

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

- **George Blumenthal, Chair**

- 1. Presentation to the Assembly of Professor John Oakley, the 2005-06 Vice Chair/2006-07 Chair of the Academic Senate**
- 2. Nomination and Election of the Vice Chair of the University Committee on Committees (UCOC) for 2005-06 (Oral report, Action)**

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 150.A.1](#), Committees, "... The members-at-large are to be named by the Assembly for two-year staggered terms. Each at large member will serve as Vice Chair in the first year and shall normally succeed as Chair in the second year."

ACTION REQUESTED: Assembly is asked to elect a member-at-large to serve as the 05-06 UCOC Vice Chair and to succeed as its Chair in 06-07.

3. Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 116. Authority of the Assembly](#) – Part II. E. "The Assembly is authorized to approve modifications to the University Academic Senate legislation...Except for Bylaws marked "[Protected – see Bylaw 116.E]", modification of Bylaws requires the approval of two-thirds of all voting member of the Assembly present; modification of Regulations requires the approval of a majority of all voting members of the Assembly present...Modifications of legislation shall take effect immediately following approval unless a different date is specified or required."

The following proposed amendment to [Senate Bylaw 128](#) was approved by the Academic Council at its March 30, 2005 meeting and was found to be consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J).

ACTION REQUESTED: The approval of the proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 128

JUSTIFICATION

Under our current bylaws, the Universitywide Committee on Committees formally appoints all members of the Standing Committees of the Assembly, usually based upon recommendations forwarded from divisional committees on committees. In addition, UCOC appoints the chairs and vice chairs of all Assembly Committees. However, our bylaws are currently mute about the membership of subcommittees or task forces formed by Assembly Committees. While such subcommittees and task forces may consist of a subset of members from the parent committee, it may also be the case that the

membership consists predominantly of members who are not a part of the parent committee or any other Assembly Committee. At the present time, neither the Universitywide Committee on Committees nor the Academic Council has any oversight of the membership of subcommittees or task forces.

Our bylaws require that all Systemwide Senate agencies must report formally through their establishing agency. Thus, Senate subcommittees and task forces must formally report to their parent committee, and Assembly Committees, when providing formal advice to the President, must formally provide that advice only through the Academic Council or the Assembly. However, Senate Committees (and subcommittees and task forces) commonly consult informally with members of the administration; therefore, it is essential that the composition of all Senate agencies, including subcommittees and task forces, remain under the control of the Universitywide Committee on Committees.

It is not the intention here to needlessly handcuff Senate committees as they organize themselves into subcommittees to efficiently go about their work. Furthermore, we must recognize that there are numerous occasions when subcommittees might proceed more efficiently if they included members of other Standing Committees. Therefore, the amended bylaw provides that the Universitywide Committee on Committees must formally appoint any member of a subcommittee or task force of an Assembly Committee who is not already a member of an Assembly Committee. In essence, this requires that UCOC appoint all subcommittee and task force members who have not already been appointed to some committee by UCOC. This amendment to Senate Bylaw 128 will insure balance on subcommittees and task forces and will help ensure that the Senate perspective is maintained.

Note that there are circumstances when Senate committees can benefit from the advice of an advisory group whose membership may include committee members, other Senate members, or individuals who are not members of the Academic Senate. Such an advisory panel may not informally advise the administration on behalf of the Senate. When such an advisory panel can facilitate a Senate committee's work, the Chair of the Academic Council will appoint its members.

The action being requested of the Academic Assembly is to approve the following change in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SENATE BYLAW 128

128. Membership of Standing Committees of the Assembly

- I. A standing committee of the Assembly may appoint one or more subcommittees or task forces, which must always report back to the main committee, but the University Committee on Committees must appoint all subcommittee or task force members who are not already members of any standing committee of the Assembly.**

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES (CONTINUED)

A. Academic Council (Continued)

- **George Blumenthal, Chair**

4. Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 477 (Action)

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 116. Authority of the Assembly](#) – Part II. E. “The Assembly is authorized to approve modifications to the University Academic Senate legislation...Except for Bylaws marked “[Protected – see Bylaw 116.E]”, modification of Bylaws requires the approval of two-thirds of all voting member of the Assembly present; modification of Regulations requires the approval of a majority of all voting members of the Assembly present...Modifications of legislation shall take effect immediately following approval unless a different date is specified or required.”

