

**ACADEMIC ASSEMBLY
MEETING MINUTES– MAY 11, 2005**

I. Roll Call of Members

Pursuant to call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday, May 11, 2005 in the Joseph Wood Krutch Theatre Room at the Clark Kerr Campus, UC Berkeley. Academic Senate Chair George Blumenthal presided. Chair Blumenthal welcomed participants and called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. The order of business and procedures for discussion were reviewed. Academic Senate Director Maria Bertero-Barcelo called the roll of members of the Assembly.

II. Minutes

ACTION: The minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 9, 2005 were approved without amendments.

III. Announcements by the President

President Dynes was not able to attend the Assembly meeting due to a scheduling conflict. He prepared his announcements prior to the meeting, which were distributed electronically to the members. The Assembly wishes to express appreciation for its advance receipt of the President's written remarks.

IV. Announcements by the ChairTask Force on Scholarly Communication

This task force forwarded a proposal to the Academic Council that asks the ICOC (the governing board for the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine) to adopt a rule that requires grantees to make research papers available at no cost on the Internet six months after publication. The Academic Council unanimously endorsed this resolution and it has been forwarded onto the ICOC.

Universitywide Minor

The Academic Council adopted in principle a universitywide minor (ITTP has proposed a minor in Information Technology). This universitywide minor would not be mandated on all campuses, but simply put forward as a model for divisions to adopt (when it serves the needs of a particular campus).

Universitywide Code of Ethics

The Academic Council endorsed a universitywide Code of Ethics, which will be on the Regents May agenda.

Chancellorian Matters

- A search for a UCI Chancellor is underway and should be completed before the end of June.
- UCD Chancellor Vanderhoff is currently being reviewed.

CalSpace

The Academic Council completed a review of CalSpace (California Space Institute) and recommended that it be disbanded. A second review took place this year, and the Academic Council again recommended that it be disbanded (with the money being used to create a new MRU). After some correspondence between the Academic Council and the Office of Research, the Office of Research has decided to disband it. The Office of Research is currently forming a group that will submit a proposal for a new MRU that will be space-related.

Cal ISI's

Established under Governor Gray Davis, there are currently four Cal ISI's (California Institutes for Science and Innovation). However, currently there is currently no mechanism for Academic Senate Cal ISI review (since they are not MRU's). After some dialogue with the Administration, there is now a proposal for a regular Senatorial review of the Cal ISI's, which will eventually be reviewed by all systemwide committees and divisions.

State of Shared Governance

The Academic Council has agreed that there should be an annual report on the status of shared governance. Chair Blumenthal has subsequently requested input on shared governance from the systemwide committees and the divisions, which he will assemble into a report that will be forwarded to President Dynes.

Task Force on Faculty/Senior Management Salaries

Professor John Oakley will chair this task force. This task force will be reporting back to the Academic Council with some recommendations within a couple of months. Chair Blumenthal is hopeful that the task force's recommendations will be discussed before this matter comes before the Regents, so that the current Chair/Vice Chair will be informed when they provide input to this Regental discussion.

SB 724 ("Scott" bill)

Chair Blumenthal updated the Assembly on the current status of this legislation, which would allow CSU's to independently offer professional doctorates in certain disciplines (especially applied doctorates and Ed.D. degrees). Although this bill was strongly opposed by UC, it passed unanimously through the Senate Education Committee, and has been sent to the Appropriations Committee.

SB 5

This bill, also known as the Student Academic Freedom Bill, failed in committee.

Pension Legislation

Governor Schwarzenegger has pulled back from his proposed pension legislation. There is also new legislation proposed by Senator Richmond, which is discussed in President Dynes' report.

V. Special Orders

There were no special orders.

VI. Reports of Special Committees

ISSUE: Academic Council Chair Blumenthal introduced Professor Shawn Kantor, Chair of the UC Merced Task Force, and described the work that the task force has doing. The “UC Merced Task Force” is a special committee of the Academic Assembly that has been responsible for Senate operations at UC Merced (the Academic Assembly delegated the authority to the task force for curricular planning, approval of courses and degrees, etc.). The Merced Task Force has delegated most Senate duties to various Merced faculty members already, so UCM has already been acting much like a division for quite some time now.

