

Status of BOARS recommendations for improved admissions tests

a. Update on core exams

b. “Proposal for Use of Supplemental Subject Matter Tests in the UC Admissions Process”

c. Timeline

The BOARS proposal (beginning on page 93 of the Assembly Call) was discussed with the intention that it will be voted on at the May Assembly meeting.

BOARS Chair Sawrey reported that the Proposal completed BOARS’ three years of work on considering all aspects of admissions tests at UC. In January 2002 BOARS produced a report on principles of testing that it developed: “The Use of Admissions Tests by the University of California,” which is available on the web.

(<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/boars/admissionstests.pdf>)

The new Proposal addresses the subject matter tests that all incoming students take to be UC-eligible. Up to now, for incoming students to be UC-eligible, they were required to take the core SAT I or ACT exam and three subject matter tests which are satisfied only by SAT II subject matter tests. These include one additional math exam, a writing exam, and a third choice from among subject matter tests. The College Board and ACT plan to change their core exams to include more advanced math, and a mandatory writing component; therefore, BOARS recommends reducing subject matter tests to two choices to avoid redundancy in math and English and to allow broader coverage from among the “a-g” subject requirements that closely follow the available subject matter tests. These, in addition to the core, would form the new requirement, called “core-plus-two.” The changes will be for students entering UC in fall 2006. For now and until information on content and predictive validity of tests is available, the core-plus-two components are equally weighted.

The Academic Council has endorsed items 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Proposal. An Assembly vote is needed on the “core-plus-two” testing proposal at the May 28 meeting so students entering their sophomore year of high school this September can plan and prepare to take subject matter tests at an appropriate time at the end of a course. It is important to have lead time for high schools, students, parents, and testing agencies. BOARS also wants approval of the option of reducing the number of required subject matter tests from 3 to 2 as described, and reaffirmation that BOARS is “on good ground” in making the determination of what will and will not be an appropriate test, once the committee reviews core exam design from the testing agencies. The new core exam will come back to Assembly and Regents; however, deliberation in body larger than BOARS would be difficult. BOARS wants to move forward, deal with the testing agencies, and report back to the Senate. Chair Sawrey said campuses have seen the BOARS document, all but one campus has responded, and all responses were in the affirmative. A few recommendations have also been made.

Members briefly discussed the importance of sending a message that math is important in this high technology age. One member suggested omitting calculus from the exams, since only the brightest students finish calculus by 11th grade.

VIII. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS (none)

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (none)

X. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT

Mark Traugott, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare (oral report)

Since the adjournment hour of 4pm had been reached, Assembly Chair Binion thanked UCFW Chair Traugott for his willingness to delay his report until the May 28 Assembly meeting, when the report will be on the agenda earlier in the day.

XI. NEW BUSINESS

No new business was brought before the Assembly.

Assembly Chair Binion thanked Assembly members and report presenters for their attendance and deliberation. The Assembly meeting was adjourned and will reconvene on May 28, 2003 at UCLA.

Meeting adjourned at 4pm.

Minutes prepared by Louisa Tapley-Van Pelt
Committee Analyst, Academic Senate

Appendix A

2002-2003 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of March 12, 2003

President of the University:

Richard Atkinson

Academic Council Members:

Gayle Binion, Chair
Lawrence Pitts, Vice Chair
Catherine Koshland, Chair, UCB
Bruce Madewell, Chair, UCD
Philip DiSaia, Chair, UCI
Duncan Lindsey, Chair, UCLA
Irwin Sherman, Chair, UCR
Joel Dimsdale, Chair, UCSD
Daniel Bikle, Chair, UCSF
Walter Yuen, Chair, UCSB (absent)
Harry Nelson, Vice Chair UCSB (alt.)
George Blumenthal, Chair, UCSC
Michelle Yeh, Chair, UCAP (absent)
Richard Church, Chair, CCGA
Andrew Grosovsky, Chair, UCEP
Lisa Alvarez-Cohen, Vice Chair UCEP
Barbara Sawrey, Chair, BOARS
Mark Traugott, Chair, UCFW
Richard Price, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (7)

Richard Abrams
James Bartolome
Margaret Conkey (alt.)
Sharon Fleming
Michael Hanemann
Russell Jones (absent)
Gwen Kirkpatrick (alt.)
Donald Mastronarde (absent)
Raymond Wolfinger

Davis (6)

Ryken Grattet (alt.)
Peter Hays (absent)
Gyongy Laký
Jerry Powell
John Rutledge
Evelyn Silvia (absent)
Philip Yager

Irvine (4)

Joseph Dimento
Linda Georgianna
Alexei A. Maradudin
Thomas Poulos (absent)

Los Angeles (9)

Kathryn Atchison (absent)
Charles Berst
Dalila Corry
Robert Ettenger (absent)
Todd Franke (alt.)
Lillian Gelberg (absent)
Ann Karagozian
Seymour Levin
Vickie Mays (absent)
Tasneem Naqvi (alt.)
Jane Valentine
Jaime Villablanca (alt.)

Riverside (2)

R. Ervin Taylor
Linda Tomko

San Diego (4)

Stuart Brody
Ellen T. Comisso (absent)
Barney Rickett
Geert Schmid-Schoenbein
Susan Shirk (alt.)

San Francisco (3)

Patricia Benner
Philip Darney
Francisco Ramos-Gomez

Santa Barbara (3)

Michael Gerber (absent)
Susan Koshy (absent)
Sydney Levy (absent)

Santa Cruz (2)

Alison Galloway
John Lynch

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Peter Berck