The proposed Senate Regulation 477 was approved by the Academic Council at its April 27, 2005 meeting and sent to the Universitywide Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J) for their concurrence that the proposed Senate Regulation 477 is consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate.

ACTION REQUESTED: The approval of the proposed Senate Regulation 477

JUSTIFICATION

Currently, when students transfer from a Community College to a UC campus, the courses they have taken for lower division major preparation will transfer for that purpose only if there is a specific agreement (called an articulation agreement) between their old CCC campus and the department to which they are transferring. For that reason, each department at the (soon to be) nine undergraduate UC campuses must determine which of the courses at the corresponding department in each of the 109 Community Colleges is appropriate for transfer for major preparation. This is a faculty responsibility, since we are responsible for determining which courses will transfer, based upon the quality of the courses. Similarly, UC departments must determine whether a sequence of courses offered at every Community College will satisfy the department’s lower division requirements.

This proposed Senate Regulation 477 would potentially streamline that process by stating that if four campuses articulate a course or lower division sequence of courses for major preparation, then the course or sequence of courses would automatically be articulated at all other UC campuses as well unless a campus specifically opts out of the agreement. Campuses would be able to opt out of such articulation within one year, and departments would have an annual opportunity to opt out as well. For that reason, this is not a mandate for departments to accept courses or sequences of courses. Rather, this regulation could lessen the burden on departments willing to accept the articulation agreements specifically worked out by departments at other UC campuses. The regulation also requires adequate notice for departments and suggests that the implementation should have as little effect as possible on students when a department decides to opt out of an articulation agreement after the Community College student has relied on the

agreement. This legislation in no way requires that departments align their lower division requirements with those of other UC campuses.

A “*Draft Proposal to Streamline the Course Major Articulation Preparation Process between UC Campuses and the California Community Colleges*,” which offers context and justification for the proposed regulation, and its addendum “*Supplemental Examples and Implementation Possibilities*” have been reviewed by the Divisions and Standing Committees of the Academic Council. On February 23, 2005, the Academic Council approved in principle the draft proposal, and on April 23, the Academic Council adopted a final draft of the proposed enabling legislation presented here for the Assembly’s approval.

PROPOSED SENATE REGULATION 477

When four or more UC campuses agree to accept a course from a given California Community College as transferable for preparation for a specific major, the course will be deemed as transferable for the same major at all UC campuses one year after notification of the campuses. Similarly, if four or more campuses agree to accept a set of courses as adequate for lower-division major-preparation for a UC upper-division major discipline, that set of courses will be deemed as accepted for lower-division preparation in the same major at all the UC campuses one year after notification of the campuses. During the year following initial notification, individual campuses may decline to participate in the agreement. Additionally, all campuses will be given an annual opportunity to opt out of any previous obligation resulting from this Regulation. The Academic Council or the Senate agency it so designates shall advise the President on the implementation of this regulation so as to ensure that there is adequate notice for all campuses, that campuses have an annual opportunity to opt out of this obligation, and that community college students who intend to transfer to UC are minimally affected by a campus’s decision to no longer accept a course or set of courses.

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND and JUSTIFICATION*:

The University of California has worked hard to improve the transfer of students between UC and California Community Colleges (CCCs). One cornerstone of this effort is the development of “articulation agreements” to show how a course or groups of courses at a CCC may be transferred for credit to a UC or California State University (CSU) campus. General education articulation agreements show how certain courses satisfy GE requirements at the UC/CSU campuses. Similarly, major-preparation articulation agreements delineate how community college courses will satisfy the lower division course requirements for UC academic majors.