The task force and the faculty of UC Merced (UCM) have submitted a formal request to establish a division of the Academic Senate. In addition, they have also provided a set of bylaws (see below). The following are issues that relate to this request:

- **Bylaws:** Assembly Secretary/Parliamentarian Peter Berck has drafted bylaws, which are under current consideration by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J).
- **Resources:** The formal request asks the Assembly to approve the establishment of a Merced division pending the certification of an agreement to provide sufficient funding for the UCM division to operate effectively and professionally, consistent with the April 11, 2005 letter to Chancellor Tomlinson-Keasey. To that end, the UCM Task Force has received a letter from Merced Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) David Ashley providing for a MSP level 1 Senate Director, a half-time assistant, as well as \$125,000 for research/grants and funds for improving the diversity of the faculty. It is anticipated that an agreement will be reached soon with the UCM administration regarding resources for the Merced division.
- **Membership:** UC Merced currently has 51 Senate members. The UCM EVC estimates 13 additional hires before July 1st, and UCM should have 64 Senate members by September 2005.
- **CAP Functions:** The only significant divisional task that the Merced Task Force has not been doing are the functions associated with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The UCM CAP actually operates under the auspices of the Academic Council (composed of 50% Merced faculty members and 50% of faculty from other campuses). The bylaws would allow the UCM division to continue to have external members on its CAP committee until such time that there is a sufficient number of Merced faculty to staff this committee.

DISCUSSION: A motion for a friendly amendment was made to delete the sentence that follows “our resolution”. The amendment was rejected by Professor Joseph Kiskis (UCD), and the amendment was withdrawn. There was considerable discussion devoted to this item, especially in regards to the amount of resources needed to adequately fund a Merced Senate office. Specifically, members debated the definition of “sufficient funding”. Some members felt that this language was vague, and lacking in specificity. Chair Blumenthal clarified that it is purposely vague because the Academic Council agreed to support the letter sent to Chancellor Tomlinson-Keasey, which sets forth more specifically what is required in terms of the amount of resources required to run the UCM division. It also calls for a written agreement on a ramp-up to the level of funding mandated in the previously approved “Framework for Establishing a Senate Operation”. He noted that the key operational aspect of this arrangement is that the Academic Council must “approve” a sufficient funding plan. An amendment was offered and seconded

that would eliminate the word “sufficient” from the proposal. After further discussion, members voted against this amendment.

ACTION: Professor Kiskis made a motion to approve the establishment of a UCM division (pending the certification of sufficient funding by the Academic Council). Members unanimously voted in favor of establishing the UC Merced division.

VII. Reports of Standing Committees

A. Academic Council—*George Blumenthal*

1. Presentation to the Assembly of the 05-06 Vice Chair/06-07 Chair of the Academic Senate

ISSUE: Academic Council Chair Blumenthal presented Professor John Oakley as the 05-06 Vice Chair/06-07 Chair of the Academic Senate.

2. Nomination and Election of the Vice Chair of the University Committee on Committees (UCOC) for 2005-06

ISSUE: Professor Ruth Greenblat (UCSF) was nominated as the UCOC Vice Chair for 2005-06.

ACTION: Members voted unanimously in favor of the election of Professor Ruth Greenblat as the 2005-06 UCOC Vice Chair.

3. Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128

ISSUE: Academic Chair Blumenthal briefed the assembly on the background of this bylaw amendment. He noted that under current bylaws, the UCOC appoints all members of standing committees of the Assembly, as well as the Chairs and Vice Chairs of such committees (usually based upon recommendations/nominations from divisional Committee on Committees). However, Bylaw 128 currently does not address the issue of the nominating members for special subcommittees or task forces of the Assembly or systemwide standing committees (which must always report back to the main committee). While in many cases such subcommittees or task forces are composed entirely of members from their parent committees, there are occasions when membership also includes members who are not members of the parent committee (or any other Assembly committee), and may also include non-Academic Senate members. He noted that at present neither the UCOC or the Academic Council has any oversight of the membership of subcommittees or task forces. Therefore, this amendment would authorize the UCOC to approve all members to Assembly subcommittees and task forces who are not already members of any standing committee of the Assembly.

DISCUSSION: Members shortly discussed dismissing or “dis-appointing” subcommittee members as well. It was noted that Senate Bylaw 35.D.5 already provides for this. It states that “a systemwide Senate agency may by a two-thirds vote, revoke any appointment it has previously made. Prior to revoking an appointment, the agency shall give notice to the appointee, including reasons for the proposed revocation, and provide the appointee with an opportunity to respond.” Members also raised the issue of length of service on subcommittees for both external members and members of systemwide standing committees. Chair Blumenthal clarified that

Bylaw 128 also places a term limit of six years for standing systemwide committees, however he did not specifically know if this limit would apply to subcommittees as well. An amendment was proposed that would limit the term of service for members of special subcommittees to a time period equal or less than that of the members of the standing systemwide parent committee. However this motion failed on the lack of a second.

ACTION: Members voted to pass the motion to amend Senate Bylaw 128.

4. Proposed Senate Regulation 477

ISSUE: Academic Chair Blumenthal and Professor Joseph Kiskis (UCD) provided the Assembly with the background and justification for the proposed Senate Regulation 477. Chair Blumenthal noted that junior transfer is a major component of UC's educational mission. The Master Plan specifies that UC commit to having 2/3 of its undergraduate population as upper-division students. This regulation also falls within the larger context of the California state legislation for a "common curriculum" in order to facilitate transfers between the CSU system and the California community colleges. While a "common curriculum" is not feasible for UC, it is desirable for UC to encourage transfer students, which this Senate regulation addresses. The language for the proposed regulation states that if four or more UC campuses agree to accept a course (or set of courses) from a given California Community College as transferable for lower-division preparation for a specific major, it will be deemed transferable for the same major at all UC campuses one year after notification of the campuses. The same rules would apply to a set of courses accepted at four or more UC campuses. Additionally, all campuses will be given an annual opportunity to opt out of any previous obligation resulting from this Regulation. This amendment was reviewed by Academic Council last year, and suggestions/revisions have been incorporated in its final draft of the amendment.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the language relating to "departments" and "campuses", noting that the justification refers to both departments and campuses, while the original regulation only notes campuses. Chair Blumenthal clarified that in the justification "campuses" and "departments" are synonymous, for if a campus approves a set of courses, then it would have been approved by the appropriate department(s) as well. An amendment to the language was proposed that would change the wording to "campuses and all relevant departments" where references to "campuses" or "departments" appear. However, Assembly Secretary/Parliamentarian, Professor Peter Berck (UCB), explained that the Assembly delegates to the divisions the authorization to reject, accept, and supervise courses of instruction; it is their business how they do this. Therefore, to prescribe the process by which campuses or divisions do this would be a violation of the bylaws of the Assembly. Members also felt that in some instances, the reference to "campuses" should be changed to "divisions". On this point, an amendment to the language was proposed that would replace the word "campuses" to "Senate divisions" [at the end of the eighth line]: "Adequate notice for all Senate divisions". This amendment was later changed to replace all instances of "campuses" to "divisions" throughout the entire wording of the main amendment to this regulation.

ACTION: (1) Members voted to defeat the amendment to the wording (to change all references of "campuses" to "divisions" throughout the main amendment). (2) Members

voted to approve the main amendment to Senate Regulation 477, which will be effective immediately.

5. Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 478

ISSUE: BOARS Chair Michael Brown (UCSB) provided background on this amendment. Also known as the Science General Education Transfer Curriculum (SciGETC), this would amend the already-existing Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC). IGETC is a series of courses that prospective UC transfer students at California community colleges may complete in order to satisfy lower-division general education (GE) requirements at both UC and CSU. SciGETC would allow students majoring in the physical or biological sciences to defer one arts and humanities course and one social/behavioral science course until after they have matriculated at the UC of their choice. Currently, IGETC only allows this in the case of hardship. In this way, SciGETC is designed to make it easier for these students to take more science related courses in order to be better prepared for their science majors. The Academic Council endorsed the SciGETC amendment contingent on the UCOP provision of the necessary resources to provide facilitation and certification of the completion of SciGETC requirements. If approved, SciGETC would be implemented in fall 2006.