UC faculty are responsible for the review and approval of articulation agreements between UC campuses and CCCs. In each discipline, they review community college course outlines and supplementary material to determine if a course offered at a community college is comparable enough to the UC course that it can be accepted for

credit. Depending on the type of articulation agreement, credit can be granted as general elective credit (Transfer Course Agreement or TCA), general education curriculum credit (Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum or IGETC), or campus-specific credit (campus general education credit or major-preparation credit). Of these, the annual TCA and IGETC agreements are developed systemwide by UCOP staff working under faculty supervision and in the case of IGETC also in conjunction with CSU faculty and staff. UC has long-established TCA and IGETC agreements with all of the CCCs.

Developing campus-level articulation agreements between institutions is a mammoth undertaking. Given the 108 CCCs, 8 (soon to be 9) undergraduate UC campuses and approximately 650 distinct undergraduate majors offered in the UC system, about 700,000 separate major-preparation articulation agreements are needed for UC to be fully articulated with the CCCs. Creating and keeping track of these agreements between and among campuses is costly, yet vital, to the transfer process. Transfer students and counselors at the community colleges rely on the agreements to provide students with the appropriate roadmap in their preparation for the BA degree to which the student plans to transfer. Unfortunately, major-preparation agreements between many UC campuses and many CCCs do not exist. Without major-preparation agreements, potential transfer students will know if the course they are taking is generally transferable by consulting the TCA, but they will not know if the department at a particular UC campus will accept the course as lower division preparation for the major.

To distribute articulation agreements statewide to students, counselors and others, the University has contributed significant resources to ASSIST², an intersegmental, web-based, transfer planning system. ASSIST is the State's official repository of all official articulation between California Community Colleges and UC and CSU campuses. Any student can log onto ASSIST for free and determine how the courses they complete at a community college will transfer to a CSU or UC campus, assuming that a major-preparation articulation agreement has been established.

Although ASSIST has been in place for over a decade and has effectively categorized articulation agreements among the three segments, the inefficient process for generating agreements between UC campuses and individual community colleges has changed little since the 1960s. All UC campuses essentially conduct a review of every community college course every few years to determine how such courses may be used to satisfy campus-specific major or campus-specific GE requirements. This process is conducted in practically the same way, in parallel fashion, at the undergraduate UC campuses.

The course approval process conducted on each UC campus appropriately gives that faculty oversight of courses that are proposed for transfer into their curriculum. It assures that the faculty members who design courses and curricula can protect the integrity of the curriculum at each UC campus. In this way, program faculty should be confident that transferring students are adequately prepared to succeed in the curriculum offered at a particular UC campus.

² *Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer*

It seems likely, though, that the course review and approval process across the campuses can be streamlined to provide faster and more efficient development of articulation agreements, particularly where consensus exists among a number of UC campuses.

With the proposed regulation in place, faculty from each campus could choose to rely on the expertise of one another for the articulation of lower-division major-preparation courses offered at California Community Colleges. Campuses will be notified that the course is about to be designated acceptable at all UC campuses for a particular major, and with a year long review period there would be time to design and develop an alternative agreement should an alternative appear to be more appropriate at a given campus. Though systemwide major-preparation articulation agreements may be difficult to achieve or simply inappropriate in some instances given that majors and their requirements vary from campus to campus, such systemwide articulation agreements should be established and agreed to whenever possible. Through these efforts both the UCs and the CCCs will be better equipped to work together towards the shared goal of adequately preparing students for the upper-division major programs they wish to enter.

* The text of the justification is adapted from “*A Draft Proposal to Streamline the Course Major Articulation Process between UC Campuses and California Community Colleges*” (August 30, 2004); and “*Supplemental Examples and Implementation Possibilities for Streamlining UC Major Preparation Articulation*” (draft November 4, 2004).

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES (CONTINUED)

A. Academic Council (Continued)

• George Blumenthal, Chair

5. Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 478 (Action)

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 116. Authority of the Assembly](#) – Part II. E. “The Assembly is authorized to approve modifications to the University Academic Senate legislation...Except for Bylaws marked “[Protected – see Bylaw 116.E]”, modification of Bylaws requires the approval of two-thirds of all voting member of the Assembly present; modification of Regulations requires the approval of a majority of all voting members of the Assembly present...Modifications of legislation shall take effect immediately following approval unless a different date is specified or required.”