DISCUSSION: In response to a member's question, Chair Blumenthal clarified that SciGETC may not generally apply to engineering students, as most schools of engineering do not recommend that their students take IGETC courses because they require different GE requirements than do the colleges of letters and sciences. He also estimated that at most about 1,000 students per year would take advantage of SciGETC systemwide. Members discussed the complexity of SciGETC, with some members arguing that SciGETC is overly complex. Chair Blumenthal responded that since SciGETC would be incorporated into the already existing IGETC (rather than creating a second and separate regulation), and he reassured members that the language of the amended regulation would be redrafted in a manner that would be easy for potential transfer students to understand. It would also be up to the community colleges to certify that a student has "substantially completed" a given requirement for a science major.

ACTION: Members voted unanimously to approve this amendment. SciGETC will be effective for students transferring to UC in the fall of 2006.

6. Academic Council Resolution on Restriction on Research Funding Sources

ISSUE: As a prelude to his remarks, Chair Blumenthal reminded the Assembly that this resolution is actually the Academic Senate's resolution (as opposed to the Academic Council's Resolution). He provided some background to this resolution. In 2004 UCORP issued a report (subsequently endorsed by the Academic Council) on "Strings on Research Funding", which concluded that external strings on research grants are not acceptable—for example, restrictions on publication. At its July 2004 meeting, the Academic Council endorsed the "Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources." After its endorsement however, several members of the Academic Senate argued that the importance of this issue was too great; therefore it should not be adopted without full and open discussion within the systemwide committees of the Academic Senate and the divisions. The Academic Council subsequently voted to send out this resolution for further comment by the above mentioned bodies. After receiving comments from

a number of systemwide committees and divisions, the Academic Council amended the resolution.

At issue is whether the banning of certain sources of funds by a majority vote of the faculty within a unit (i.e. department, college, school, or even a campus) is appropriate based solely on the source of those research funds. 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 revised 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.

DISCUSSION: Considerable discussion was devoted to the title and whether “restrictions” should be in the title. One member suggested that “on restriction” be removed, and the title be changed simply to the “Academic Senate Resolution on Research Funding Sources”. A motion to amend the title in this way was made and seconded. Further discussion focused on “academic freedom” however. A “friendly” amendment was proposed and seconded (to the original amendment) to change the title to the “Academic Senate Resolution on Academic Freedom and Research Funding”. It was noted that Senate members who were opposed to this resolution do not see it as an academic freedom issue, which for several members represented an argument against inserting “academic freedom” into the title of the resolution. Assembly members voted on this new title, but the proposed amendment was defeated by a vote of 22 opposed and 20 in favor with two abstentions. Another amendment was proposed to change the title back to the “Academic Senate Resolution on Research Funding Sources”, which passed.

The second part of the discussion centered on the actual resolution itself, and specifically, the role of the Regents. While members noted that this is a document which talks about academic freedom, the key issue is whether faculty members (or a group of faculty members) have the right to restrict the sources of research funds for their colleagues. Members generally acknowledged that the UC Regents are a body that has the authority to make rulings on sources of research funds however. While not speaking for any future action of any future Academic Council, Chair Blumenthal anticipated that in the case of a possible future Regental action (such as a proposed ban on one source of research funding), the Academic Council/Academic Senate would send a clear response. Further discussion focused on any restrictions that may be placed on faculty (Regental or otherwise). Some faculty argued against including language that identifies the possible role of the Regents in these types of issues. However, one member reminded the Assembly that the Regents are the constitutional governing body over UC, and this document should not claim that they (the Regents) have no authority to designate the parameters of function for UC. Towards the end of the discussion, a motion was made and seconded to remand the resolution back to Academic Council to rewrite the language of the resolution. However, that motion failed.

ACTION: The “Academic Senate Resolution on Research Funding Sources” passed.

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

ISSUE: Chair Blumenthal briefed the Assembly on the national labs:

- Lawrence Berkeley National Lab (LBNL): The LBNL contract has been awarded to UC. However, UC has agreed to change some of the ways in which LBNL is governed. It will now be governed by a group separate from the President's Council.
- Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL): UC's contract has been extended for two years until after the Los Alamos contract has been awarded.
- Los Alamos National Lab (LANL): A second draft request for proposal (RFP) has been issued, which substantially increases the amount of money that can be awarded to a private corporation governing the lab. Also included in the second RFP is the stipulation that whoever wins the competition, that/those organization(s) will have to establish a new retirement/pension system. A final RFP draft is expected sometime in May. Chair Blumenthal estimated that preparing the bid will roughly cost UC somewhere between one million to two million dollars, which will come out of the reserve funding set aside by the Regents. UC will have 90 days to submit a bid once the final RFP bid is issued. LANL Director Pete Nanos also resigned.

8. Academic Council Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL—Cliff Brunk)

ISSUE: Academic Council Vice Chair Brunk briefed the Assembly on this special committee: There will be a June meeting with the Directors of LLNL and LBL, as well as an upcoming meeting with President Dynes. UC is appealing the LANL fine imposed on it. He also made special note of the Institute for Global Conflict and Cooperation (IGCC) and the Institute for Geophysics and Planetary Physics (IGPP). He mentioned that they are sponsored largely by lab management fees (which suffered a cut this year), and ACSCONL wishes to enter into a discussion with the lab management to produce an advisory committee that would assist in allocating those funds to such MRU's. Regarding the funding of IGCC specifically, lab management has made a decision on its funding for the interim period ('04-05 year). While ACSCONL is pursuing the creation of an advisory board (see above) for the future, at the present time this funding decision must be referred to President Dynes. That said however, a letter of concern has been sent to Chair Blumenthal by the Director of IGCC, and Chair Blumenthal is asking for input from the Senate committees, as well as raising the issue to President Dynes.

9. Apportionment of Representatives to the Assembly, 2005-2006

ISSUE: At its April 27, 2005 meeting, the Academic Council approved the apportionment of 40 Divisional Representatives for 2005-06.

10. Assembly Meeting Schedule, 2005-2006

ISSUE: The following Assembly meetings have been scheduled for the 2005-2006 year:

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

B. Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) – *Quentin Williams*
Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 600.B

ISSUE: Before providing background on the amendment, CCGA Chair Quentin Williams (UCSC) noted a minor revision to replace the word “the” with “a” in the first sentence of the proposed wording: “No voting member of the Senate shall be recommended for a post-baccalaureate degree by a department or program in which he or she has an appointment unless,…” He explained that this revision is not trivial because UC faculty members are often associated with more than one department or program.

Chair Williams stated that the current Senate Regulation 600.B prohibits faculty colleagues from bestowing graduate degrees upon each other at their own campuses or divisions. This amendment is partially in response to the growth in new graduate degrees, such as the Masters of Advanced Studies (MAS) programs, which offers UC faculty the opportunity to advance their careers through engaging in additional training and education. There are already a number of MAS degrees on UC campuses (Davis, San Francisco, San Diego), with the promise of more to come. These types of degrees are of particular interest to faculty within the allied health fields who might be interested in adding to their expertise in clinical work. CCGA has determined that there has been some enrollment by UC faculty members in these programs; however the extent of this enrollment is unknown. As noted above, 600.B strictly prohibits this, which means that certain MAS programs have been in violation of 600.B. The original intent of this regulation was to prohibit faculty colleagues from bestowing post-baccalaureate degrees upon fellow faculty members at their own campuses. This regulation prevents a form of ‘nepotism’, in which a faculty member might be awarded an advanced degree by his/her own colleagues – a situation in which could be rife with conflicts of interest.

In December 2004, the CCGA proposed amending Senate Regulation 600.B on the grounds that it may prevent UC faculty from pursuing professional development that could be highly beneficial to their careers and to the University (CCGA cites not only clinical training in the allied health fields, but also certain professional degrees such as the MBA). CCGA wrote the proposed amendment with the intent that post-baccalaureate degrees could only be granted to Academic Senate members where there is no conflict of interest. The proposed amendment to 600.B was approved by the Academic Council at its April 2005 meeting and sent to UCR&J for their concurrence. In order to retain the original intent of the regulation, the Academic Council recommends restricting the granting of advanced degrees to faculty members who have no power or influence (fiduciary responsibility, voting action, committee assignments, etc.) over the department or program issuing the degree.