The proposed [Senate Regulation 478](#) was approved by the Academic Council at its April 27, 2005 meeting and sent to the Universitywide Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J) for their concurrence that the proposed Senate Regulation 478 is consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate.

BACKGROUND and JUSTIFICATION

At the beginning of this academic year, the Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates asked the UC, CSU and CCC Academic Senates to review and approve a proposal developed by faculty involved with the Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulation Curriculum (IMPAC) that would better prepare transfer students who are majoring in high unit disciplines, particularly those in the sciences. The goal of the Science General Education Transfer Curriculum (SciGETC) program is to make it easier for students intending to major in the physical and biological sciences, who transfer to UC from a community college, to simultaneously prepare for their major while satisfying all but two of the courses they need to satisfy the general education requirement. Specifically, the following proposed amendment to [Senate Regulation 478](#) would allow students in the physical and biological sciences to defer two of their Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) courses, something that is currently allowed only in the case of hardship.

Currently, there are two ways in which students who transfer to UC after completing two years at a community college can satisfy their UC campus general education requirements. First, they can complete all of the courses required for general education at the campus to which they have transferred. Alternatively, during their first two years at a community college, they can take a sequence of courses called the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC), which is spelled out in Senate Regulation 478. Students who complete the IGETC sequence before transfer do not have to complete the general education requirements at the UC campus to which they have transferred. Therefore, IGETC allows community colleges to satisfy the UC general education requirements in their two years at a community college, no matter to which UC campus they ultimately transfer.

At the present time, only in the case of a documented hardship are students permitted to defer two of the IGETC courses until after transfer. However, many community college students in the physical and biological sciences, with a heavier load of lower division courses, are unable to simultaneously prepare for their major while also satisfying the IGETC curriculum. Consequently, the proposed SciGETC program would allow students in those majors to defer two IGETC courses until after they transfer -- one course in Arts/Humanities and one course in the Social and Behavioral Sciences. In addition, since SciGETC would apply only to science students, they would not be required to take both a physical and biological science course. A year-long laboratory course in a single field would suffice. Note that most engineering programs at UC already have very different and less course intensive general education requirements; for that reason, SciGETC would not apply to engineering students.

The SciGETC program is an important positive step in facilitating the transfer of science students from the community colleges to UC. The central element of the SciGETC program allows students in the physical and biological sciences to defer two IGETC courses until after transfer so that they will have more time available at community college for lower division major preparation. Since there will be some cost associated with the implementation of this amendment, if it passes, Provost and Senior Vice President Greenwood has assured the Academic Council that the University would meet its responsibility to adequately fund the implementation of this proposal.

ACTION REQUESTED: The approval of the proposed amendment to Senate Regulation 478:

Present language appears in normal text. Proposed language is noted in bold underlined

B. University Policy for the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (Am 3 May 90)

The University's policy for the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum is as follows:

1. To fulfill the lower division B/GE requirements prior to transferring to the University of California, a student has the option of fulfilling the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum or fulfilling the specific requirements of the school or college of the campus to which the student will transfer.
2. If the lower division B/GE requirements are not satisfied prior to transfer, the student will be subject to the regulations regarding B/GE lower division requirements of the school or college of the campus to which the student transfers, with the following exception. A student may fulfill the lower division B/GE requirements by fulfilling the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) after the transfer, provided all four of the following conditions are met. (Am 25 Feb 99)
 - a. A student may complete a maximum of two courses of the

IGETC after transfer.

- b. **EITHER (1)** The last-attended community college must certify the IGETC area(s) and the one or two courses yet to be completed, and that the lack of these courses was for good cause such as illness or class cancellation. **OR (2)** **For students intending to major in the physical and biological sciences, the last-attended community college must certify that the student has substantially completed the articulated lower division courses for the major and that the student has completed the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum except for (i) one course in Arts and Humanities and (ii) one course in Social and Behavioral Sciences; students in this category may satisfy the IGETC requirement in Physical and Biological sciences with a year-long sequence in a single laboratory science.**
- c. A student who has been approved to complete one or two IGETC courses after transfer may take a certified IGETC course in the area remaining to be completed at any California community college subject to the UC campus rules regarding concurrent enrollment or, at the option of the UC campus, may take approved substitute courses at that UC campus.
- d. The IGETC must be completed within one academic year (two semesters or three quarters plus any summer that might intervene) of the student's transfer to UC.

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES (CONTINUED)

A. Academic Council (Continued)

- **George Blumenthal, Chair**

6. Academic Council Resolution on Restriction on Research Funding Sources (Action)

At its July 21, 2004 meeting, the Academic Council adopted a Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources. In October of 2004, the Academic Council, in response to concerns raised by some faculty members regarding the need for broader consultation on the issues the resolution addresses, sent [the Resolution](#) out for full Senate review and consideration of whether it should stand as written and adopted, or should be amended or rescinded. [Formal responses](#) from all nine Divisions and from six standing committees of the Assembly (CCGA, UCAF, UCAP, UCFW, UCORP, and UCPB) showed extremely strong support for the resolution in principle. Based on those formal comments and recommendations, the Academic Council unanimously adopted an amended version of the Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources, which is presented here for the Assembly's approval.

JUSTIFICATION:

On July 21, 2004, the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) presented to the Academic Council the [“Report on Problematic Restrictive Clauses in Contracts, Grants and Gifts for Research”](#) and its attendant Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources. The Academic Council adopted both the report and the Resolution, and they were subsequently sent to President Dynes with the request that they be distributed to the various campus administrations.

The report and the Resolution were the outcome of UCORP's almost two-year-long engagement with the issue of restrictions on research awards. The committee had, in October 2002, identified tobacco industry funding as a key issue, and throughout the year had discussed the UCSF vote on whether to accept tobacco funding, and the University's negotiations with the American Legacy Foundation (ALF) regarding a restrictive clause in its grants relating to tobacco industry funding. In July 2003, UCORP was given a formal charge from then-Academic Council Chair Binion to review UC's stance on tobacco funding bans within units of the University, along with a broader charge to review UC research funding policies and “strings” on research awards. In fulfillment of that charge, UCORP issued its July 2004 Report and the attendant Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources, the core argument of which was aimed at preserving the academic freedom of individual faculty members. Although the Resolution was prompted by faculty votes within individual units of the University to ban “tobacco money,” it was not particular to that one source or issue.

UCORP's view of the academic freedom questions raised by this issue accords with the American Association of University Professors' (AAUP's) academic freedom position. The [2002-03 AAUP Committee “A” Report](#) states in part:

“A very different situation obtains, however, when a university objects to a funding agency because of its corporate behavior. As a practical matter, the distinction between degrees of corporate misdeeds is too uncertain to sustain a clear, consistent, and principled policy for determining which research funds to accept and which to reject. An institution which seeks to distinguish between and among different kinds of offensive corporate behavior presumes that it is competent to distinguish impermissible corporate wrongdoing from wrongful behavior that is acceptable. A university which starts down this path will find it difficult to resist demands that research bans should be imposed on other funding agencies that are seen as reckless or supportive of repellent programs. If the initiative in calling for these bans on the funding of faculty research comes from the faculty itself, our concerns about the restraints on academic freedom are not thereby lessened.”

By adoption of both the previous version of the Resolution and the current version (amended 3/31/05) that is now before the Assembly, the Academic Council is expressing its belief that banning certain sources of funds by a majority vote of the faculty within a unit is a fundamental infringement of the academic freedom of the individual UC researcher who may wish to accept such funding and who is otherwise acting in compliance with UC policy. UC policy requires that scholarship be judged solely by professional standards, and the Resolution is aimed at showing that bans based upon judgments regarding the funding source or speculations about how the research might be used fundamentally interfere with a faculty member’s freedom to carry out a research program. The amended Resolution clarifies that the UC Board of Regents has sole authority to set research policy that would ban the acceptance of research funding from a particular source. It also makes clear the right of an agency of the UC Senate to request that the Regents adopt a policy to refuse funding from a particular source, and the necessary path for making such a request.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of the Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources.

**Resolution of the Academic Council
Restrictions on Research Funding Sources
Adopted by the Academic Council, March 31, 2005**

Preamble: This resolution states that no unit of the University, whether by faculty vote or administrative decision, has the authority to prevent a faculty member from accepting external research funding based solely on the source of the research funds. The authority to set such research policy rests with the UC Board of Regents. Nothing in this resolution would prevent individual faculty members from voluntarily eschewing a particular source of research funding. Agencies of the Academic Senate may, through their divisions, propose that the statewide Academic Senate request, through the President, that the Board of Regents adopt a policy to refuse funding from a particular source.

WHEREAS, Only the UC Board of Regents has the plenary authority to establish policies on the acceptance of research funding; and

WHEREAS, Agencies of the Academic Senate may, through their divisions, propose that the statewide Academic Senate request, through the President, that the Board of Regents adopt a policy to refuse funding from a particular source; and

WHEREAS, No Committee, Faculty, or Division of the Academic Senate of the University of California has the plenary authority either to set aside the principles of academic freedom or to establish policies on the acceptance of research funding; and

WHEREAS, Freedom of inquiry is a fundamental principle of the University of California; and

WHEREAS, The University of California faculty code of conduct requires that “[Professors] respect and defend the free inquiry of associates”; and

WHEREAS, The University of California policy on academic freedom requires that scholarship be judged solely by reference to professional standards, and that researchers “must form their point of view by applying professional standards of inquiry rather than by succumbing to external and illegitimate incentives such as monetary gain or political coercion”; and

WHEREAS, The University of California has existing policies that encourage the highest ethical standards in the conduct of research, require disclosure of conflicts of interest, guarantee the freedom of publication, and prevent misuse of the University's name; and

WHEREAS, Restrictions on accepting research funding from particular sources on the basis of moral or political judgments about the fund source or the propriety of the research, or because of speculations about how the research results might be used, interfere with an individual faculty member's freedom to define and carry out a research program; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the University of California Academic Council, That the principles of academic freedom and the policies of the University of California require that individual faculty members be free to accept or refuse research support from any source consistent with their individual judgment and conscience and with University policy. Therefore, a unit of the University may not refuse to process, accept, or administer a research award based on the source of the funds; nor may such a unit encumber a faculty member's ability to solicit or accept awards based on the source of the funds, except as directed by the UC Board of Regents.

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES (CONTINUED)

A. Academic Council (Continued)

- **George Blumenthal, Chair**

7. Report from the President's Council on the National Laboratories (Oral Report)

8. Report from the Academic Council Special Committee on National Labs (ACSCONL) (Oral Report)

- **Cliff Brunk, Chair**

9. Apportionment of Representatives to the 2005-06 Assembly (Information)

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 105. A. 4.](#), the Academic Council at its April 27, 2005 meeting approved the apportionment of the 40 Divisional Representatives for 2005-06. On the basis of Divisional Academic Senate membership as of March 2005, [the Webster Method of Calculation](#) was used to determine the number of Divisional representatives. The apportionment of representatives for 05-06 is as follows:

DIVISION	NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES/DIVISION
Berkeley	6
Davis	6
Irvine	4
Los Angeles	9
Riverside	2
San Diego	4
San Francisco	4
Santa Barbara	3
Santa Cruz	2
TOTAL:	40

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES (CONTINUED)

A. Academic Council (Continued)

- **George Blumenthal, Chair**

10. 2005-2006 Assembly Meetings (Information)

In accordance with Senate Bylaw 110.A.3.b., the following dates for the 05-06 Assembly meetings were set in consultation with the President of the Senate and the Academic Council.

Meeting Dates and Locations

Submission Receipt Date³

October 19, 2005 (most probably via teleconference)
November 9, 2005 (most probably via teleconference)
February 8, 2006 (possibly face-to-face Oakland/Berkeley)
April 12, 2005 (most probably via teleconference)
May 10, 2006 (face-to-face Oakland/Berkeley)
June 14, 2006 (most probably via teleconference)

September 8, 2005
October 7, 2005
January 6, 2006
March 6, 2006
April 7, 2006
May 8, 2006

³ Final date on which the Secretary/Parliamentarian can receive reports and other submissions for inclusion in the *Notice of Meeting*.