DISCUSSION: The San Diego division spoke against this amendment on the grounds that the provisions to avoid conflicts of interest are not very compelling. The San Diego division is particularly concerned about the future possibility of not only future “courtesy” admissions to graduate programs, but also “courtesy” degrees. They also think that the convenience factor associated with this amendment (the fact that faculty members would be able to pursue degrees at their own campuses) would outweigh the prospect of nepotistic implications. In response, Chair Williams reemphasized that UC has embarked on a serious of professional graduate programs in the form of the MAS degree that are designed to enhance the skills of professionals. He noted that a rejection of the amendment to 600.B would be a statement that UC does not want its own faculty to indulge in the educational development that it wants to extend to the rest of the community. Although he acknowledged the San Diego division’s fear of “courtesy” degrees as a

legitimate concern, he said that the key issue is whether the Assembly can trust its own faculty to avoid conflicts of interest. He also remarked that there would be relatively small numbers of faculty enrolling in these programs—it would mostly apply to faculty members in specific disciplines who want/need to enhance/broaden their professional skills.

Members discussed the relative merits of this amendment further. Some members argued that in many cases it is simply impossible for certain faculty members in certain disciplines to pursue advanced degrees on other campuses. In particular, the status quo burdens two specific groups—faculty members at relatively remote campuses (Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, etc.) and female faculty members. Members also pointed out that in certain fields, such as nursing and physical therapy, the institutions where one can pursue higher degrees are somewhat limited—in essence making the UC host institution the only option for some faculty members. Finally, members also noted that the risk for misconduct is relatively small (in terms of conflicts of interest or “courtesy” degrees).

ACTION: The amendment to Senate Regulation 600.B passed with a vote of 30 in favor to 18 opposed.

C. **Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) – Michael Brown**
ISSUE: Chair Brown briefed the Assembly on the activities of this committee. BOARS is currently studying admissions with particular attention to the AP honors bump, admissions by exception, eligibility in the local context (ELC), and the new SAT evaluation. BOARS has made recommendations that have been acted upon by the Academic Council in the form of approval:

- Admitting students from the full range of the eligibility pool. Students have to meet eligibility requirements in order to be UC eligible (a certain pattern of courses, certain GPA, testing requirements, etc.). Those requirements assure faculty that students within that pool are judged as capable to succeed at a UC institution. Students who meet these requirements technically qualify them for any campus within the UC system.
- Using personal statements in admissions decisions. There was Regental concern about using the personal statement as a tool to assess writing quality. BOARS ruled that writing is assessed by other measures in the application process. The personal statement is used as supplemental information to better understand the applicant, and is not designed as a writing assessment tool.

D. **University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) – John Oakley**
ISSUE: Chair Oakley briefed the Assembly on the following issues:

- UC Retirement System (UCRS): He noted the UC continues to negotiate/consult with the Governor on this issue.
- APM Revisions: The committee has recently completed its informal review of “family friendly” revisions, such as faculty sick leave and general leaves of absences. While UCFW applauds these proposals, the committee believes that there is more work to be done in this area—especially in regards to child care.
- Faculty Sick Leave: UCFW is currently conducting an informal review of this issue. The committee is setting up a work group to examine this issue further and redrafting of these revisions.

- FITSCO (Fidelity Investments Tax-Exempt Services Company): This is an acronym for the new software platform that will be managing the DC/403(B) retirement plans. Among the issues being addressed are privacy and security, as well as a policy change regarding 403(B) loans.
- Electronic Communication Policy: UCFW is currently examining an update to this policy. Of particular concern are privacy concerns for UC faculty, as well as systemwide standardization of this policy.
- Health Care Task Force: This task force is (1) currently responding to faculty requests (Bush Health Savings Plan); and (2) looking at PERS (especially at long-term care in terms of catastrophic coverage).

E. **University Committee on Committees (UCOC) – Albert Stralka**
Professor Stralka did not give an oral report.

VIII. Petitions of Students (none)

IX. Unfinished Business (none)

X. University and Faculty Welfare Report (none)

XI. New Business

No new business reported.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Attest: George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst