

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE
SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ



NOTICE OF MEETING REGULAR MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Wednesday, November 10, 2004
10:00 am - 1:00 pm

VIA TELECONFERENCE
FOR INFORMATION ON HOW TO PARTICIPATE
PLEASE CALL (510) 987-9458 or Your Divisional Senate Office

I.	ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS	1
II.	MINUTES	
	Minutes of the Meeting of May 12, 2004	2
	Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, May 12, 2004	11
	Minutes of the Special Meeting of June 30, 2004	12
	Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, June 30, 2004	15
III.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT	16
	Robert C. Dynes	
IV.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR	16
	George Blumenthal	
V.	SPECIAL ORDERS	
A.	Consent Calendar	16
	UCLA Division's Request for a Variance to Senate Regulation 764	
B.	Annual Reports (2003-04)	
	Academic Council	20
	Academic Freedom	25
	Academic Personnel	28
	Affirmative Action and Diversity	32
	Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools	35

Next regular meeting of the Assembly: March 9, 2005. To be held either by teleconference or face-to-face on the UC Berkeley-Clark Kerr Campus.

Committee on Committees	38
Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs	40
Educational Policy	43
Faculty Welfare	48
Information Technology and Telecommunication Policy	51
Library	56
Planning and Budget	59
Preparatory Education	62
Privilege and Tenure	65
Research Policy	67
VI. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES (none)	
VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES	
A. Academic Council	
• George Blumenthal, Chair	
1. The Assembly adoption of “Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure” as its rules of order to govern questions of order not covered by Senate legislation. (action)	71
2. Academic Council Special Committee on National Labs (ACSCONL) (oral report)	73
• George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair (oral report)	
• Cliff Brunk, ACSCONL Chair	
B. University Committee on Educational Policy (action)	
• Joseph Kiskis, Chair	
1. Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaws 170 and 180 and Senate Regulation 544	73
2. Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 630 B	78
C. Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) (oral report)	
• John Oakley, Chair,	80
An update on 04-05 UCFW activities	
D. Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) (oral report)	80
• Michael Brown, Chair	
An update on 04-05 BOARS activities	
VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT (none)	
IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS (none)	
X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (none)	
XI. NEW BUSINESS	

I. ROLL CALL

2004-05 Assembly Roll Call November 10, 2004

President of the University:

Robert C. Dynes

Academic Council Members:

George Blumenthal, Chair
Cliff Brunk, Vice Chair
Robert Knapp, Chair, UCB
Dan Simmons, Chair, UCD
Joseph DiMento, Chair, UCI
Kathy Komar, Chair, UCLA
Manuel Martins-Green, Chair, UCR
Donald Tuzin, Chair, UCSD
Leonard Zegans, Chair, UCSF
Walter Yuen, Chair, UCSB
Alison Galloway, Chair, UCSC
Michael Brown, Chair, BOARS
Quentin Williams, Chair, CCGA
Alan Barbour, Chair, UCAP
Joseph Kiskis, Chair, UCEP
John Oakley, Chair, UCFW
Max Neiman, Chair, UCORP
Michael Parrish, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (6)

Roger Amundson
Lowell Dittmer
Dorit Hochbaum
Kyriakos Komvopoulos
Herb Strauss
Barrie Thorne

Davis (6)

Ines Hernandez-Avila
Kyaw Tha Paw U

Irvine (4)

Hoda Anton-Culver
Ross Conner
James Earthman
Calvin McLaughlin

Los Angeles (9)

Philip Bonacich
Yoram Cohen
Harold Fetterman
Margaret Jacob
Vickie Mays
Jose Moya
Owen Smith
Jane Valentine
Jaime Villablanca

Riverside (2)

Emory Elliot
Mary Gauvain

San Diego (4)

Gerald Doppelt
Igor Grant
Barbara Sawrey
Nicholas Spitzer

San Francisco (4)

Dan Bikle
Barbara Gerbert
Lawrence Pitts
Peter Wright

Santa Barbara (3)

Ann Jensen Adams
Kum Kum Bhavnani
Nelson Lichtenstein

Santa Cruz (2)

Faye Crosby
Michael Issacson

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Peter Berck

II. MINUTES (Action)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE REGULAR MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE *DRAFT Minutes of May 12, 2004*

I. Roll Call of Members

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday May 12, 2004, at Covell Commons in Sunset Village at UC Los Angeles. Academic Senate Chair Lawrence Pitts presided. Chair Pitts called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m., and Academic Senate Director Maria Bertero-Barceló called the roll of members of the Assembly. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. Minutes

Action: The minutes of the meeting of March 10, 2004 were approved as written.

III. Announcements by the President, Robert C. Dynes

Provost M.R.C. Greenwood and Senior Vice President Bruce Darling joined President Dynes at the table. President Dynes' discussion topics and comments were previously distributed by email, which had allowed for review prior to the meeting.

The Budget and Interactions in Sacramento. UC is currently in a very difficult position—at the crossroads of mounting budget cuts and the pressures of increasing enrollment. Efforts to inform the Governor and state legislators about UC's role in the state and importance to California's overall economic health continue to be fundamental to the progress of budget negotiations. The recent higher education "compact" represents a personal commitment from the Governor to UC. The agreement would raise fees and cut budgets at California universities in the short term, in exchange for the promise of funding increases in the five subsequent years. The compact eliminates what would have been an additional 3% cut this year and restores the university to normal fiscal levels by 2010-2011—including funding to keep faculty and staff salaries competitive. There is also a new commitment to maintain "effective" Academic Preparation (Outreach) programs and a provision to allow UC to retain fee increases and to return 1/3 of those increases in financial aid, which is an improvement over the state's current mandate of 20% return to aid of the most recent fee increases. The compact also maintains funding for UC Merced. At each period of budget crisis throughout California's history, such compacts have helped both the state and the University. There is much reason for optimism now, because Sacramento's view has shifted. State leaders understand they can't afford not to invest in the University of California.

Advocacy Campaign. President Dynes and UCOP have launched an advocacy campaign on behalf of UC. All members of the university community—faculty, students, alumni and friends—are being asked to spread the message about UC's unique and critical role in the economic health of California. A campaign website has been set up at <http://www.UCforCalifornia.org>. As part of the effort, alumni have embarked on a massive email and letter writing campaign to state legislators. The President recalled that one state legislator was particularly impressed by the fact that UC generates, on average,

three inventions per day, and was later heard to repeat that fact to colleagues. Advocacy efforts must be long term and sustained to be effective in today's uncertain political and budget climate.

National Labs. The Academic Senate is conducting a survey about whether or not UC should enter competitive bids to renew management of the Department of Energy laboratories. It is important that the faculty inform themselves about the issues and weigh in.

Searches. The search continues for a Lawrence-Berkeley Laboratory Director, UCB Chancellor, and UCSC Chancellor.

Questions, Answers and Comments

Q: Can you provide clarity about professional school fee increases in the compact?

A: I believe that the professional schools will be independent to set fees, and that their fee revenues will be returned to the schools.

Q: Will there be a VERIP?

A: No. But individual campuses are free to negotiate individual post-retirement teaching circumstances.

Q: What is UC's position on the CSU Mission Statement, which suggests a role for research in applied areas?

A: There is a research role for CSU, and the Master Plan provides for state support of research at CSU, but we believe there is also a clear agreement that CSU will not offer doctoral degrees.

Q: What are the non-state funding sources for Outreach being discussed in newspaper reports?

A. The non-state sources come from private funding as well as funds from out of state tuition. There is still a misperception that Outreach is a student recruitment tool rather than college preparatory education. However, we are continuing efforts to educate legislators about the purpose and importance of Outreach programs like MESA, and we believe this is having an impact on thinking. UC has committed \$12 million to Outreach for 04-05 in the hopes that state funding will be restored. In addition, the Chancellors are committed to maintaining local outreach programs despite central funding issues.

C: The term "Outreach" carries too much baggage, and BOARS discourages its use. A better phrase is "Academic Enrichment" or "Academic Preparation," because these programs are truly academic in nature.

C: The increase in undergraduate fees—10% for each of the next 3 years—and graduate student fees—20 percent rather than 40 percent this year—is still below comparison institutions.

C: This budget is about as good as we can get at this time, although the devil is in the details. The Faculty can support the accountability measures in the Compact.

C: President Dynes remarked that UC prepares about 5% of K-12 teachers in California, and 25% of math and science teachers. Math and science education is an area where UC can make a direct impact on the future of the state. Provost Greenwood added that too many students intending to major in math and science leave without a degree in those

areas. The University can step up and assume a leadership role in efforts to recapture some of these students, to keep them in the field and interest them in science and math teaching. It is vital for the economic recovery and long-term health of the state.

C: Clarification is needed about the new time and effort reporting system related to projects using federal funds.

Q: Which of California's educational segments is hurt most in the compact; where does the money for UC come from; and where will it be distributed?

A: None of the three groups gets hurt more. There is no zero sum rule. The monies will go back to the campuses to let them determine priorities.

Q: What kind of assurances do we have that the future will actually be promising after the bond money is used up and structural deficits remain?

A: I don't have an obvious answer to that. One answer may have to be tax increases.

IV. Chair's Announcements

Chair Pitts introduced incoming UC Provost M.R.C. Greenwood, who was attending her first Academic Assembly meeting. He introduced some of the main topics on the agenda, including the forthcoming CPEC study and BOARS' preliminary report; senate balloting on UC's management of DOE laboratories; and a Senate resolution related to the state and university budget. A Scholarly Communications Task Force will meet over the summer to study ways to address the rising costs of scholarly journals and new models for UC faculty to maintain access as editors, reviewers, and authors. A flow sheet has been developed to allow Council members to more easily track their actions as well as their interactions with the administration on various topics.

V. Consent Calendar

Action: Assembly approved the Consent Calendar items (as listed under "Special Orders," Item V of the published agenda):

- A. Santa Cruz, D.M.A. in Music Composition – Approval of New Degree
- B. Davis, M.A.S. in Maternal and Child Nutrition – Approval of New Degree

VI. Reports of Special Committees – Report of the Senate's Task Force on UC Merced

Task Force Chair Peter Berck updated the Assembly on the progress of the UC Merced campus enterprise. The UC Merced Task Force has acted as UCM's Senate as well as the department in faculty hires since its inception in 1998, but the Task Force is in the process of shifting from consisting of faculty from the other campuses to primarily UCM faculty as more of the latter are hired. Faculty recruitment and hiring is on schedule. Approximately 30 faculty will have been hired by July 1, and 60 will be on board by opening day in 2005. As more faculty are hired—there are approximately 23 currently on board—the Task Force will continue to transfer more Senate authority to UCM's committee structure. On a day-to-day basis, UCM is operating similarly to other divisions—through its committee structure. Divisional Council meets every other week, and several other committees—including Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council and a Committee on Planning and Resource Allocation—meet regularly. It is expected that

UCM will officially be granted divisional status when the 60th FTE is hired in fall 2005. Moreover, UCM faculty have been attending meetings of system-wide committees as guests, which has provided the UCM faculty with valuable introductions to shared governance and senate issues. Construction of the science building at Merced is behind schedule, and may not be useable for teaching until after opening term of fall 2005.

The Task Force is seeking the Assembly's endorsement of its plan for Merced's transition to divisional status. Academic Council approved a resolution related to this in March. The plan is for non-UCM Task Force members who are directly involved in the Merced committees to remain active over the next year. Other non-UCM members would retire and be replaced with UCM faculty, appointed by Council. Second, the Task Force would be authorized to delegate authority to its committees in a structure similar to that of a regular division.

One member asked if UC or the Task Force had followed a blueprint in developing Merced. The Task Force has studied the circumstances and lessons related to the development of other UC divisions. Recent senate divisions—UCSC, UCSD, and UCI—started with about 60 members, which has been considered a precedent. Consideration is currently being given to drafting a specific framework that would address potential future campus start-ups in the Senate bylaws.

Action: The following resolution was placed before members of the Assembly:

Resolved: "The UCM Task Force should increasingly be composed of members assigned to UCM. The Task Force is authorized to delegate authority to its committees (who are not all Task Force members) in manners similar to the delegations of existing Divisions to their committees."

Assembly gave unanimous consent to the resolution.

VI. Reports of Standing Committees

A. Academic Council, Lawrence Pitts, Chair

1. Nomination and Election of the UCOC Vice Chair for 2004-2005

Professor Gershon Shafir has been nominated by UCOC to serve as that committee's Vice Chair for 2004-05.

Action: The Assembly unanimously elected Professor Shafir as 2004-2005 UCOC Vice Chair.

2. Ratification of the 2004 Oliver Johnson Awardees

The biennial Oliver Johnson Award honors outstanding service to the Academic Senate, and is chosen by Academic Council on the advice of Divisional Committees on Committees and UCOC. This year, Academic Council selected two awardees—Aimee Dorr, Dean of Education at UCLA, and UCB Professor Calvin Moore. The Assembly was asked to ratify the choices.

One Assembly member praised Calvin Moore's tireless efforts on behalf of the Senate, noting in particular his work on admissions at UCB and his contributions to BOARS's

work on eligibility. Another member mentioned Aimee Dorr's previous roles as Council Chair, UCLA Division Chair, and CCGA Chair, and spoke of her contributions to the Compendium and the National Labs, and her work with the CSUs in teacher development.

Action: The Assembly unanimously ratified Aimee Dorr and Calvin Moore as the 2004-2005 recipients of the Oliver Johnson Award.

3. Academic Council's Resolution on the Budget

Academic Council approved this resolution in April, and has moved it to the Assembly for approval. The "Whereas" sections came out of extensive committee and Council deliberations about which fundamental University principles are being jeopardized by the budget crisis and why those areas need protection. Faculty are asked in the resolution to participate directly in a sustained advocacy campaign on behalf of the university by educating colleagues, friends, community leaders and lawmakers about UC's impact in California, particularly on the state's economy and health care. (Focus groups have determined that Californians view some of UC's primary importance to be in the areas of business and health care.)

One member suggested that the effort should maintain a central organizational oversight. Chair Pitts remarked that it would be most effective for Assembly members to focus individual action at the local level, but that best practices related to this could be a future Council discussion item. He encouraged those present to consider a process by which they could identify alumni, friends, contributors, etc., who have influence or who would be willing to lend their support to help educate Californians about UC's unique and critical role in the state. For instance, it might be useful as a motivator to pull together anecdotes about specific UC programs benefiting the community that have disappeared or are in jeopardy due to funding.

One Assembly member remarked that the campaign against Proposition 54 was successful in part because of a successful public education effort about the dangers of restricting health care research. It would be useful to revisit the public and private community partnerships developed in that campaign to strengthen the current effort. Another member suggested an additional key audience would be parents of current undergraduates.

Action: The Assembly voted unanimously in support of the Resolution.

4. Ad Hoc Committee on Bylaw Revisions, George Blumenthal, Chair

The current review of the system-wide Senate bylaws continues an effort begun last year, when the Assembly passed changes pertaining to committee membership and charges. System-wide committees and divisions have reviewed the additional changes being proposed this year. UCR&J has also reviewed the proposed amendments and found them to be consonant with the code of the Academic Senate.

New amendments and bylaws include:

- Clarification of the role of Secretary in the divisions.
- Clarification of procedures related to student petitioning of the Assembly
- Extending to Senate bodies the right to hold meetings and vote electronically, either at the divisional or system-wide level. (This bylaw also allows campuses to explicitly exclude the possibility of electronic meetings or votes).

- Establishment of a standard term of reference for time periods. At the system-wide level, “calendar days” would be the sole term of reference for the unit measuring time.
- Provisions allowing divisions greater autonomy to conduct business differently.
- Addition of two appendices: a glossary of terms, and a legislative record.
- Addition of a clause giving Council the right to act in lieu of the Assembly if an issue has appeared on an Assembly agenda and was not acted upon for lack of a quorum.
- Addition of a provision allowing system-wide Senate agencies that appoint committee members to remove a committee member by a 2/3 vote. (The member in question must be given the chance to respond).

Action: A motion was introduced to approve the proposed bylaw changes listed on pages 41-70 of the May 12 Call, which would take effect immediately, with the following two exceptions: First, Bylaw 120.D.6, allowing the Assembly to choose its own rules of order, would take effect immediately following the next regular meeting of the Academic Assembly (October 13, 2004); and second, the amendment to Bylaw 50.A and the elimination of Bylaw 235 would become effective only when the UCB division chair certifies that the UCB Division has established a Berkeley Faculty for the School of Public Health.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. Report from the President’s Council on the National Laboratories

The President’s Council is a body of advisors on the Department of Energy Laboratories. Among its ranks are a number of faculty including the Chair and Vice Chair of the Senate and the Chair of UCORP. It is the body to which the five lab review panels—covering the areas of science and technology, national security, environmental health and safety, lab security, and projects—report. The panels bring an outside view to the lab directors. The LBNL bid will be submitted shortly, with the award coming in January. The LANL contract will be awarded in July 2005. The draft RFP will be out for public comment in the summer or early Fall, with a final draft available after the November election.

6. Academic Special Committee on the National Labs (ASCONL)

ASCONL is conducting a poll of UC faculty on the issue of whether or not UC should compete to retain management of the Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos National Labs. Voting will close Friday, May 14. The results of the vote will be analyzed and encapsulated in a form that can be presented to the Regents. A second follow-up poll is possible next fall, depending on changing circumstances. A student poll is also being conducted by Student Services to gauge undergraduate opinion, but does not capture graduate student opinion due to technical reasons. Finally, UC lecturers are conducting a poll, and have consulted with ASCONL about their ballot.

B. Report from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)

Chair Pitts summarized the terms and conditions for UC eligibility, admissions, selection and enrollment. Most UC eligible students fall under *The Eligibility Index*—a statewide standard set by BOARS that combines quantitative factors—a student’s GPA and average test scores, bounded by respective minimums, which have been shown to correlate with

UC success. A student may also be eligible through very high examination scores alone. Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) accepts the top 4% of students from all accredited public high schools. The Dual Admissions Program was a 2002 program that offered admission to the 4-12.5% block above the ELC group after those students completed lower division work at a community college, but the DAP is ending due to very low response. However, the Guaranteed Transfer Option, which is partly modeled on the DAP, and works similarly to UC's referral pool, has been instated in response to budget cuts limiting the enrollment of eligible freshmen. Approximately 8,000 students were offered this option this year. It is hoped that GTO will be used only this next academic year. Admission by Exception (perhaps should be re-named "Admission by Exceptional Performance") uses non-traditional criteria to offer pathways to underrepresented groups and/or athletes and artists. Finally, Admission by Transfer admits Community College students who complete certain coursework and achieve a minimum GPA.

Barbara Sawrey described *BOARS' Eligibility Criteria and Eligibility Principles*. BOARS has been working on revisions to UC's eligibility criteria in preparation for a report from CPEC, the first in seven years, which will be released at the end of May. The report is expected to show that UC is drawing more than the top 12.5% of California high school graduates mandated by the Master Plan. Since the exact level is unknown and may be as high as 16%, BOARS has drafted several contingencies, and will be ready to adjust its recommendations based on the specific outcome of the study. BOARS will bring its ultimate recommendation to Council and to a special June meeting of the Academic Assembly for endorsement.

BOARS' Eligibility Principles. UC is unique among institutions both in having separate concepts of eligibility and selection, and in making transparent the precise eligibility factors that guarantee admittance to one of UC's campuses. This works both as a filter and as a motivator for student success. BOARS has developed a set of principles to guide its detailed recommendations about UC eligibility, which it hopes will continue to be foundational in future Senate deliberations. Council approved these principles in March. In summary, BOARS believes primary importance should be given to a student's Subject a-g GPA (greater importance than standardized tests); eligibility criteria should remain stable and be easily understandable to the public, so students know whether they are eligible to apply; high achieving students from every high school in the state should have access to UC, including those who attend schools with fewer or lesser resources; eligibility paths should remain open to students from non-traditional educational backgrounds—e.g. home schools, alternative schools, and charter schools; new and more efficient ways of testing students should be explored; and finally, eligibility standards should be monitored and adjusted on a regular basis to ensure ongoing compliance with UC admissions goals.

Q: Where do underrepresented groups fall into the curve?

A: Most underrepresented groups—including certain ethnicities, low income, urban or rural students, first generation, etc., are admitted under the index. Adjusting the Eligibility Index at the margins of eligibility is one of the main ways UC can alter the number of students admitted. Along with its final recommendation, BOARS will present

data showing how changes to various aspects of the index and returning to 12.5% will affect specific groups.

Q: ELC students can get away with bad SAT scores because they are eligible just by taking the test. Egalitarian principles should not drive down standards.

A: These students are getting high scores on the SATs and performing well overall. In any case, the point is to urge them to complete their eligibility requirements. Because the vast majority of ELC students are eligible according to statewide standards anyway, BOARS is considering raising the ELC cut-off above 4%. I would be happy to receive comments about this.

Q: Does UC have a vision or a set of principles in view of changing student demographics?

A: The vision is that the make-up of UC will match the demographics of graduating High School classes, but we are a long way from that.

Q: Why is the SAT retained since standardized tests are poor predictors, culturally biased and expensive?

A: There would be more grade inflation if there were no second, verifying look at the achievements of students in high schools. There are many unused fee waivers for the SAT every year. Finally, the tests are changing for the better to include writing, due in part to pressure from UC.

C: Parents and students need better tools with which to accurately calculate GPAs.

C: In June BOARS should present a rationale for special consideration of student athletes.

Action: The Assembly unanimously approved BOARS' proposed eligibility principles.

BOARS will submit its full recommendation on eligibility standards to Council in June. For Assembly's recommendation to be forwarded to the Regents in time for their July meeting, a special Assembly meeting will need to be held June 30, and be centered primarily on this one discussion/action item. Chair Pitts polled Assembly members about whether the telephone format of the March meeting had worked well enough to be used again on June 30.

Action: The Assembly agreed that the teleconference format would be acceptable for the Special Meeting on June 30.

VIII. Petitions of Students (none)

IX. University and Faculty Welfare Update, Ross Starr, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare

Phased retirement plan. The Council of Vice Chancellors and UCFW have made significant progress on a retirement recall plan/phased retirement plan agreement.

Educational Fee Waiver. UCFW and Academic Council have recommended to President Dynes the phased introduction of educational fee waivers for dependents of UC faculty, which is a benefit available to faculty at many of UC's competing institutions. The

President responded positively to the idea, but has indicated that current budget conditions make the fee waiver impossible at the present time.

The UCFW Task Force on Investment and Retirement concentrates on retirement plans. The Task Force has been working with UCOP to implement an enhanced tax shelter, commonly known as a 457B plan, for the current tax year, which will allow faculty to double their tax-deferred income contributions. The issue will come before the Regents this month. UCFW does not expect the resumption of contributions to the UC Retirement Plan in the near term, but expects greater demand on the system in the future and is monitoring changes closely.

The UCFW Health Care Task Force consults regularly with UCOP staff in formulating medical plans and premium structures for UC faculty. The salary-based tiered premium structure introduced this year went through this Task Force. UCFW will be reviewing the 2005 structure as it becomes available.

X. Unfinished Business (none)

XI. New Business (none)

Meeting adjourned, 3:00 p.m.
Attest: Lawrence Pitts
Academic Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by
Michael LaBriola
Senate Analyst

Distributions:

1. President Dynes' List of Discussion Topics for the Meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate, Wednesday, May 12, 2004
2. Summary of Terms and Conditions for UC Eligibility, Admissions, Selection and Enrollment.

Appendix A

2003-2004 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of May 12, 2004

<p>President of the University: Robert C. Dynes</p> <p>Academic Council Members: Lawrence Pitts, Chair George Blumenthal, Vice Chair Ronald Gronsky, Chair, UCB Bruce Madewell, Chair, UCD Abel Klein, Chair, UCI Cliff Brunk, Chair, UCLA Irwin Sherman, Chair, UCR Jan Talbot, Chair, UCSD Daniel Bikle (alt. for Leonard Zegans, Chair, UCSF) Walter Yuen, Chair, UCSB Alison Galloway, Chair, UCSC Barbara Sawrey, Chair, BOARS Kent Erickson, Chair, CCGA Ramon Gutierrez, Chair, UCAP Lisa Alvarez-Cohen, Chair, UCEP Ross Starr, Chair, UCFW Janis Ingham, Chair, UCORP Michael Parrish, Chair, UCPB</p> <p>Berkeley (6) Ronald Amundson (alt. for Richard Abrams) Michael Hanemann (absent) Dorit Hochbaum David Hollinger (absent) Donald Mastronarde (absent) Raymond Wolfinger</p> <p>Davis (5) William Casey Peter Hays (absent) Gyongy Laky (absent) Brian Morrissey (alt. for John Rutledge) Philip Yager</p> <p>Irvine (4) Linda Georgianna Ross Conner Calvin McLaughlin Thomas Poulos (absent)</p>	<p>Los Angeles (9) Kathryn Atchison Charles Berst Yoram Cohen (absent) Harold Fetterman Vickie Mays Jose Moya Owen Smith Jane Valentine Jaime Villablanca</p> <p>Riverside (2) Mary Gauvain Linda Tomko</p> <p>San Diego (4) Stuart Brody (absent) Leroy Dorman (alt. for Gerald Doppelt) Barney Rickett (absent) Nicholas Spitzer (absent)</p> <p>San Francisco (3) Philip Darney Francisco Ramos-Gomez Peter Wright</p> <p>Santa Barbara (3) Ann Jensen Adams Susan Koshy Nelson Lichtenstein (absent)</p> <p>Santa Cruz (2) Faye Crosby Theodore Holman</p> <p>Secretary/Parliamentarian Peter Berck</p>
--	--

I. Roll Call of Members

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met in a special session on Wednesday June 30, 2004 by teleconference. Academic Senate Chair Lawrence Pitts presided. Chair Pitts called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m., and Academic Senate Director Maria Bertero-Barceló called the roll of members of the Assembly. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. Announcements by the President, Robert C. Dynes

Provost M.R.C. Greenwood and Senior Vice President Bruce Darling also joined President Dynes on the call. President Dynes thanked the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and BOARS Chair Barbara Sawrey for their leadership and thoughtful work in developing recommended adjustments to UC freshman eligibility requirements being put before the Assembly. The President expressed his support for the proposal. He noted in particular its emphasis on academic achievement and how successfully it avoids negative impacts on any one group. He added that it will continue to be important for UC to emphasize and adhere to the California Master Plan for Education.

III. Chair's Announcements, Lawrence Pitts

Chair Pitts reviewed the order of business and procedures for discussion. A recent report from the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) indicated that UC is accepting as eligible 14.4% of California public high school graduates. In an effort to return to the 12.5% eligibility pool outlined in the Master Plan, BOARS has proposed several adjustments to UC's eligibility criteria. The Assembly is asked to review and approve BOARS' proposal, which was endorsed by Academic Council the previous week. Each division will be given the opportunity to speak, comment or propose amendments. Any Senate member may speak, but only Assembly members can vote. Assembly's recommendation will be forwarded to the Regents in time for their July meeting

IV. Report from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)

Meeting UC's eligibility criteria guarantees in-state high school graduates entry to a UC campus. The last CPEC study was conducted in 1996 and indicated that UC was making eligible those students from the top 11.1% of the public high schools. This prompted BOARS to make changes allowing a higher percentage of graduates to become eligible, including the institution of Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC). Now with a 14.4% pool, BOARS has had to study ways to tighten eligibility. They have projected how many students and which groups would be affected by different combinations of changes to various eligibility criteria, including minimum GPA achieved in A-G courses, scores on standardized tests, the ELC program, and the eligibility index.

First, BOARS is proposing procedural adjustments to the way eligibility is calculated, which are projected to reduce the pool to 13%. A-G grades in a statewide context will be calculated in a way that is consistent with ELC. This includes elimination of the “best of pattern” practice, which has allowed campuses to consider GPA from only the best grades from the minimum required number of A-G courses. Additionally, ELC students will now be considered and counted as only conditionally eligible, contingent on their fulfillment of testing and other eligibility requirements. These procedural adjustments can be made immediately.

Second, BOARS is proposing that the minimum high school GPA for UC eligibility in both the statewide context and ELC be raised from 2.8 to 3.1. GPA is the best predictor of student success at UC and is also something the student can control. Raising the minimum GPA also raises academic excellence at the university without disproportionately impacting any one group, although tighter standards will hurt students in all groups to some extent. The new GPA requirements would affect students arriving at UC in fall 2007, giving sophomores an appropriate two years warning.

Discussion

Several Assembly members commended BOARS for its hard work in finding an effective, compassionate and scholarly solution to a difficult problem. However, a couple of members expressed concern about recommendation #3 ([See Final Assembly Report](#)) to raise the minimum GPA to 3.1. One member called it premature to impose such a standard without knowing first what impact the procedural adjustments might have. Lowering the number of eligible students even more may give the university bad publicity, and moreover, it is ethically wrong to institute standards that hurt minority students at a time when the minority population of California is growing.

Professor Sawrey talked about the fine line UC has to walk between Proposition 209, constraining the university’s ability to look specifically at race or ethnicity, and federal guidelines against discrimination. She said BOARS has been very sensitive to the impact of its recommendations on diversity and disadvantaged students. There is still the possibility of admission to the university “by exception,” and BOARS supports efforts by campuses to maximize to 6% their enrollment within this category. The admissions study group convened by the President last year also made a strong recommendation that campuses fully utilize admission by exception. Finally, the 3.1 GPA probably is a maximum level. The proposal allows for flexibility after data gauging the effects of the procedural adjustments and the new SAT/ACT tests becomes known. CPEC’s study was the best under the circumstances and UC should adhere to the data. There is a risk to the University of not abiding by the Master Plan. For instance, CSU may continue to seek the authority to grant the doctoral degree. Finally, the Senate has been charged with bringing a plan to the Regents for how to return to 12.5%, and must do so. This is the best possible solution.

Action: An amendment was introduced to strike recommendation #3 from the proposal. First, on the basis that the statistical uncertainties were too great and there needed to be more research and assurance that the change would produce the intended effect without overcorrecting; and second, that raising GPA would be an unwise move politically. Therefore, UC should wait until after implementation of procedural adjustments #1 and

#2 to move forward with recommendation #3. The motion was seconded, but was later withdrawn after the member received clarification to his satisfaction that #3 will not go into effect until 2007, giving ample notice to students, and that there is sufficient flexibility present in the proposal to allow for adjustments as solid data become available about the impact of #1, #2 and the new SAT and ACT tests.

Action: An amendment was introduced to strike the numeral “5.” from recommendation #5, so that the recommendation reads as part of the body of text, not as a separate recommendation for the Regents to approve. The recommendation is not in the Regents’ purview. The motion passed unanimously.

Action: A motion was introduced and seconded for Assembly to endorse the BOARS report. Assembly members voted to approve BOARS’ proposed eligibility criteria, with one abstention.

Chair Pitts thanked Assembly members for their hard work. He noted that the teleconference can be an effective medium for discussion of substantial topics, and in the future may allow the Assembly to meet more often.

Meeting adjourned, 10:50 a.m.
Attest: Lawrence Pitts
Academic Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by
Michael LaBriola
Senate Analyst

Appendix A

2003-2004 Assembly Attendance Record, Special Meeting of June 30, 2004

<p>President of the University: Robert C. Dynes</p> <p>Academic Council Members: Lawrence Pitts, Chair George Blumenthal, Vice Chair Ronald Gronsky, Chair, UCB Bruce Madewell, Chair, UCD Abel Klein, Chair, UCI Cliff Brunk, Chair, UCLA Irwin Sherman, Chair, UCR Jan Talbot, Chair, UCSD Leonard Zegans, Chair, UCSF (absent) Walter Yuen, Chair, UCSB Alison Galloway, Chair, UCSC Barbara Sawrey, Chair, BOARS Quentin Williams, Vice Chair CCGA (alt. for Kent Erickson, Chair, CCGA) Ramon Gutierrez, Chair, UCAP Lisa Alvarez-Cohen, Chair, UCEP (absent) Ross Starr, Chair, UCFW Janis Ingham, Chair, UCORP Michael Parrish, Chair, UCPB (absent)</p> <p>Berkeley (6) Richard Abrams (absent) Michael Hanemann (absent) Dorit Hochbaum (absent) David Hollinger (absent) Donald Mastronarde Raymond Wolfinger</p> <p>Davis (5) William Casey Peter Hays Gyongy Laky Brian Morrissey Philip Yager</p> <p>Irvine (4) Linda Georgianna (absent) Ross Conner (absent) Calvin McLaughlin Thomas Poulos (absent)</p>	<p>Los Angeles (9) Kathryn Atchison Charles Berst Richard Weiss (alt. for Yoram Cohen) Harold Fetterman Vickie Mays (absent) Jose Moya Owen Smith Jane Valentine (absent) Jaime Villablanca</p> <p>Riverside (2) Mary Gauvain Joseph Childers (alt. for Linda Tomko)</p> <p>San Diego (4) LeRoy Dorman (alt. for Stuart Brody) Gerald Doppelt (absent) Barney Rickett (absent) Nicholas Spitzer</p> <p>San Francisco (3) Philip Darney (absent) Francisco Ramos-Gomez Peter Wright</p> <p>Santa Barbara (3) Ann Jensen Adams Susan Koshy (absent) Nelson Lichtenstein (absent)</p> <p>Santa Cruz (2) Tony Fink (alt. for Faye Crosby) Theodore Holman</p> <p>Secretary/Parliamentarian Peter Berck</p>
---	---

III. ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Robert C. Dynes (Oral Report)

IV. ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

George Blumenthal (Oral Report)

V. SPECIAL ORDERS

A. Consent Calendar

UCLA Division’s Request for a Variance to Senate Regulation 764

The Los Angeles Division requests a variance to [Senate Regulation 764](#) (“**Credit in special study courses for undergraduates is limited to five units per term.**”), which will allow the division to increase from 16 to 32 the allowable number of units that can be taken as individual studies courses. The request for a variance to Senate Regulation 764, which is embodied in UCLA’s proposed revision to their divisional regulation A320, was unanimously approved by the Academic Council at its July 21, 2004 meeting based on UCR&J’s finding that UCLA’s request is consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate, and on the recommendation of the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP). The Council acted in accordance with Senate Bylaw 125 B.5, which authorizes it to give its provisional approval if such requests cannot be placed on the Agenda of the Assembly within sixty calendar days after receiving divisional approval.

CURRENT AND PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR THE UCLA DIVISIONAL REGULATION A320

Chapter I. General Provisions

Section 5.

Courses Academic Senate {Divisional} Regulation A320. Upper-Division Tutorials.

<i>CURRENT LANGUAGE</i>	<i>PROPOSED LANGUAGE</i>
<p>A320 [A] All special individual studies courses for undergraduate students are numbered 199. These courses are structured by the instructor and student at the time they are initiated. The structure of the course, including both the specific proposed courses of study and the requirements that must be met before a grade can be assigned, are then summarized on the standard form “Petition for Enrollment in a Special Studies Course (199)”.</p> <p>[B] In order to register for a special studies course, the “Petition for Enrollment in a Special Studies Course (199)” must be approved by both the instructor in charge and the Chair of the department [or head of the relevant interdisciplinary program].</p>	<p>A320 [A] Upper-Division Tutorials for undergraduate students are numbered 195 through 199. These courses are structured by the instructor and student at the time they are initiated. The structure of the course, including both the specific proposed course of study and the requirements that must be met before a grade can be assigned, are then summarized on a petition for enrollment in an Upper-Division Tutorial (195-199).</p> <p>[B] In order to enroll in an Upper-Division Tutorial, a petition for enrollment in an Upper-Division Tutorial (195-199) must be approved by both the instructor in charge and the chair of the department or interdisciplinary program. <i>One instructor may not sponsor more than seven (7) students enrolled in an Upper-Division Tutorial (195-199) in any one term.</i></p>

<p>[C] Limitations</p> <p>1) Enrollment requires the consent of the instructor who is to supervise the study. The applicant shall show that his or her background is adequate for the proposed study.</p>	<p>[C] Limitations</p> <p>1) [No change]</p>
<p>2) Credit for supervised individual studies in a single term is limited to a maximum of 8 units. Subject to the provisions of Divisional Regulation A-310, the student may take a 199 or 199H course on a Passed/Not Passed or a letter grade basis, but the total number of units allowed in individual study courses (199 or 199H) for a letter grade is 16. The student may take a 199F (Field Study) only on a P/NP basis. The total number of units allowed in 199F is 8.</p> <p>3) At the close of the term, some tangible evidence of work accomplished, signed by the student and the supervising faculty member, shall be filed by the department for an appropriate period of time. The department shall designate the form of the evidence acceptable for this purpose.</p>	<p>2) Credit for Upper-Division Tutorials (195-199) in a single term is limited to a maximum of 8 units. Subject to the provisions of Divisional Regulation A-310, the student may take any Upper-Division Tutorial (195-199) on a Passed/Not Passed or a letter grade basis, but the total number of units allowed in Upper-Division Tutorials (195-199) for a letter grade is 32.</p> <p>3) At the close of the term, some tangible evidence of work accomplished, signed by the student and the supervising faculty member, shall be filed and retained by the department for three years.</p>
<p>4) At the outset of a special studies course (199) the student must complete and the instructor in charge must sign a "Petition for Enrollment in a Special Studies Course (199),"" which will include the specific proposed course of study and the requirements to be met before a grade can be assigned. The form must have been completed and submitted before a grade can be assigned in the course.</p> <p>5) In order to register for 199, 199F, and/or 199H, a student must have advanced Junior standing and at least a 3.0 G.P.A. in his major field, or he/she must have Senior standing.</p>	<p>4) At the outset of an Upper-Division Tutorial (195-199) the student must complete and the instructor in charge must sign a petition for enrollment in an Upper-Division Tutorial (195-199), which will include the specific proposed course of study and the requirements to be met before a grade can be assigned.</p> <p>5) In order to enroll in an Upper-Division Tutorial (195-199), a student must have advanced junior standing and at least a 3.0 G.P.A. in his major field, or he/she must have senior standing.</p>

<p>6) A student who has an outstanding Incomplete in a 199 or 199H may not register for another 199 or 199H until the grade of Incomplete has been removed.</p> <p>7) On the advice of the instructor(s) and Chair concerned, the Dean of a student's college or school may authorize exceptions to the limitations listed.</p> <p>8) Departments may impose additional limitations on the individual study courses.</p> <p>[Variance to SR 764.] [Am 2 June 77] [Am 9 May 84]</p>	<p>6) A student who has an outstanding Incomplete in an Upper-Division Tutorial (195-199) may not enroll in another Upper-Division Tutorial until the grade of Incomplete has been removed.</p> <p>7) [No change]</p> <p>8) [No change]</p> <p>[Variance to SR 764.] [Am 2 June 77] [Am 9 May 84]</p>
---	---

UCLA Quick Guide to Reserved Course Numbers – Final from Registrar’s

Office The numbers 19, 89, 89HC, 99, 189, 189HC will be established automatically by the Registrar’s Office for most departments.

Lower-Division Seminars/Tutorials	Upper-Division Research Seminars (190-194)
<p>19. Fiat Lux Freshman Seminars. (1 unit) Grading: P/NP. Format: Seminar. Limited to 20 students. Taught by faculty in their areas of scholarship. Designed to engage students in an active learning environment with their peers and a distinguished faculty member.</p>	<p>190. Research Colloquia. (1-2 fixed units) Grading: P/NP only. Format: Seminar. Designed to bring students doing supervised tutorial research together in a seminar setting with one or more faculty to discuss their own work or related work in a discipline. Led by one of the supervising faculty.</p>
<p>88. Sophomore Seminars. (2-5 fixed units) Grading: P/NP or Letter grade. Format: Seminar. Limited to maximum of 20 lower-division students. Readings and discussions designed to introduce students to current research in the discipline. Culminating project may be required.</p>	<p>191. Variable Topics Seminars (1-5 fixed units) Grading: department option. Format: Seminar. Research seminar on selected topics. Reading, discussion, and development of culminating project. Note: variable topic <u>lecture</u> courses must be offered under a different number.</p>
<p>89. Honors Seminars (1 unit) Grading: P/NP or Letter grade. Format: Seminar. Limited to 20 students. Adjunct to a lower-division lecture course. Explores topics in greater depth through supplemental readings, papers, or other activities. Led by instructor of the lecture course. Applies toward honors credit for eligible students. Honors content noted on transcript.</p>	<p>191H. Honors Seminars.</p> <p>192. Undergraduate Teaching Practicum. (2-4 fixed units) Grading: P/NP or letter grade. Format: Seminar. Limited to juniors/seniors. Training and supervised practicum for advanced undergraduates in teaching courses. Students assist in preparation of materials and development of innovative programs with the guidance of faculty in a small course setting.</p>
<p>89HC. Honors Contracts (1 unit) Grading: P/NP or Letter grade. Format: Tutorial. Restricted to students in College Honors and departmental honors programs. Adjunct to a lower-division lecture course. Individual study with instructor of lecture to explore topics in greater depth through supplemental readings, papers, or other activities. Individual honors contract required. Honors content noted on transcript.</p>	<p>193. Journal Club Seminars. (1 or 2 fixed units) Grading: P/NP only. Format: Seminar. Limited to undergraduates. Discussion of readings selected from current literature of the field. Can also be used for speakers-series seminars.</p>
<p>97. Variable Topics (fixed or variable units) Grading: department option. Format: department option, many are set up as seminars. Topics vary by instructor. (Note: These are permanent offerings.; no change from current reserved numbering.)</p>	<p>194. Research Group or Internship Seminars. (1 or 2 fixed units) Grading: P/NP only. Format: Seminar. Designed for undergraduates who are part of a research group or internship. Discussion of research methods and current literature in the field or discussion of faculty’s or student’s own research. May meet concurrently with a graduate research seminar in the same department (use “C” prefix). May use 194I for internship adjunct.</p>
<p>98. Professional School Seminars. (2-5 fixed units) Grading: P/NP or Letter grade. Format: Seminar. Limited to 20</p>	

<p>students. Taught by professional school faculty, seminars are designed to introduce students to the nature of professional work the role of professionals in society.</p>	<p>Upper-Division Tutorials (195-199)</p>
<p>98T. Collegium of University Teaching Fellows. (5) Grading: Letter grade only. Format: Seminar. Taught by advanced graduate students in their field of specialization. One-time-only offerings. Introduces students to a cutting edge of a discipline in a small seminar environment. (Note: no change from current numbering.)</p>	<p>195. Community or Corporate Internship. (2-4 fixed units) Grading P/NP or Letter grade. Format: Tutorial. Limited to juniors/seniors. <u>Contract required</u> with supervising faculty member. Internship in a supervised setting in a community agency or business. Student meets on a regular basis with instructor and provides periodic reports of their experience.</p>
<p>99. Student Research Program (1-2 variable units) Grading: P/NP. Format: Tutorial (supervised research or other scholarly work), three hours per week per unit. Entry-level research for lower-division students under guidance of a faculty mentor. Enrollment by contract. Students must be in good academic standing and enrolled in a minimum of 12 units (excluding this course). May be repeated; consult the Undergraduate Research Center. <u>Contract required.</u></p>	<p>196. Research Apprenticeship. (2-4 fixed or variable units) Grading: P/NP. Format: Tutorial (supervised research or other scholarly work), three hours per week per unit. Limited to juniors/seniors. <u>Contract required.</u> Entry-level research apprenticeship for upper-division students under guidance of a faculty mentor. May be repeated; consult department.</p>
<p>Upper-Division Seminars/Tutorials</p>	
<p>188. Special Courses (1-5 fixed units) Grading: department option. Format: varies (seminar or lecture) Departmentally sponsored experimental or temporary courses, such as courses taught by visiting faculty. Approved for one term or one year only. (Note: Former 198 courses.)</p>	<p>197. Individual Studies (2-4 fixed or variable units) Grading: P/NP or Letter grade. Format: Tutorial. Limited to juniors/seniors. <u>Contract required.</u> Individual intensive study, with scheduled meetings to be arranged between a faculty member and a student. Assigned reading and tangible evidence of mastery of the subject matter required.</p>
<p>189. Advanced Honors Seminars. (1 unit) Grading: P/NP or Letter grade. Format: Seminar. Limited to 20 students. Designed as adjunct to an undergraduate lecture course. Explores topics in greater depth through supplemental readings, papers, or other activities. Led by instructor of the lecture course. Applies toward honors credit for eligible students. Honors content noted on transcript.</p>	<p>198. Honors Research. (2-4 fixed or variable units) Grading: Letter grade only. Format: Tutorial. Limited to juniors/seniors. <u>Contract required.</u> Development and completion of an honors thesis or comprehensive research project under direct supervision of a faculty member</p>
<p>189HC. Honors Contracts (1 unit) Grading: P/NP or Letter grade. Format: Tutorial. Restricted to students in College Honors and departmental honors programs. Adjunct to an undergraduate lecture course. Individual study with instructor of lecture to explore topics in greater depth through supplemental readings, papers, or other activities. Individual honors contract required. Honors content noted on transcript.</p>	<p>199. Directed Research or Senior Project (2-4 fixed or var. units) Grading P/NP or Letter grade. Format: Tutorial. Limited to juniors/seniors. <u>Contract required.</u> Research under the guidance of a faculty mentor. Supervised individual research or investigation. Culminating paper or project required.</p>

JUSTIFICATION:

The request for a variance to Senate Regulation 764 is required to implement the proposed recommendations from the Joint Administrative/Senate Task Force on Undergraduate Education in a Research Context.

V. SPECIAL ORDERS (Cont'd.)

- Annual Reports

ACADEMIC COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE. The Academic Council is the administrative arm of the Assembly of the Academic Senate and acts in lieu of the Assembly on non-legislative matters. It advises the President on behalf of the Assembly and has the continuing responsibility via its committee structure to investigate and report to the Assembly on matters of University-wide concern.

2003-2004 ISSUES:

During the 2003-2004 academic year, the Academic Council took under review and made recommendations on more than seventy initiatives, proposals, reports, variances, and APM policy changes covering a wide range of issues. Some of these issues carried over from last year, such as retirement benefits for health sciences faculty, review of the Reports on Faculty Instructional Activities, and revision of the Senate Bylaws; others included: proposed guidelines for the establishment of a new division; equivalent status for Cooperative Extension Specialists; the University Professor review procedure; Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards Policy and Procedures; proposed new policy on Conflicts of Interest Created by Consensual Relations, the Senate's request for a broad review of DANR; and a Senate proposal to align the campus calendars. The Academic Council's final recommendations on many of these issues are posted on the Senate's website at: <http://www.Universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/>. Matters that were of particular and/or persistent focus for the year are noted below.

THE STATE BUDGET

The budget and other funding matters were either explicitly or implicitly at the center of many of Council's deliberations for the year. Particular effort was made to develop as far as was possible proactive recommendations and strategies to address potential budget cuts, such as the proposed cut in enrollment funding. In the process of looking at a wide scope of strategies, budgetary principles and priorities were distilled.

Budget strategies and priorities. After broad Senate discussion of the budget and its effect on enrollment, the Academic Council finalized a formal Resolution, "California's Budget Crisis and the University of California," which was adopted by the Assembly at its May 12, 2004 meeting. The Resolution was part of a general university advocacy and education campaign to bring attention to the unique role of UC in the economic and cultural health of the state. Council is continuing its interest in further developing faculty advocacy activities. In light of the "compact" that was made with the Governor, which intends to provide UC with stable funding in coming years as well as possible funding for initiatives, Council made preliminary recommendations for budget priorities in the context of long-range planning. Early in the year Council also endorsed the proposal "Increasing Access and Sustaining Excellence," which had been updated to reflect the current budgetary situation, and delineates funding principles consonant with the fulfillment of the University's mission.

Graduate education. Giving high priority to graduate education, Council endorsed and sent forward to the President: 1) "A Crisis in Graduate Education at UC," a letter

highlighting the contributions of graduate education to the state and calling for a commitment to greater fundraising efforts for graduate education; and 2) a “Resolution on Graduate Support,” which calls for changes in the return-to-aid formula that will enhance graduate student support.

ADMISSIONS ISSUES

The Academic Council and its committees reviewed BOARS’ recommended changes to the eligibility criteria that were developed in response to the findings of the 2004 CPEC Eligibility Study. In order to adjust UC’s eligibility pool to the level set out in the Master Plan, recommendations were made for procedural changes and for raising the GPA required for eligibility. The recommendations were endorsed by the Assembly at its Special Meeting on June 30, and then forwarded to the Regents. Throughout the year, the Academic Council Chair and the Chair of BOARS served as key members on the President’s Admissions Study Group, which was empanelled to look at a wide range of admissions issues. Council will continue its close involvement with a continuing Study Group next year, and BOARS has been charged with carrying out a number of the group’s recommendations.

FACULTY WELFARE ISSUES

Significant faculty welfare matters taken under review in 2003-04 included:

Resolution on Including Private Equity Investments in the 403(b) Plan and the Proposed New 457(b) Plan. The Academic Council endorsed this resolution in support of allowing employees and retirees the option of including private equity investment in their UC equity portfolio.

Academic Council Resolution on Educational Fee Waiver. This long-standing recommendation of the Senate’s to institute an educational fee waiver for qualified children, spouses and domestic partners of all faculty and eligible UC employees was again forwarded to administration along with a proposed gradual implementation schedule to minimize initial costs.

Model Plan for Faculty Recalled for Post-retirement Reaching. The result of a two-year consultative process between the Senate and the Council of Vice Chancellors, this model can be used as a normative “floor” for negotiations with faculty for post-retirement teaching. The Council has asked that a follow-up study be conducted of the types of recall agreements reached under the plan with a report to come out in spring 2006.

Proposed Changes to Retirement Benefits for Health Sciences Faculty. In recognition of the opposition among health sciences faculty to the proposed changes, and in light of impending increases for voluntary tax-deferred savings, the Academic Council recommended that the proposed changes not be made and that other options having minimal impact on the UCRS continue to be explored.

TASK FORCES AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

Task Force on Graduate and Professional School Admissions. This group was established last year to review graduate and professional school admissions guidelines and principles, in part in response to a resolution of the State Legislature calling upon the University to implement comprehensive review at the graduate and professional school level. The task force report, which was completed and sent forward in December, found that comprehensive review of applications to UC’s graduate academic and professional

programs is the standard process implemented for selection of high quality graduate and professional school students. Completion of an addendum to the report relating specifically to diversity in graduate and professional school programs is pending.

Honors/AP. Last year, a task force was empanelled by the Academic Council to formulate a recommendation on the appropriate role of Honors/AP/IB and community college courses in the admissions process and, in the case of AP and IB courses, the credit given by the campuses. Completion of the task force report is expected in the 2004-05 session.

Professorial Step System. This task force was formed last year in response to concerns raised about the rationale behind the professorial step system, and to consider whether a step with uniquely high standards - a so-called barrier step - should be maintained, and, if so, whether Professor Step VI is the right point for a review of that nature. The final report of the task force raised questions as to possible inequities in the academic promotion of women and underrepresented minorities. Council responded to the report by: 1) establishing a subgroup to identify the type of data needed to carry out a study of the effect of Step VI on the advancement of women and minority groups through the professorial ranks; and 2) asking UCAP to review and recommend more appropriate language for the Step VI criteria. Next year's Council will address the outcome of both of these efforts.

Academic Council's Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL). This special committee was given the charge to: 1) consult with the Administration regarding the management of the DOE Labs, the decision about whether to compete to continue managing the laboratories, and the circumstances surrounding any possible bid; 2) report to the Academic Council on the relationship between the DOE Labs and UC; 3) advise the Academic Council about the best timing and form of Senate input, both at a system-wide and campus level, regarding the advisability of UC competing to retain management of the Labs. The group met monthly throughout the year. A central effort of the group was the development and administration of a system-wide survey of all Senate faculty on questions relating to UC's competing to continue to manage LANL and LLNL. The survey had a response rate of 26%. Of those faculty members who completed the survey, a more than 3-1 majority was in favor of competing for both labs. The full results were reported to the Board of Regents, which took them under consideration. The final report on the survey was completed in July and made public on the Senate website. ACSCONL will continue its work in 2004-05.

Special Committee on Scholarly Communication. This committee was conceived to investigate a wide range of scholarly publication issues including: cost-effective production and optimal dissemination of scholarly works; dissemination methods and use for peer review and academic advancement; assessing faculty interest in and legal issues related to new methods of publication. The committee will begin activities in 2004-05.

OLIVER JOHNSON AWARD

The Oliver Johnson Award for Distinguished Leadership in the Academic Senate is given every other year. Professor Aimee Dorr and Professor Calvin Moore were selected by the Academic Council and approved by the Assembly as the 2004 co-recipients of the award, which was presented at the annual Chair's Dinner in July.

RESEARCH ISSUES

Restrictions on Research Awards. In the spring of 2003 the Academic Council gave UCORP the charge to investigate university policy concerning external restrictions attached to research contracts, grants and gifts, and the nature of such restrictions. Coming out of that investigation were three documents, which were reviewed and adopted as Council positions. The first, the Academic Council Resolution on SUTI (Sensitive but Unclassified Technical Information), formalized the Senate's opposition to the implementation of this new federal research category that is inimical to fundamental research. The second and third documents were the final committee report on the types of restrictions, "Problematic Restrictive Clauses in Contracts, Grants and Gifts for Research," and its accompanying "Resolution on Restrictions on Funding Sources," which supports the right of individual researchers to accept funding from any source that is legitimate under university policy.

Senate Review of System-wide Research Units. Council reiterated its request (originally formulated last year) for a formal response from administration to the Senate's recommendation for a joint Senate/administrative work group that could develop a review structure for the California Institutes for Science and Innovation, taking as a point of departure previously submitted Senate reports. It is anticipated that progress on this matter will be realized in the coming year. Council also forwarded a report recommending a revamping of the MRU review process by re-categorizing units according to their primary function and restructuring the review cycles and criteria in a way that would free up funding for new initiatives.

RELATIONS WITH OTHER GOVERNING BODIES

Joint Administrative/Senate Retreat: The Academic Council has recently established the practice of meeting in alternate years with the chancellors and with the executive vice chancellors to discuss matters of joint concern. This year, Council members met with the chancellors to discuss: 1) shared governance practices in regard to budgetary decisions; 2) improving efficiency in the academic personnel process; and 3) support for campus Senate offices. Following up on topic #1, divisional chairs subsequently reported general satisfaction with the process of campus budgetary decision-making. As an outcome of topic #2, a joint administrative-senate workgroup on improving efficiency in the academic personnel process was formed, the activities of which will continue to be monitored by next year's Council.

The Regents. Last year, the Academic Council recommended that the non-voting status of the Faculty Representatives to the Regents be maintained for another year, during which time the Senate Chair and Vice Chair would work toward achieving greater integration into the Regents' deliberations process. At the July 2004 Council meeting, Chair Pitts reported that as non-voting Faculty Representatives both he and the Council Vice Chair have enjoyed a significant degree of access to regental meetings and deliberations, noting that this access (and other advantages of having a non-voting status) might diminish if the faculty representative were a Regent. It was argued on the other hand that a Faculty Regent with voting rights would have a given and unvarying authority and that such status would have significant symbolic meaning. In a close vote, the Academic Council opposed a change in the current status of the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents. This outcome will be conveyed to the 2004-05 Academic Council

members, who will revisit the question of the status of Faculty representation on the Board of Regents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

We express our sincere gratitude to the following members of senior administration for their time and effort this past year in maintaining the other half of a productive dialogue with the Senate: Richard Atkinson, former President; C. Judson King, former Provost and Sr. Vice President-Academic Affairs; Robert Dynes, President; M.R.C. Greenwood, Provost and Sr. Vice President-Academic Affairs; Bruce Darling, Sr. Vice President-University Affairs; Joseph Mullinix, Sr. Vice President-Business and Finance; and Lawrence Hershman, Vice President-Budget.

Respectfully submitted:

Lawrence Pitts, Chair

George Blumenthal, Vice Chair

Divisional Chairs:

Ronald Gronsky, Berkeley
Bruce Madewell, Davis
Abel Klein, Irvine
Clifford Brunk, Los Angeles
Irwin Sherman, Riverside
Jan Talbot, San Diego
Leonard Zegans, San Francisco
Walter Yuen, Santa Barbara
Allison Galloway, Santa Cruz

Guests:

Peter Berck, UCM Task Force
Sam Traina, UCM Task Force (June, July)

Senate Committee Chairs:

Barbara Sawrey, BOARS
Kent Erickson, CCGA
Ramon Gutierrez, UCAP
Lisa Alvarez-Cohen, UCEP
Ross Starr, UCFW
Janis Ingham, UCORP
Richard Goodman, UCPB Sept.-Dec.
Michael Parrish, UCPB Jan.-Aug.

Council Staff:

Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Executive Director
Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst
Betty Marton, Policy Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM (UCAF)
2003-04 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Budget restrictions limited the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) to two meetings in Academic Year 2003-04: November 21, 2003 and March 23, 2004, in Oakland. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Resolution on the USA Patriot Act

UCAF was interested in the mounting efforts on campuses to address the USA Patriot Act, which included divisional resolutions at Berkeley, Santa Cruz and Irvine opposing the Act and planned resolutions and educational forums at other divisions. To UCAF, these efforts revealed a widespread concern that the Patriot Act might be implemented in a way that could compromise civil liberties and academic freedom on campus. Members agreed that it would be important for members of the campus community to educate themselves about actual and potential dangers posed by the Patriot Act. A resolution was also developed and set before the committee in April, which passed unanimously.

“Be it resolved that the University of California Senate Committee on Academic Freedom supports efforts in the UC Academic Senate and on UC campuses to implement safeguards against potential threats to civil liberties and academic freedom posed by the USA PATRIOT Act and related acts of government legislation.”

In June, Academic Council unanimously endorsed a similar version of UCAF's resolution, which was forwarded to the president.

UCAF members will continue to monitor the implementation and effects of the Patriot Act along with efforts to oppose or address it at the campus level. In addition, members may consider taking steps to gather, compile and disseminate data on faculty opinion and experiences in relation to the Patriot Act.

APM 010

In November, several months after the Academic Assembly approved a revised University statement on Academic Freedom, UCLA's CAF asked UCAF to endorse its position that APM 010 be re-opened to a system-wide examination on the grounds that not enough time and effort had been devoted to educating faculty and involving them in the revision. UCAF members agreed that the process of Senate review had been conducted hastily and that educational efforts could have been more thorough, but the committee declined to endorse the UCLA position. Nevertheless, members thought that current interest around the APM revision provided an ideal opportunity to increase educational efforts about academic freedom and to clearly communicate the new policy at the campus level. Members were considering ways to engage their local committees in this effort.

Academic Freedom Forum Website

A webpage for the June 2003 System-wide Senate Forum on Academic Freedom was created on the Senate website. It contains speaker presentations, along with other relevant materials, academic freedom links, and resources. Members saw the webpage as a good means to disseminate information and knowledge from the event to a larger audience.

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucaf/afforum/>

Academic Freedom and Students

Student Regent Matt Murray joined UCAF in March to get input into a policy he had drafted on academic freedom for students. Regent Murray's position was that a new policy should address ambiguities about student academic freedom—in particular, students who are engaged as teaching assistants, post docs or researchers in scholarly inquiry, research and publishing activities in a capacity similar to faculty. It was not clear to UCAF that the notion of academic freedom as it relates to the professoriate can apply in the same sense to students. However, members concluded that it would be useful to have an affirmative policy or statement, consistent with the faculty code of conduct, as a clear reference for students about their rights and responsibilities. It was suggested that the starting point for such a policy or statement might be the faculty regulations relating to students outlined in APM 015. UCAF plans to take the issue up again next year.

Corporate and Economic Pressures on Academic Freedom

UCSF Professor Lisa Bero joined UCAF to discuss her research into the correlations between corporate sponsorship of research and research findings that are friendly to the interests of the funders. The committee discussed how such ties could compromise freedom of inquiry and the stated mission of the university to discover new knowledge, and how inappropriate influences make it difficult for the academic community to judge scholarship quality, cast suspicion on the professoriate, and call into question the notion of self-regulation, a foundation of academic freedom. UCAF believes that it is the responsibility of the academic community to take control of this issue by managing its own conflicts of interest ethically, so controls are not imposed from the outside. In July, UCAF was asked to comment on a UCORP resolution regarding restrictions on sources of research funding. The committee took the opportunity to discuss some of these issues, and called upon Academic Council and appropriate Senate committees to investigate the problem.

Members also discussed the extent to which corporate funding of grants and clinical trials interacts with the academic personnel process as a possible incentive or disincentive for merit increases and promotions. It was suggested that CAPs and CAFs could work together on the issue. The committee will continue to discuss these issues in the future.

Proposed New Policy on Sexual Harassment

In November, UCAF sent comments to Council about a proposed new university policy on sexual harassment. The comments focused on Paragraph G of the policy, entitled "Free Speech and Academic Freedom." UCAF suggested that more emphasis be placed

on protections for students, and the protection of scholarship. UCAF submitted two alternative formulations of Paragraph G to Academic Council.

Other Issues and Activities

Finally, members devoted part of each regular meeting to reports and updates about issues facing local committees. Discussion included the authority of Institutional Review Boards (IRBs); civil liberties issue in connection with federal government access to student records; hate speech and conditions of civility on campus; university policy regarding the withholding of pay during a strike, political influence in federal scientific review panels; and discussion of academic freedom cases at other universities.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Watson, Chair, Riverside
Philip Bonacich, Los Angeles
Barbara Epstein, Santa Cruz
Patrick Fox, San Francisco
Peter Irons, San Diego
Gregory Kelly, Santa Barbara
Carol Redmount, Berkeley (Fall)

Jerold Theis, Davis
Howard Tucker, Irvine
David Vogel, Berkeley (Spring)
Mark Higgins, (student representative-
San Diego)
Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-04**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Personnel held five meetings during Academic Year 2003-04, including one teleconference meeting, and conducted additional business by E-mail. A summary of issues considered this year by UCAP are outlined as follows:

Report of the Professorial Step System [Step VI] Task Force.

UCAP submitted a response letter to the Academic Council on 18 May 2004 including recommendations and voting action taken on individual recommendations in the report.

As a related but separate issue, UCAP submitted a letter to the Council outlining the need for more comprehensive faculty personnel data/statistics and urging that administration and the Office of the President be requested to construct a systematic database to allow studies and make accurate assessments of the way in which faculty move through the ranks, by including individual time at each rank and step, accelerations and decelerations, step merit increases, and bulges at major career reviews.

Electronic Publication and Scholarly Communication, including publication review.

UCAP has maintained that electronic scholarly works should be considered as other scholarly work. Individual campuses are dealing with developing principles and quality measures for assessing electronic publications. Members were invited to submit comments on local practices with respect to consideration of electronic publications in the review process. This was preliminary to the establishment of an Academic Council Special Committee on Scholarly Communications to study these and other issues related to electronic publications. UCAP considered barriers that make it difficult to assess electronic publication during promotions and reviews. Most campus departments are keeping abreast of developments in electronic publication and new citation practices in their respective fields. UCAP discussed these issues with Associate Vice President and University Librarian Greenstein.

Series considerations for clinician-scientists in the health sciences.

Members from campuses with medical schools were asked to consult with their CAPs to assess the degree to which clinical and adjunct faculty may be misclassified.

Personnel actions: University Professor.

UCAP acted on the following: a) provided nominations for faculty to serve on an ad hoc review committee to consider an appointment to the title University Professor; b) approved a proposal from the Provost to change the APM so that UCAP reviews University Professor appointments and makes recommendations to the Provost and President; c) considered nominations for appointments to the title University Professor and forwarded recommendations.

Amendment to SB 335.B to comply with existing Whistleblower Policies.

UCAP endorsed the Bylaw change as reported to Council on 28 October 2003.

Reports from the Task Force on Faculty Instructional Activities.

On October 7, 2003 UCAP responded to Council on Describing and Reporting Faculty Instructional Activities and Faculty Instructional Responsibilities: Guidelines for Departmental Policies, endorsing the tenor and content of both reports, and lauding the University's move toward greater accountability with respect to instructional workloads.

Academic Personnel Manual: New Proposals, Amendments:

- Supervisor of Physical Education Title Series—UCAP affirmed that this was a superfluous title and recommended to close the series.
- UCAAD Proposal to revise APMs 210, 240 and 245—UCAP participated actively in fine-tuning with UCAAD the proposed amended language. In its letter to Council on 24 February 2004 UCAP reported on its endorsement of modifications proposed to APMs 240 and 245, and in its April 21, 2004 letter, UCAP reported that it was not in full agreement on the proposed revisions to APM 210; however, the majority endorsed most of the revisions.
- Family friendly policies: Proposed revisions to APMs 133 17-g-j; 210-1-d; 2b and 5d; 220-10, 15, 16 and 18-b; and 760—UCAP endorsed the direction of proposed changes to these policies.
- Formal Review of APM 260 – University Professor—UCAP submitted response to Council on 18 May 2004 endorsing all the proposed revisions save the numeric limitation outlined in 260-0-e. UCAP members believed this was an unwarranted limitation and that the University should be able to appoint all those incumbents who are worthy of this honor regardless of the number already on a campus. UCAP also recommended that OP consider adding language to specifically state that the appointment is indefinite only as long as the University Professor is fully performing as described in the APM.
- Formal Review of APMs having to do with salaried Clinical Professor series and Community Health Professor series: APMs 278, 279, 133-0, and 210-6—UCAP submitted a lengthy response to the Academic Council on 18 May 2004 in which it outlined its own several changes and recommendations.
- Correction to APM 137-30-c--on April 21, 2004 UCAP reported to Council that it endorsed this APM revision, which involved a wording change.

Development of Policy on Administrative Structures for Interdisciplinary Activities.

UCAP was requested to consider a question from one Division Chair as to whether there are administrative mechanisms for review and funding sufficient to attract, retain and promote individuals who are not in established departmental units. UCAP was invited to draft best practices. UCAP did not make specific recommendations, since campuses vary with respect to the kinds of administrative structures they have in place; however, members forwarded values and goals that they favor, including encouraging each campus to develop a checklist of explicit expectations in terms of teaching, research and service for use in all appointments, that should be discussed at the time of appointment with department and program chairs. Also, there should be clear, full and explicit

communication among departments, programs and ORUs about the faculty in them, at review time.

Member Items:

- Campus Procedures for Gender Equity Review—Members discussed individual campus practices and numbers of overturns of CAP decisions by administration.
- Solicitation of External Letters of Evaluation by Departments—members shared individual campus practices.
- CAP Activity Survey—as per UCAP’s annual practice, members submitted data on CAP activities for AY 2002-03.
- UCSD CAP recommended revision to APM 620-16, -18, and -24; removing a stipulated but frequently excepted limitation on salary at \$100 less than the step at the next rank—UCAP did not express any sentiment for changing the language, and tabled the issue.
- How criteria for above-scale promotion are decided—members shared individual campus interpretation and practice.

Additional business:

UCAP also received and discussed and/or commented on the following reports and issues, some of which are outside of its specific charge and duties:

- Graduate Admissions Task Force Report.
- Budget Restrictions and Effect on Enrollment—UCAP and Division CAPs remain concerned about available funding for faculty hiring during the current budget shortfall. UCAP reaffirmed the importance of consulting faculty when there is a budget shortfall and when/if further reductions are considered, with respect to monies available for faculty merits, and other decisions related to faculty salaries.
- UC Health Sciences Faculty Retirement Proposal—UCAP approved.
- Conflict of Interest Created by Consensual Relationships—UCAP approved.
- Sexual Harassment and Procedures for Responding to Report of Sexual Harassment—UCAP approved.
- Efficiencies in Personnel Review Process—UCAP discussed possible efficiencies within CAPs to save both money and staff time.
- Specialists in Cooperative Extension—After further discussion by this year’s Committee, UCAP’s recommendation and action taken in 2002-03 not to approve equivalent rank status for this group remained as its standing response.
- UC Outreach Strategic Panel Report, *Forging California’s Future through Educational Partnerships: Redefining Educational Partnerships*—UCAP submitted a response to the report on 25 February 2004 that addressed the importance of rewarding faculty outreach efforts, and listed ideas that merit further discussion with respect to incorporating outreach into the University’s research and teaching missions.

UCAP Representation.

UCAP was represented on additional Task Forces and Work Groups this year, including: Academic Council (UCAP Chair is a member), Assembly of the Academic Senate, UC Merced Task Force, and Step VI Task Force (UCAP Chair is a member).

Acknowledgement of Committee Consultants:

UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Assistant Vice President for Academic Advancement Ellen Switkes and Director of Academic Personnel Myron Okada. UCAP also consulted with UCAAD Chair Ross Frank on its proposed changes to APM language that addresses diversity issues, Academic Senate Chair Lawrence Pitts and Academic Senate Vice Chair George Blumenthal on issues facing the Academic Council and Senate, and Academic Senate Executive Director Maria Bertero-Barcelo on Senate office procedures and Committee business. In addition, UCAP received reports from guest consultants Geoffrey Mason, Merced CAP Chair, Daniel Greenstein, Associate Vice President and University Librarian and John Ober, Director, Education and Strategic Innovation, CDL.

Respectfully submitted,

Ramón Gutiérrez (SD), Chair

Alan Barbour (I), Vice Chair

Janet Broughton (B)

Anna Maria Busse Berger (D)

John Hemminger (I)

Inder Chopra (LA)

Roland Winston (M)

Raymond Williams (R)

Salah Baouendi (SD)

Joseph Guglielmo (SF)

Martin Scharlemann (SB)

Joyce Brodsky (SC), fall/winter

Alan Richards (SC), spring/summer

Lawrence Pitts (*Ex officio*, Academic Senate Chair)

George Blumenthal (*Ex officio*, Academic Senate Chair)

Louisa Tapley-Van Pelt, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND DIVERSITY
(UCAAD)
2003-04 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity met twice in Academic Year 2003-04 and held four conference calls to conduct its business with respect to its duties outlined in Senate Bylaw 140. The issues that UCAAD considered this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

Revisions to APM 210, 240 and 245 – Appointment and Promotion

UCAAD drafted revisions to three Academic Personnel Manual sections—210, 240 and 245. The committee recommended to Academic Council that these APM sections outlining rules for the evaluation and recognition of faculty, department chairs, and divisional deans be amended to include efforts that contribute to diversity—“to more explicitly include diversity activities as part of the measure of excellence in the University.”

In APM 210, which outlines criteria for the appointment, promotion and appraisal of faculty, UCAAD drafted language asking reviewing committees to specifically consider a candidate's contributions to a broad range of diversity efforts in teaching, research, and service. New language was also added to APM 245 requiring department chairs to submit an annual affirmative action plan, and to APM 240, asking deans and provosts to make a similar commitment to maintain a divisional affirmative action program.

UCAAD worked in conjunction with the University Committee on Academic Personnel and consulted with a UCAP subcommittee to fine-tune the final language.

Chair Frank and UCAP's Chair presented the revisions to the Academic Council in March. During the process of Council review, several committees and divisions suggested modifications, and in June, modified versions of the APM revisions passed Council unanimously and were forwarded to the Provost asking her to initiate a process of formal campus review.

The Budget Crisis and its Effect on Enrollment

UCAAD examined several of the alternatives the Senate and University were considering to respond to the budget crisis and the decision by the California legislature not to fund new enrollment growth at UC. In December, UCAAD submitted comments to Council recommending that the University pursue, above all, options that would have the least adverse effect on diversity and underrepresented student populations. UCAAD expressed strong support for the current system of comprehensive review; and opposition to lotteries, increases to faculty workload, fees, and the faculty-student ratio. Finally, the committee submitted its members' rankings of 17 options to limit enrollment, which were tabulated into a Senatwide “score card” aggregate total.

Report of the Professional Step System Task Force

UCAAD discussed the Step System Task Force Report in the context of its implications for diversity and equity. Members submitted comments to Council expressing concern about the apparent disproportionate number of women and underrepresented minorities

sitting at the barrier between step V and VI. UCAAD recommended that the problem warranted further study and asked that more satisfactory data be provided to the Academic Senate.

Report on Diversity in Graduate and Professional School Enrollment

Academic Council Chair Pitts asked UCAAD to consider the problem of low minority enrollment in UC's graduate and professional schools in a formal report and recommendation addressed to the graduate and professional schools. Committee members researched and shared campus best practices related to recruitment, admission and retention; the role of affirmative action officers. At the end of 2003-04, a draft of the report was pending.

Other Issues and Additional Business

In addition to discussing and submitting official responses to senate issues, UCAAD members discussed and reported on news and items of interest from campus committees. These included discussion of local search committee practices, local faculty hiring data, exit interviews and surveys, creation of and liaison with campus equity officers, recruitment practices, equity reviews and career reviews, and concerns about faculty enrichment. Members were also particularly concerned about the decimation of the Outreach budget and disappointing data related to faculty diversity. Finally, the committee endorsed a Senate bylaw change proposal to formally eliminate the University Committee on Student Affirmative Action—which has not operated for over 20 years—and include student diversity issues within the charge of UCAAD.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements:

UCAAD would like to extend thanks to UCOP consultant Sheila O'Rourke, Executive Director, Academic Compliance, who provided the committee with regular consultation, reports and data and briefed members on numerous items and issues, including:

- Data and statistics on faculty hiring and retention.
- University obligations and responsibilities for faculty and student affirmative action in relation to both Proposition 209 and Federal Affirmative Action Regulations.
- UC policies on conflicts of interest created by consensual relationships and on sexual harassment and procedures for responding to reports of sexual harassment.
- The rights of faculty or the public to request salary data.
- Career equity review procedures on the campuses.
- UC programs and fellowships that target diversity.
- President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program.

In its research on the **Report on Diversity in Graduate and Professional School Enrollment**, Mark Westley, Director of Graduate Student Advancement provided the committee with important information and James Litrownik, Coordinator – Data Management Analysis, organized and prepared data for our use. UCAAD would like to thank them for their time and expertise.

Finally, UCAAD occasionally consulted with Academic Council Chair Lawrence Pitts and Vice Chair George Blumenthal on Academic Council business, and Academic Senate Executive Director Maria Bertero-Barceló on Committee and Senate office matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Ross Frank (UCSD), Chair
Allan Stewart-Oaten (UCSB), Vice-
Chair
Gibor Basri (UCB)
Charles Elkan (UCSD)
Bruce Haynes (UCD)
Cynthia Hudley (UCSB)
Vanna Gonzales (Graduate Student,
UCB)
Cesar Oyervides-Cisneros
(Undergraduate Student, UCR)
Katherine King (UCLA-Fall)
Muriel McClendon (UCLA-Spring)
Diane Wara (UCSF)
Stephen Jenks (UCI)
Triloki Pandey (UCSC)
Christine Gailey (UCR)
Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the 2003-2004 academic year, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) convened eleven times which included a two-day meeting, a joint meeting with the CSU Admissions Advisory Council, and a joint meeting with the UC Admissions Directors and Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs. Additional business was conducted in subcommittee meetings, by teleconference, and by email. Highlights of the committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Eligibility

Reexamining the eligibility index was BOARS' primary focus this year. As established by the California Master Plan for Higher Education, 12.5 percent of the state's public high school graduates are to be deemed eligible for UC. Early in the academic year, preliminary estimates suggested that UC's eligibility rate was above 12.5 percent. In anticipation of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) study's release, BOARS began studying options for adjusting the criteria to make no more than 12.5 percent of California public high school graduates eligible for UC.

The committee began by developing a set of principles to guide their formulation of eligibility. The principles focused on the need to continue emphasizing high academic achievement and likely success at UC while also maintaining access for high-achieving students from a breadth of different backgrounds. The principles were approved by the Academic Assembly in May 2004.

In May 2004, the results of the CPEC study were released indicating that 14.4 percent of California public high school graduate were meeting UC eligibility. BOARS reviewed the current eligibility components, which include the a-g course pattern, grade point average (GPA), standardized test scores, and Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC). Changes in each of the factors and various combinations were simulated and BOARS studied the effects of each. Overall, the simulations showed that changes to the minimum GPA were most effective in increasing the academic quality of eligibility pool and the expected college performance. Adjusting the minimum GPA also had the least negative impact on students from disadvantaged populations.

The Academic Council and the Academic Assembly endorsed BOARS' recommended adjustments to the freshman eligibility requirements in June 2004.

Study Group

In November 2003, President Dynes charged a study group of regents, faculty, and administrators to examine undergraduate eligibility and admissions policies and implementation issues facing the University. Chair Sawrey represented BOARS on the study group. After five meetings, the study group adopted 15 findings and

recommendations that address eligibility, admissions, oversight, efficiency, and clarity. Many of the recommendations proposed further examination to be conducted by BOARS. These included reexamining current guidelines for the admission of ineligible students, examining the policy of admitting students from the full range of the eligibility pool, considering how greater commonality in the implementation of comprehensive review can be attained, reviewing the feasibility of requesting applicants to submit at least one letter of recommendation, examining the extent to which campuses consider the quality of writing in the personal statement, and including data on appeals in the BOARS' comprehensive review annual report. BOARS has begun addressing some of these issues and will continue examining them next year.

Comprehensive Review

BOARS continued to refine the admissions selection process also known as comprehensive review. The committee considered how participation and achievement in outreach and other academic preparation programs should be evaluated in the comprehensive review process. BOARS agreed that simple participation in an outreach program should not be accorded any weight and that sustained involvement is required. Principles and a rationale were developed to guide campus admissions staff on this topic. Changes in the application will reflect this decision by asking students to describe their involvement in outreach or academic preparation programs.

High School Issues

Granting program status. BOARS reviewed and approved a policy for granting program status to organizations that have standardized curriculums that meet a-g requirements. Prior to approving the policy, UC had agreements with several organizations, such as Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB), to accept their courses as meeting the a-g requirements. To identify other programs that might qualify for program status, BOARS approved a list of criteria for evaluating programs. Upon approval of the policy and criteria, the BOARS high school subcommittee approved and denied program status to several organizations.

Earth Science as d-requirement. BOARS considered a request from a UC faculty member to accept earth science courses as fulfilling the d-laboratory science requirement. The high school subcommittee concluded that the current doctrine, under which biology, chemistry, and physics are regarded to be the most fundamental science subjects, is sound and should remain in place. The full committee has not yet taken action on this topic.

WASC-accreditation policy. BOARS' policy requiring schools to be WASC-accredited in order to establish an a-g course list came under fire by Christian schools that felt the policy was discriminatory. No changes were made in the policy, but work is underway at WASC to streamline procedures for accreditation.

Admissions Tests

In anticipation of the release of new SAT and ACT exams, BOARS began preparing guidelines for evaluating the new tests. BOARS will also continuously monitor and evaluate the role of test scores in the eligibility criteria.

Joint meeting with CSU Admissions Advisory Council

For the first time, BOARS meet with the CSU Admissions Advisory Council. The meeting was held in Long Beach at the CSU Chancellor's Office and the two groups discussed a number of common issues. Information was exchanged about enrollment reductions plans, collaborative opportunities in admission and enrollment, use of SAT, ACT, CST, and other standardized tests, and alignment of a-g subject areas. Members from both groups thought the meeting was productive and suggested that future meetings be scheduled periodically.

Joint meeting with Admissions Directors and Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs

BOARS met jointly with the Admissions Directors and Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs. Each campus updated BOARS on the 2004 admissions process, new and continuing challenges in admissions, and plans for the 2005 admissions season.

Review and Updates of Other Issues

During the course of the year, the committee also discussed and/or commented on other issues such as the budget and its effect on enrollment and a web policy for Senate documents.

BOARS Representation

The Chair, Vice Chair, or members represented BOARS in various other committees including the Academic Assembly, Academic Council, UC Merced Task Force, UCEP, UCOPE, ICAS, the Admissions Processing Task Force, and Eligibility and Admissions Study Group. Members also participated in the counselor conferences.

Acknowledgments

BOARS would like to acknowledge the following UCOP consultants for their contribution, work, and insight over the past year: Dennis Galligani, Associate Vice President-Student Academic Services; Sue Wilbur, Director-Admissions; Nina Robinson, Director-Policy and External Affairs; Judy Kowarsky, Associate Director-Admissions; Roman Stearns, Special Assistant to the Admissions Director; Roger Studley, Coordinator-Admissions Research.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Sawrey, Chair (UCSD)
David Stern (UCB)
Mark Rashid (UCD)
James Given (UCI)
Keith Stolzenbach (UCLA)
Dennis Focht (UCR)
Jane Stevens (UCSD)
Dick Flacks (UCSB)
Karen McNally (UCSC)
Carmel Levitan (Graduate student rep, UCSF/UCB)
Fabián Rentería (Undergraduate student rep, UCLA)
Emily Hung, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES (UCOC)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Committees (UCOC) is charged in Academic Senate Bylaw 150 to “appoint the Chairs and where specified in the Bylaws, the Vice Chairs and all appointed members of all other Senate committees that report to the Assembly.” This includes 16 of the 18 Senate committees with the exception of the Academic Council and UCOC. The Assembly elects the Chair and Vice Chair of the Assembly. UCOC nominates two members at-large to the Assembly, out of which its own Chair is appointed.

To fulfill its charge, UCOC held three meetings in Academic Year 2003-04: December 9, 2003, and February 11, March 9, 2004. The committee also held three teleconferences: October 3 and November 12, 2003, and April 20, 2004. Committee work was also conducted by email.

ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

UCOC began this year by identifying unfilled 2003-04 committee positions, including two UCLA Assembly representatives and one UCSF UCORP representative. In addition, UCOC appointed UCPB vice chair Michael Parrish, (UCSD) to replace Chair Richard Goodman, who passed away during the term, and Stan Glantz (UCSF) to vice chair. Both the chair and vice chair will continue through 04-05.

UCOC established appointment goals, including the achievement of a diverse overall balance within committees with respect to discipline and geographical representation. UCOC members agreed to act as liaison to two committees each and to initiate personal contact with each of their assigned chairs, vice chairs and committee members to identify significant issues and obtain input on potential new chairs and vice chairs. Procedures for appointing 2004-05 system-wide committees reflect recent revisions to Bylaw 128.

Members reported on their interactions with chairs and vice chairs in meetings and over email until a slate of candidates was developed. Members discussed all nominations, voted, and contacted the selected candidates after determining their willingness to serve. With the exception of a vice chair appointment for UCIE, UCOC completed system-wide appointments ahead of schedule, and a slate of committee chairs and vice chairs was presented to the Academic Assembly on May 12, 2004.

In addition to appointing chairs and vice chairs to system-wide committees, UCOC is responsible for appointing members to the Editorial Committee. In 2004-05, the Editorial Committee will align with the other committees to have a chair and vice chair rather than northern and southern co-chairs. In consultation with the Editorial Committee co-chairs and UC Press Director, members worked with their divisional committees to identify candidates with the requested disciplines to fill the Editorial Committee vacancies.

It is also the responsibility of divisional COC members to appoint representatives to the system-wide committees. It was agreed that UCOC members would work with their divisions to identify candidates for these appointments by considering relevant experience and confirming the candidates' commitment and willingness to serve a full term.

OTHER BUSINESS

Searches. During this year, UCOC was asked by President Dynes to select nominees from campuses to be considered for selection on five search committees to replace the UC Provost and Senior Vice President, the UCB, UCSD and UCSC Chancellors, and the Director of the Lawrence Berkeley National Labs. Members held teleconferences to discuss and select their nominees. Names were then forwarded to the president.

Oliver Johnson Award. The Oliver Johnson Award is presented every other year to an individual or individuals who have performed exemplary Senate service. Each local COC appointed one nominee and forwarded the names to UCOC. UCOC reviewed the nominees and selected two to be forwarded to the Academic Council. The Council, in most cases, selects one nominee from the two submitted. This year, the Council selected both nominees.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Utts, Chair (UCD)
Albert Stralka, Vice Chair (UCR)
Julie Carlson (UCSB)
Pamela Den Besten (UCSF)
Sandy Faber (UCSC)
Todd Franke (UCLA)
Manuela Martins-Green (UCR)
Gershon Shafir (UCSD)
Vicki Smith (UCD)
Frederic Wan (UCI)
Sheldon Zedeck (UCB)
Lawrence Pitts, Academic Council Chair
George Blumenthal, Academic Council Vice Chair
Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Executive Director
Micki Conklin, Committee Analyst

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) met a total of eight times during the 2003-2004 academic year. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Reviews of Proposed Graduate Degree Programs

One of CCGA's primary responsibilities is to review all campus proposals for new graduate degree programs. A total of 13 proposals were forwarded to CCGA for review during the academic year. The following table is a summary of actions of these proposals as of August 2004.

Program Proposed	Disposition
UCD, Ph.D. in Linguistics	Approved 10/7/03
UCI/CSULA/CSULB/ CPP with newly added CSUF Joint Ed.D.	Approved 11/4/03
UCSD, Ed.D.	Approved 12/3/03
UCDS, M.A.S. in Marine Biodiversity and Conservation	Approved 1/4/04
UCSF, M.S./D.P.T. Physical Therapy	Approved 1/6/04
UCSC, D.M.A. in Music Composition	Approved 3/16/04
UCSC, M.A. in Social Documentation	Approved 3/16/04
UCSC, M.A./Ph.D. in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology	Approved 3/24/04
UCSC, M.A./Ph.D. in Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology	Approved 3/24/04
UCSB, M.A./Ph.D. in Film Studies	Approved 4/14/04
UCD, M.A.S. in Maternal and Child Nutrition	Approved 4/15/04
UCSD/SDSU/CSUSM, Joint Ed.D. Degree	Approved 5/11/04
UCR, M.A./Ph.D. Religious Studies	In Progress

CCGA also reviewed and approved proposals to reconstitute, change an existing graduate program or unit, and establish a new school. These included:

- UC Irvine proposal to reconstitute the College of Medicine as the College of Health Sciences
- UCLA request to change the name of the School of Public Policy and Social Research to the School of Public Affairs
- UC Davis proposal to establish a Graduate School of the Environment

Budget Crisis and Graduate Education

The effect of the budget crisis resulted in numerous discussions about the impact on graduate education. In the present fiscal environment, CCGA was extremely concerned about the lack of understanding towards graduate education that seems to exist among legislators and the public. The committee was also concerned about the consequences this misunderstanding might have for graduate funding and fees. CCGA took a strong position that increases to graduate fees and non-resident tuition will inevitably decrease

the accessibility and appeal of this highest level of education. The committee maintained that increases in graduate fees and tuition is a major hurdle in UC's ability to attract high quality students. UC struggles to compete with other major research universities across the nation and world to recruit the best graduate students, and every increase in fees reduces UC's competitiveness. CCGA also argued that the quality of graduate education also has profound and hidden ramifications for our state's economy.

In several letters to the Academic Council, the committee tried to highlight importance of graduate education to the State of California. Members advocated committing more fundraising efforts to the needs of graduate education and increasing public awareness about the critical value for the economic and educational advancement of the state and its citizens. Graduate education at UC should be promoted as a profound contributor to the state's industrial, economic, agricultural, and service infrastructure. To ensure the quality and excellence of graduate education and continue driving the California economy forward, the UC graduate enterprise must remain competitive with other institutions in the world.

CCGA members were very disturbed by the budget compact with the Governor which agreed to a 50% differential between undergraduate and graduate fees. The committee will continue to stress the importance of UC's ability to maintain high caliber graduate programs and attract high quality graduate students. The contributions of graduate students help to form an essential component of the University's reputation and are important contributors to the vitality and economy of the State of California. Members also suggested.

Applied or Professional Doctorates

This year, CCGA had several discussions about the challenges UC is facing with the proliferation of applied doctorates, also referred to as professional doctorates. Applied doctorates blend clinical and research components and concentrate on the practice of a discipline in a professional field. Recognizing that they are uniquely different than PhD degrees, CCGA developed separate guidelines for reviewing applied degree program proposal, which were incorporated into the CCGA Handbook. With last year's approval of two applied doctorates - audiology (AuD) and physical therapy (DPT) – there were concerns that professional associations were elevating entry-level certification to require doctoral-level training. This raised questions about whether degree inflation was a result of an expanding knowledge base in applied fields or an attempt by professional organizations to increase the status of practitioners. In discussions, CCGA concluded that changes in degree requirements should be subject to a rigorous academic review to determine whether doctoral level training is educationally justified. Noting that many applied doctorates are joint degrees with CSU, CCGA also discussed UC's continued role in offered applied doctorate degrees. In many professional fields, CSU has significant master's level programs and has expressed a desire to offer the applied doctorate independently, which is contrary to its role under the Master Plan. CCGA briefly outlined these issues in a letter to Academic Council, which was ultimately forwarded to the Provost.

Graduate Instructional Activities

In reviewing the Report of the Task Force on Instructional Activities, CCGA commented that the report seemed primarily aimed at undergraduate teaching and did not address the complexities of graduate education. Subsequently, the Academic Council requested that CCGA develop alternative metrics for recording faculty activities that more accurately reflected graduate level instruction. A CCGA subcommittee produced several possible algorithms to quantify the broad range of instructional activities associated with the mentor-apprentice-based system of graduate education. The committee also outlined several guidelines to consider when viewing the graduate educational enterprise.

Review of Other Policies and Issues

During the course of the year, the committee also reviewed and commented on the following issues and proposals:

- Report of the Graduate and Professional School Admissions Task Force
- Proposed New Policy on Conflicts of Interest Created by Consensual Relationships & Proposed
- Revised Policy on Sexual Harassment and Procedures for Responding to Reports of Sexual Harassment
- Course approval for off-campus graduate courses
- Report of the Professorial Step System Task Force
- 15-Year MRU Review Reports: Pacific Rim Research Program and Humanities Research Institute
- UCPB Resolution on Graduate Student Support
- UCPB Report on Restructuring the MRU Review Process

Respectfully submitted:

Kent Erickson, Chair (D)

Quentin Williams, Vice Chair (SC)

Michael Hanemann (B)

Trish Berger (D)

Matthew Foreman (I)

William Roy (LA)

Xuan Liu (R)

James Posakony (SD)

Grayson Marshall (SF)

Gale Morrison (SB)

Bruce Schumm (SC)

Edward Sheen (graduate student)

Emily Hung, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY (UCEP)
2003-2004 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) met seven times during Academic Year 2003-04 to conduct its business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 170 and in the University-wide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (the "Compendium"). The major activities of the committee and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

The Budget Crisis and its Effect on Enrollment. UCEP held ongoing discussions related to the state and university budget crisis. In November, the committee submitted comments to Council analyzing potential options that were being considered to address the legislature's decision not to fund new enrollment growth. The committee outlined several possible approaches, and ultimately favored managing enrollment yield at the level of campus acceptance rates rather than at eligibility. The committee also proposed a set of principles that it felt should guide the decision-making process, emphasizing above all continued adherence to the Master Plan for Higher Education and the preservation of educational and instructional quality. Finally, UCEP members' aggregate ranking of 17 options to limit enrollment were tabulated into a Senatwide "score card" total.

State Budget Mandate on Higher Fees. In a February letter to Council, UCEP spoke against the possible implementation of a state budget mandate to charge higher fees for students who exceed by more than 10% the minimum number of credit units required for graduation. The committee remarked that the mandate was poor educational policy, and could hurt students with double majors, those who enter UC with Advanced Placement or community college credits, and pre-med and engineering majors who routinely need an additional semester to complete their degrees. UCEP also disagreed with estimates that the mandate would save \$9.4 million. However, UCEP recommended that if UC was forced to implement the mandate, the university should adhere to four principles that would be least harmful to the educational mission of the university. Council unanimously approved UCEP's principles, and a summary document was forwarded to President Dynes.

Disenrollment. On two occasions, UCEP submitted comments to Council on the option of disenrolling students subject to dismissal for poor academic performance or failure to meet minimum progress. In a January letter, UCEP noted the importance of student progress, but objected to stricter application of disenrollment rules as a means to solve the university's financial problems. The committee asked that campus Senates take steps to involve themselves more in gathering data and monitoring the issue. Later, the committee learned that most campuses do not regularly keep data on the issue, although UCEP did review data from one campus indicating a high number of students subject to dismissal and a correspondingly low dismissal rate. In a June letter to Council, UCEP asked that each campus Committee on Educational Policy require a systematic, annual reporting from the Deans on the numbers of students in various probationary categories,

and report that data to UCEP. Next year, UCEP plans to study these system-wide numbers and convey a set of recommendations to Academic Council.

Impediments to Intercampus Course Enrollment through SR 544. UCEP developed a document affirming the value of Senate Regulation 544, which was crafted with the help of UC Director of Intercampus Academic Program Coordination, Julie Gordon. UCEP expressed concern that not all campuses had developed a mechanism to actually implement 544, which gives students the right to enroll concurrently and receive credit for courses taken on UC campuses other than their own; that the opportunity is not widely known; and that other obstacles impede its use beyond a case-by-case basis. UCEP's document affirmed the principle that the university should strive to minimize barriers to students taking maximum advantage of educational opportunities and resources. It described various impediments to course sharing and proposed ways to better publicize the opportunity and to strengthen existing procedures and regulations, including policy related to faculty and student credit, the course enrollment and approval process, and the role of the registrar. Academic Council endorsed UCEP's SR 544 document, and forwarded it to the Provost for distribution to campuses.

Distance Learning and Hybrid Courses. UCEP met with Robert Blake and Kathleen Dillon, Director and Associate Director of the UC Consortium for Language, Learning and Teaching, a system-wide initiative that also depends upon the smooth implementation of SR 544. The Consortium aims to preserve language resources and enhance cross-campus student access to the less commonly taught languages through course sharing technologies like the Internet and videoconferencing. UCEP endorsed the concept of technology-enabled distance learning, and the notion that such instructional models can give students a wider range of curricular options. UCEP also reviewed two procedural documents used by two local Committees on Courses when reviewing and approving courses with a "hybrid" instructional format using an online or distance component. UCEP members distributed these procedures to their campus committees as examples on which to base local versions.

Senate Regulation 630. Academic Council approved a UCEP request to grant a variance to the residency requirement for students in the UC Sacramento Pilot Program (UCCS), which makes the UCCS exception identical to that for the Education Abroad and UC Washington Center programs. The UCR Office of Student Academic Affairs also asked UCEP to consider changing Regulation 630 to allow for specific residency policy to be set at the local level, but UCEP decided it did not see a compelling reason to relax or get rid of the requirement in favor of local control. Finally, UCEP asked Council to eliminate SR 630b, which provides an out-of-date exception to the residency requirement for students in Colleges of Engineering.

Reports on Faculty Instructional Activities. In December, UCEP commented on two reports produced by the Faculty Instructional Activity Task Force. The committee endorsed the value of a new system to report faculty instructional activities to the legislature in a more comprehensive and accurate way, clarifying the diversity of ways UC faculty deliver education and instruction. Members also consulted with their local

COCIs about how those committees would work with campus registrars in implementing the new system of course categorization.

Transfer Articulation. UCEP discussed two proposed state senate bills affecting articulation and transfer agreements among California colleges and universities, as well as some negative impressions, confusion and problems involved in transfer to UC. Eric Taggart, director of ASSIST (Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer), joined UCEP by phone to discuss his work and UC's possible participation in the California Articulation Number Board (CAN). UCEP sent a memo to ICAS in support of UC's participation in CAN at the level of writing extended course descriptors and by using the descriptors to the greatest extent possible to define what is expected of transfers.

UCEP Review of Domestic Off Site Academic Programs. UCEP agreed to a Council request to accept as part of the committee's charge the review and approval of university-wide domestic academic programs and courses. This includes but is not restricted to such courses and programs as UCCS, UCDC, and the language consortium, and UCEP approval would come only after a course has gone through the approval process at the home campus of record. UCEP approval will preserve faculty input, but will save the time and resources needed to shop a proposal around to each campus. Council approved language for the bylaw changes that will enable the implementation of this approval process. The bylaw change will go to Assembly next year.

Alignment of Campus Calendars. In November, UCEP resubmitted to Council a previous year's recommendation that quarter-based campuses align their calendars and semester-based campuses align theirs. The committee argued that calendar alignment would save UC resources, promote intercampus cooperation and facilitate more efficient use of fully funded summer sessions, Education Abroad, and multicampus programs like UCDC and UC Center in Sacramento, as well as greater use of simultaneous intercampus enrollment via Regulation 544. Calendar alignment would broaden educational opportunity and work for the general educational benefit of all students. Council unanimously endorsed UCEP's sentiments and forwarded a recommendation to the Provost. In August, the committee developed and submitted a lengthier, more formal recommendation, which it expects Council to review, endorse and forward to the administration.

Report of the Professorial Step System Task Force. UCEP discussed the Step System Task Force Report in the context of its educational policy implications—the positive or negative influence the UC personnel system can have on faculty morale and teaching effectiveness. UCEP members were split in their support of the Task Force's recommendation to eliminate the barrier step review, but said the University should have the best possible system, one that keeps faculty active and productive over time and avoids unnecessary disincentives to their full engagement in educational delivery.

Additional business: UCEP regarded its charge and purview broadly, taking the view that the majority of Senate issues have at least some educational policy implications. UCEP also issued formal responses on the following:

- BOARS' Proposed New Eligibility Criteria.
- UCPB Resolution on Graduate Student Support.
- Comments to BOARS about a UCD professor's request to add Earth and Space Sciences to the Core Subject List.
- Comments about a UCOPE proposal to set a maximum class size for the entry-level writing requirement.
- UCAAD's revisions to APM 210, 240, 245.
- Review of APM 278 and 279 – Clinical Professor Series.
- Proposed Revised Family Friendly Policies – APM 133, 210, 220, 760.
- Proposed Policies on Sexual Harassment and Conflicts of Interest Created by Consensual Relationships.
- UCD proposal for a Graduate School of the Environment.
- UCLA request for a variance to Senate Regulation 764.
- UCI proposal to reconstitute its College of Medicine as the School of Medicine.
- UCLA request to change the name of its School of Public Policy.
- Academic Senate Proposal for Online Posting of Committee Minutes.

Other: UCEP also discussed issues related to buy-out policy and sabbatical accrual, UC Merced Planning, the business of Academic Council, Academic Assembly and ICAS, and the work of campus Committees on Educational Policy and Courses of Instruction.

UCEP Representation: UCEP's Chair represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, the Academic Assembly, Academic Planning Council, the UCDC Steering Committee, the AP Honors Task Force, and the Implementation Task Force for Faculty Instructional Workload. The Vice-Chair represented UCEP on the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) and the UC Merced Task Force. Finally, UCEP nominated one of its members for service on the Academic Council Special Committee on Scholarly Communications.

Acknowledgements: UCEP would like to extend thanks to UCOP consultants Julius Zelmanowitz, Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives and Julie Gordon, Director of Intercampus Academic Program Coordination for their consistently valuable contributions. UCOP also consulted with and/or received reports from: Dennis Gallagani, Associate VP, Student Academic Services; Lawrence Pitts, Academic Senate Vice Chair; and María Bertero-Barceló, Academic Council Executive Director. UCEP also thanks alternates Richard Hughey (UCSC), and Gregg Herken (UCM) for their service.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Alvarez-Cohen (B), Chair
Joseph Kiskis (D), Vice-Chair
J. Keith Gillless (B)
David Bunch (D)

Robert Newcomb (I)
David Rigby (LA)
Harry Green (R)
Richard Arneson (SD)

Mike Winter (SF)
Denise Segura (SB)
Donald Brenneis (SC)
Anne Kelley (M) (*non-voting*)
Lawrence Pitts (Member *ex officio*, as
Chair of Academic Council)
Ivy Lee (Graduate student, SF)
Christine Gagnier (Undergraduate student, I)
Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) met eight times during the 2003-2004 academic year. Three of the meetings were held by videoconference with sites at UCOP, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles and San Diego. Videoconferencing saves travel expense (to the Senate) and travel time (of committee members). A major focus of UCFW has been to protect the integrity of existing benefits including retirement systems. This year's committee pursued initiatives from 2002-03 and developed new proposals.

UCFW has two focused working groups: TFIR (Task Force on Investment and Retirement) and HCTF (Health Care Task Force). Retirement benefits and health care benefits are by far the largest -- in dollar terms and in personal importance --- of all UC non-salary benefits. These focused task forces are essential to the successful function of UCFW, doing the time-consuming homework needed to keep in touch with developments in these areas.

UCFW Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR). Under the chairmanship of Robert Anderson (UCB), TFIR drafted two resolutions that were endorsed by the full committee. The first opposes any change to UCRP that would reduce benefits --- including projected benefits --- for current UC employees and annuitants, and the second recommends the retention/inclusion of private equity investments in UC-managed funds available within the 403(b) Plan and projected 457(b) Plan. The first resolution was introduced to Academic Council for information only without a request for a Council resolution. The second resolution received the endorsement of the Academic Council and was forwarded to the Office of the President (UCOP). TIFR continues to monitor the financial effect on UCRP of possible separation of the National Laboratories. TFIR has also consulted closely with UCOP on the development of the 457(b) Plan tax-deferred savings plan, to be introduced toward the end of 2004.

UCFW Health Care Task Force (HCTF). The Health Care Task Force consults with UCOP on the rapidly changing health care marketplace and on health care coverage for UC faculty and staff. This year the task force, co-chaired by Harold Simon (UCSD) and Robert May (UCI), has continued this important work with a focus on maintaining affordable health care premiums and investigating possible cost saving options for prescription drug plans. HCTF consults regularly with UCOP on health insurance premiums and the structure and availability of health care programs. In 2002-03 HCTF and UCFW recommended graduating health insurance premiums by salary beginning in calendar year 2004. On the recommendation of HCTF and UCFW, the Academic Council agreed to post an explanation of the tiered health care premium structure on the System-wide Senate website.

Educational Fee Waiver Program. UCFW continued to pursue the implementation of an educational fee waiver for qualified children, spouses, and domestic partners of all UC faculty, and eligible employees. The committee has recommended the fee waiver since 1999, and the Academic Council recommended it to the President in 2000 and in 2002. In light of the current budgetary situation, UCFW proposed a resolution this year recommending gradual implementation to keep initial costs low. The resolution received the unanimous support of the Academic Council and it was forwarded to President Dynes. UCFW regards a fee waiver benefit as an important element in the recruitment and retention of faculty, a prevailing standard of faculty compensation at leading American research universities, and a means of partially mitigating the lack of salary increases for

both faculty and staff. In his letter of response, the President endorsed the concept of the fee waiver while noting that the University was not in a position to implement a fee waiver program at this time. It is the committee's belief that this is a dimension in which the University of California can and should be competitive with its peers.

Model Plan for Faculty Recalled for Post-Retirement Teaching. UCFW has long sought a phased retirement option for UC faculty. Discussions on this subject with the UC Council of Vice-Chancellors (COVC) were a principal focus of the committee in 2002-03 under the direction of chair Mark Traugott. This year, 2003-04, the COVC and UCFW agreed on a model retirement recall plan. UCFW's Resolution on a Model Recall Plan, was unanimously adopted by the Academic Council and sent to Administration in May with a recommendation for immediate implementation. The Model Plan states a norm, but includes flexible language allowing actual recall agreements to differ. The plan provides for a pre-retirement recall agreement of several years duration with compensation proportional to salary prior to retirement and with continuing range adjustment. The introduction of this plan is made possible by the change in UCRP's "Normal Retirement Age" to age 60. This allows campus administrations and faculty 60 years of age or older to agree to binding recall arrangements in advance of retirement. It is anticipated that the Model Recall Plan will become recommended University policy before the end of this year.

Revision to APM 120 – Emeritus Titles. A new initiative rectifies an anomaly in the APM governing the conferral of the emeritus title. Current rules are that faculty members who retire at the Associate and Professor levels are automatically conferred the title *Professor Emeritus*. Those who separate from the University on UCRP disability status do not qualify because, at the time of their separation, they are not officially retired. These faculty are not currently automatically accorded the title when they actually retire. The Academic Council unanimously endorsed UCFW's proposed amendment to APM 120-Emeritus Title. It would automatically grant the title *Professor Emeritus* to faculty members who retire from the University while on UCRP disability status. The Administration is in the process of amending the APM to incorporate this change.

Faculty Home Loan Programs/Faculty Housing. At the request of Academic Council, UCFW reviewed and submitted a report on the adequacy of UC's Faculty Home Loan Programs. The committee found that the Mortgage Origination Program (MOP), funded by the Regents and administered by UCOP is working well. It provides floating rate first mortgage loans limited by 90% loan-to-value and 40% mortgage payment-to-income restrictions. Campuses reported that the availability of MOP loans is very helpful in faculty recruitment and retention. Nevertheless, in high housing cost markets (most UC locations), the loan-to-value and mortgage payment-to-income restrictions may make the size of the MOP loans inadequate to purchase suitable housing, especially for junior faculty appointees. UCFW found that funding for the Supplemental Home Loan Program (SHLP) --- funded by the campuses --- is severely limited and the committee recommended that the campuses and UCOP consider ways to increase the available funding for this program. Since the committee filed its report, the UC Office of Home Loans has introduced several new loan programs: forty-year MOP loans, SHLP loans (subject to funding) at interest rates keyed to some of the lowest prevailing market rates, and graduated payment MOP loans. UCFW recommended that information on these options be made widely available. In a follow-up to its report to Council, the committee held an in-depth discussion on affordable faculty housing at its July meeting. Housing continues to be a major problem in faculty recruitment for most UC campuses (at some campuses a critical problem).

Suggestions for Future UC Budget Allocations. Academic Council asked Senate committees to submit budget priorities for coming years. UCFW's chief recommendation is restoring and

maintaining competitive faculty salaries. Competitive salaries go to the quality of the faculty and hence sustaining the role of the University of California as a leading research university. The committee also made a number of additional recommendations: educational fee waiver for dependents of UC employees, University funding of health care premiums, University funding of UCRP contributions (when contributions resume), child care for children of UC faculty, pre-funding of retiree health care benefits, and expanded programs for faculty home ownership. The committee made it clear that none of these additional recommendations should distract from the singular importance of restoring and maintaining competitive faculty salaries.

In response to requests for comment from the Academic Council, UCFW submitted its views on:

- University-wide Task Force on Faculty Instructional Activities
- Senate Bylaw 355 to comply with Whistleblower Policies
- Policy on Conflicts of Interest Resulting from Consensual Relations
- Sexual Harassment Policy
- Health Sciences Faculty Retirement Proposal
- Revised APM-Family Friendly Policies
- University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD)'s Proposed Revisions to APM 210, 240 and 245
- Proposed and New APM Policies for the Clinical Professor Series and the Community Health Professor Series
- Step VI Task Force Report
- Nomination to UCRS Advisory Board

Acknowledgment. UCFW wishes to acknowledge and thank the following members of the Administration for their willingness to consult regularly with the committee: Joseph Mullinix, Senior Vice President-Business and Finance; Lawrence Hershman, Vice President-Budget; Judy Boyette, Associate Vice President-HR&B; David Russ, University Treasurer; Ellen Switkes, Assistant Vice President-Academic Advancement; Michele French, Executive Director-HR&B Policy and Program Design; Jill Slocum, Coordinator- Health Science Compensation. In addition we thank the System-wide Senate staff for meticulous intensive administration and assistance: Maria Bertero-Barcelo (Academic Senate Director), Betty Marton (UCFW Analyst), Kimberly Peterson (HCTF Analyst).

Respectfully submitted,

Ross Starr, Chair (SD)

John Oakley, Vice Chair (D)

S. Katharine Hammond (B)

Jim Chalfant and Elizabeth Constable (D)

Douglas Haynes (I)

Marvin Alkin (LA)

Raymond Russell (R)

George Gregory (SF)

Roger Anderson (SC)

Steven Gross (SB)

Robert Anderson, UCRS Board

Carol Zytowski, CUCEA

Members-at-Large:

Daniel Mitchell (LA)

Harold Simon (HCTF Co-chair)

Robert May (HCTF Co-chair)

Betty Marton, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY (ITTP)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-04**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Under Senate Bylaw 155, the University Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy (ITTP) is charged with representing the Senate in all matters of instruction and research policy involving the use of information technology and telecommunications and advising the President concerning the acquisition and use of information and telecommunications technology.

ITTP held three regular meetings and two teleconferences during the 2003-04 academic year. Highlights of the committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Sharing Campus Practices

Members reported on the structure and activities of their divisional committees. The committee concluded that there is great value in sharing campus practices and experiences. ITTP intends to explore the ways in which the committee can increase the awareness and propagation of best practices. It is vital that ITTP have a full membership (representatives from each of the campuses and student representatives) so that the committee can be informed of the activities and perspectives of all the campuses and effectively propagate best practices across the system.

Committee Projects

The committee identified several key IT-related topics to explore in-depth. Several members volunteered to research these topics and present reports to the committee for discussion and recommendations.

IT Funding Allocations

The committee is currently conducting a historical assessment of the variances in IT resources funding across campuses. With the assistance of our consultants from the Office of Information Resources & Communications, data has been gathered from a variety of sources in order to evaluate the IT budgets for each campus. ITTP's intention for gathering and analyzing this information is to create a model that will allow a better understanding and comparison of the IT budgets for the campuses.

Status: ITTP's analysis of campus IT funding allocations will continue during the 2004-05 academic year.

Instructional Technology

There is currently no system-wide committee or office that specifically focuses on instructional technology. The ITTP committee is currently creating a central source of information about the different instructional technology projects and initiatives on each campus.

Status: Information continues to be gathered on campus projects, support and other resources (e.g., a designated statewide funding stream) for instructional technology. The committee plans

this fall to invite a representative from UC's Information Technology Learning Center to discuss system-wide projects and resources. ITTP is also considering making recommendations for central coordination and faculty inclusion in instructional technology efforts since the Academic Senate has authority and supervisory responsibility over courses and curricula.

Open Source

A report outlining UC policies current being applied to open source issues was presented at the March 12th meeting of the committee. Issues from both the Office of Technology Transfer (OTT) and faculty viewpoints were compared, and problems with federal export control regulations and contracts and grants, as related to open source, were also identified. There seems to be a lack of uniformity in the way policies regarding open source are applied on the different campuses.

Status: ITTP outlined three recommendations for possible action regarding the open source licensing issues and plans to invite a representative from the system-wide Office of Technology Transfer to discuss these recommendations in the fall:

1. Request the new UC leadership to formalize in an official policy the spirit and principles outlined in President Richard Atkinson's January 30, 2002 letter on computer code distribution, which is provided in OTT Operating Guidance Memo No. 02-02 (<http://patron.ucop.edu/ottmemos/docs/ott02-02.html>).
2. Ask that the OTTs be reminded of the principles outlined in President Atkinson's letter.
3. Encourage the University to not impede allowing open source language in contracts and grants when the granting agencies indicate that they are willing to accept open source deliverables.

SPAM

Campuses and departments are employing a variety of methods to reduce spam and defend against the problems that spam causes to servers. Approaches to spam reduction often involve several principles: user sovereignty, user flexibility, minimal disruption, and multi-layer defense. UC's responses to spam are constrained by the diverse email client software, greatly varying sophistication of users, and academic freedom. This combination of factors makes it unlikely that a single, consistent approach to spam reduction will be adopted across the UC system in the near future.

Status: ITTP will continue to monitor the issue of spam and the methods employed for dealing with this problem.

Student Technology Fees

As budget cuts to higher education are increasing nationally, the number of colleges and universities charging student IT fees are on the rise. A technology fee, however, does not currently exist as one of UC's approved categories of system-wide student fees. Demands by students for increased access to new technologies (e.g., wireless access) have prompted some UC campuses and departments to seek out ways in which they can charge these technology fees. The ITTP committee determined that there are currently three different processes through which a student IT fee can be approved at UC:

1. The UC system can institute a student IT fee by obtaining approval from the Regents for a new system-wide fee.
2. A campus can institute a student IT fee by obtaining formal approval from the students for a campus-wide fee.
3. A college, school or department can institute a student IT fee by obtaining approval from the Chancellor for a “course materials fee” for which there is a formal application and approval process. This is the venue now followed by one UC campus for a course fee to support IT in a majority of undergraduate courses.

Status: UC campuses should consider a course fee comparable to IT fees already being charged by other academic institutions to better provide for the rising IT support expectations from students and faculty.

Wireless Policy

Almost all of the UC campuses are implementing some form of wireless, but these efforts are primarily occurring on an ad hoc basis. The committee, in discussion with our consultants and invited guests, began outlining the various issues that need to be considered by a campus before implementing wireless (e.g., ensuring future upgradeability, balancing access management and security).

Status: The 2004-05 ITTP committee will consider developing a white paper outlining a vision and guidelines for the future of UC wireless.

Consultation with the Administration

Kristine Hafner, Associate Vice President of Information Resources and Communications, and David Wasley, Assistant to the Associate Vice President for Information Infrastructure Planning, serve as consultants to the ITTP committee. Members of the committee, in their roles as ITTP representatives, also engaged in regular consultation with their campus Chief Information Officers and other IT-related administrators. This interaction with the administration has been invaluable to the committee by providing a conduit of timely information and resources.

The committee was regularly updated on system-wide activities by the ITTP Chair and consultants from the Office of Information Resources and Communications. The committee is very satisfied with the work of IR&C and continues to be briefed on the following items:

- Plans for the University to transition from a paper-based to an electronic effort reporting system for federal awards.
- Actions taken by the UC campuses to deal with illegal file-sharing of copyrighted materials.
- Efforts of the Information Technology Infrastructure Task Force to develop a resource framework to project a model of the University’s long-term infrastructure investment needs for IT.
- Activities of the Information Technology Leadership Council, an organization of UC’s chief information officers and other senior information technology leaders, to address common IT challenges for the UC campuses (<http://www.ucop.edu/irc/itlc/>).

- Implementation of a pilot project of the Identity Management Work Group to create an infrastructure for federated authentication of UC employees and students for the use of system-wide applications and services (<http://www.ucop.edu/irc/itlc/ucfedauth/>).
- Participation of several UC campuses (Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles and Merced) in the Educational Partners Program of the Sakai Project, a collaborative project that is focusing on the development of open source interfaced instructional technology tools for use by higher education institutions (<http://www.sakaiproject.org>).
- Strategic sourcing activities occurring at the University in an effort to produce savings through the establishment of system-wide vendor contract agreements for software and hardware (<http://www.ucop.edu/irc/agree.html>). Committee members provided the IR&C consultants with suggestions to increase faculty awareness and use of system-wide vendor agreements – develop a website that: (1) has an easy to remember address (e.g., software.ucop.edu), (2) gives faculty a simple process to purchase the software/hardware under the vendor agreements, and (3) allows feedback on the types of additional agreements that are needed.

Invited Guests

ITTP invited several guests in addition to their regular consultants to inform the committee about IT-related issues. These special guests and their topics included:

Digital Libraries

Peter Brantley, Director of Technology of the California Digital Library (CDL), spoke to ITTP about the CDL and new digital service architectures. Information was provided on the evolution and future of digital libraries, the CDL's current services and technologies, and the development of future services and technologies.

Export Control Regulations

Barbara Yoder, Policy Development Administrator for the Research Administration Office, presented an overview and specific examples of federal export control regulations to the committee. Administrator Yoder answered the committee's questions on how these export controls affect IT-related areas of research and equipment, as well as how policies on open source apply to an exemption from licensing regulations allowed for "publicly available" technical data.

Wireless Implementation

Michael Kleeman, Research Associate for the Berkeley Roundtable on the International Economy (BRIE), joined ITTP for a discussion on wireless implementation issues and policy. The committee was informed of the various standards for wireless implementation, the evolution of this technology, and the pros and cons of the different wireless protocols. Examples were provided of various institutions that had implemented wide area coverage of wireless, the costs and plans for this implementation, and the problems they've experienced.

Formal Recommendations

ITTP transmitted formal responses and recommendations to the Academic Council on the following issues:

- Academic Senate website posting policy for committee documents

ITTP Representation

The ITTP Chair serves as a faculty representative to the Information Technology Leadership Council (ITLC) and as an ex-officio member of the University Committee on Library (UCOL).

Acknowledgment

ITTP is grateful for the invaluable contributions made by its consultants from the Office of Information Resources and Communications: Associate Vice President Kristine Hafner and Assistant to the Associate Vice President David Wasley.

Respectfully submitted:

Alfonso Cardenas, Chair (LA)

Kenneth Goldberg (B)

Caroline Bledsoe (D)

Lisa Naugle (I)

Curt Burgess (R)

Andrew B. Kahng (SD)

Michael Brook (SF)

Kevin Almeroth (SB)

Kimberly Peterson, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY (UCOL)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Under Senate Bylaw 185, the University Committee on Library (UCOL) is charged with advising the President concerning the administration of the libraries of the University in accordance with the Standing Orders of the Regents. UCOL met once during the 2003-2004 academic year. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Campus Reports

UCOL members reported on the activities of the divisional academic senate library committees. The primary topics of concern for the campus committees this year have been budget cuts to the libraries and scholarly communications issues (e.g., the economics of scholarly publications, alternative means of publishing). Members shared ideas and best practices for dealing with various issues related to the libraries and scholarly communications.

Information Literacy

Linda Kennedy, President of the Librarians' Association of the University of California (LAUC), provided the committee with a report on LAUC's information literacy developments. The LAUC Task Force on Information Literacy has completed its work, and as a result has adopted a statement defining and affirming the importance of information literacy instruction, and which emphasizes the role of librarians, collaboration with faculty, and the library's role in instruction. LAUC is considering encouraging, through a grants program, projects in the area of information literacy.

UCOL members reported on the information literacy efforts being conducted on their campuses. A few of the members have discussed the information literacy issue and possible options for implementing solutions to the problem with their committees. Several of the campus libraries have also been active in informing the faculty and students of information literacy resources (e.g., information literacy exhibit).

Shared Collections

LAUC President Linda Kennedy informed members of her involvement as the chair of a committee on shared government collections. The committee determined that sharing every single title was not entirely feasible and that the libraries should instead concentrate on sharing large, widely used titles (e.g., journals). It is also important to allow each campus to make its own decision whether to rely on a shared copy or acquire its own. The campuses are currently conducting a pilot project in sharing government collections.

Joint Meeting with University Librarians

UCOL met jointly with the University Librarians for half a day. The University Librarians presented the following topics to UCOL for information and recommendations:

Strategic Planning for Libraries and Scholarly Information

The System-wide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC) has drafted a strategic plan for the libraries and scholarly information. This plan identifies five strategic directions for the UC libraries and scholarly information:

1. Collection Management and Coordination
2. Shared Facilities
3. Shared Services
4. Persistent Access to Digital Information
5. Scholarly Communication

The University Librarians plan to publish this strategic plan when it has been finalized. Short summaries aimed at specific target audiences (e.g., faculty, library staff) will accompany the final document.

Scholarly Communication

A summary of the outcome of the Elsevier negotiations was presented. While this short-term problem has been solved, the next step is to deal with the long-term problems with the nature of scholarly communication. The regional faculty forums on scholarly communication produced a variety of helpful input. From these discussions, four priorities have been identified:

1. Expand and extend current infrastructure, encouraging innovation (eScholarship and partnership with UC Press).
2. Expand communication efforts; seize attention and aggressively forward information about the costs, cost distribution, and economic service interdependencies among the university libraries in their selection, acquisition, processing, management, and provision of access to the university's library collections.
3. Establish selection principles that account for scholarly value and economic sustainability and operate according to them.
4. Build expertise within and across the university libraries; create a network of highly engaged and informed library staff to shape and support system-wide as well as campus-based efforts.

Regional Library Facility Planning

The Regional Library Facilities (RLFs) Task Force is preparing a final report for the University Librarians. This report identifies key issues for the RLFs, identifies the working group most appropriate to address each issue, and makes specific recommendations where appropriate. One purpose of the report is to provide justification for expansion of the facilities, since, for example, it is projected that the South RLF will have reached full capacity by 2006.

Effects of Budget Cuts on the UC Libraries

The University Librarians presented to the UCOL members the effects of and actions taken as a result of the budget cuts from the last two years. Many of the campus libraries have received significant cuts to their permanent budgets and have had to layoff staff. A few of the libraries received some offset funding from enrollment growth allocations, however UC will not receive enrollment growth funding from the state in the coming year. Some Chancellors have protected the libraries by absorbing some of the general budget cuts. It is not yet clear how the future budget cuts will translate on the campuses, but all of the libraries anticipate significant reductions in their funding allocations.

UCOL Representation

UCOL is also represented on the University Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy – the UCOL Chair is an *ex officio* member of ITTP.

Acknowledgment

UCOL wishes to acknowledge the contributions of its administrative consultants: Karen Butter, Chair, University Librarians; Daniel Greenstein, Associate Vice Provost for Scholarly Information, University Librarian for System-wide Library Planning, and Executive Director of the California Digital Library; Linda Kennedy, LAUC President; and Gary Lawrence, Director, Library Planning & Policy Development.

Respectfully submitted:

Abdelmonem A. Afifi (LA), Chair
Elaine Tennant (B)
Raymond Waddington (D)
Lamar M. Hill (I)
Eugene N. Anderson (R)
Andrew Mizisin (SD)
Martin London (SF)
Wolf Kittler (SB)
Ben Crow (SC)
Bridget Smith (Graduate Student, UCB)
Kimberly Peterson, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)
ANNUAL REPORT for 2003-2004**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

UCPB met seven times in the 2003-2004 session. The major activities of the committee and the issues it addressed during the year are noted in the following report.

The State Budget

The impact of the proposed state budget in its various stages throughout the year was the chief focus of the committee in these related discussions and actions:

Consultations with UCOP. UCPB was regularly briefed on the state budget process and outlook, including the transition of administration, gubernatorial and legislative actions, analysis of the state's fiscal situation, and the development of the compact with the governor.

Budget Proposal. UCPB's proposal "*Increasing Access and Sustaining Excellence*" was revised and updated to pertain to the current budgetary situation, and was endorsed by Council in December 2003.

Enrollment Management Options and Academic Senate Statement on the Budget. In response to proposed cuts in enrollment funding, and at the request of Council, UCPB held in-depth discussions of possible options for managing enrollment and formulated a set of principles for the implementation of possible enrollment options. The outcome of these deliberations were incorporated into what would eventually become the Senate's May 2004 "Resolution on California's Budget Crisis and the University of California."

Graduate Education Support. The committee discussed at length the ramifications of proposed increases in graduate student fees, including the relative costs of hiring postdoctoral scholars as opposed to supporting and training RAs and TAs, the role of international students, and the essential role of graduate education in maintaining UC's research mission. In a related action, UCPB drafted a *Resolution on Graduate Student Support*, calling for tuition and fee remissions associated with teaching assistantships to be treated as benefit expenses to be charged to instructional budgets along with the costs of the teaching assistantships themselves, and for financial aid to be allocated to campuses with due regard to graduate student enrollments.

Budget Priorities. In light of the eventual compact with the Governor promising a certain level of funding in coming years, UCPB formulated a list of Budget Priorities for Planning Purposes, setting at highest priority, salaries and benefits and support for graduate education.

Other UCOP Consultations

UCPB was updated on the revised Enrollment Handbook and on follow up to last year's Report of the Task Force on Faculty Instructional Activities. The committee was also briefed on a possible change in the formula used for payout of the endowment pool, which would keep the payout constant and move with the market, rather than the current formula based on a 60 month moving average.

Multi-campus Research Units

MRU Review Process. Last year, UCPB initiated a consideration of the MRU review structure and this year charged a subcommittee with developing specific recommendations on how to improve and restructure the MRU review procedure, including: making the review more useful and informative; distinguishing among the types of MRUs; and developing a schedule for

transition to outside funding and a structure for competing programs for university funding. The final report, "Restructuring the MRU Review Process," recommended a structure for re-categorizing MRUs according to their primary function and outlined a way that Office of Research funds can be recycled and used for new research initiatives, based on an NIH-like model of regular competition for funding. The report was endorsed by the Academic Council and forwarded to the President and Provost.

Participation in Reviews. In accordance with its role as stipulated in the Compendium, UCPB considered and commented on the 15-year reviews of the President's Initiative for Research in the Humanities and the Pacific Rim Research Program. UCPB endorsed the continuation of both MRUs, recommending that in both cases, the review procedure should apply more clearly defined measures of success.

Senate Review of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation

UCPB proceeded to engage with questions of funding for, long-term planning for, and regular Senate review of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation. A request was reiterated for a formal response from administration to the UCPB and the UCORP reports that were forwarded through Council last year. A UCPB member participated as an observer in the "mid-launch" review of the Cal ISIs, held in September, and co-drafted a report of the review that was submitted to the Academic Council summarizing the structure and focus of the review. In order to better judge the impact Institutes have on campuses, UCPB began to gather data from campuses on numbers of FTEs, graduate students and the level of graduate student support associated with the Institutes, and requested that the CPBs of host campuses also try to find out what funds may or will be used for operating costs for the Institutes. UCPB will continue its efforts related to this issue next year.

Academic Initiatives

UCPB considered and acted on the following proposed academic initiatives:

UCI Proposal to Reconstitute the School of Medicine as the School of Health Sciences – endorsed.

UCLA Proposal to Change the Name of the School of Public Policy and Social Research to the School of Public Affairs – endorsed.

UC Davis Proposal for the Establishment of the Graduate School of the Environment – not endorsed.

In addition, the annual list of Campus Five-Year Perspectives was received.

Other Committee Initiatives and Issues

Changes in the University Definition of Equipment – UCPB recommended an alternate formula that would mitigate the possible negative impact on individual researchers with respect to indirect costs and the eventual allocation of ICR monies.

Allocation of Summer Funding – At the request of Council, UCPB began an inquiry into how and whether funds for summer instruction are used to offset budget cuts. The committee will continue to monitor this issue in 2004-05.

University Extensions – UCPB briefly reviewed the fiscal health and management of individual University Extensions, finding no cause for generalized concern.

UCPB reviewed and formally commented on the following additional issues and proposals:
Report of the Task Force on Instructional Activities – recommended changes to better define categories of instructional activities.

Proposed Amendments to the Senate Bylaws – endorsed.

Report of the Task Force on Graduate and Professional School Admissions – endorsed.

Equivalency Status for Cooperative Extension Specialists – After reviewing administration's response to questions raised in the Senate review last year, UCPB reiterated its opposition to the proposal.

Proposal for a Formal Review of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources – endorsed.

Report of the Professorial Step System Task Force – not endorsed.

UCPB Liaisons with Other System-wide Bodies

The Chair, Vice Chair or a committee member sat on the following committees and reported to UCPB on their activities: Academic Council, Academic Planning Council, Executive Budget Committee, Council on Research, UC Merced Task Force, Technology Transfer Advisory Committee, the Industry-University Cooperative Research Program Steering Committee; the System-wide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee, and the Educational Finance Model Steering Committee.

Acknowledgements

UCPB would like foremost to acknowledge the fine work and dedication of its appointed chair for 2003-04, Professor Richard Goodman (UCLA), who passed away in January of 2004. He is missed. The committee also extends sincere thanks to the following UCOP consultants for their consistently valuable contributions: Larry Hershman, Vice President-Budget; Sandra Smith, Assistant Vice President-Planning & Analysis; Linda Guerra, Acting Assistant Vice President-Planning & Analysis; Jerry Kissler, Associate Vice President-Budget, Planning, & Fiscal Analysis; Cathie McGowan, Director, Science & Technology Programs and Initiatives; Dante Noto, Director, Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Programs and Initiatives; Kate Jeffery, Director, Student Financial Support.

Respectfully submitted:

Richard Goodman, Chair (Sept. '03 – Jan. '04)

Michael Parrish, Vice Chair and Acting Chair (Jan.'04 –Aug. '04)

Stanton Glantz (SF representative Sept. '03-Jan. 04; acting vice chair Feb.'04 –Aug '04)

Calvin Moore (B)

Theodore DeJong (D)

Derek Dunn-Rankin (I)

John Edmond (LA)

Jonathan Turner (R)

Christopher Newfield (SB)

Robert Meister (SC)

David Gardener (SF)

Jean Bernard Minster (SD)

Christopher Viney (M)

Lawrence Pitts, Academic Council Chair

George Blumenthal, Academic Council Vice Chair

Brenda Foust, Senior Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION (UCOPE)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-04**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Preparatory Education held two meetings during AY 2003-04 to conduct its business with respect to its duties outlined in Senate Bylaw 192. Committee activities engaged in and issues that were considered this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

Senate Bylaw 192. Preparatory Education. As a result of actions taken by the Assembly last year, this year the Senate Chair and Vice Chair were added to UCOPE's membership as *ex officio* nonvoting members. Also, UCOPE's amended and expanded charge now includes advising on "the language needs of students from diverse linguistic backgrounds." Next fall UCOPE will include a Vice Chair position from within its membership of divisional representatives.

Name changes for writing exam and writing requirement. The former Subject A examination is now named the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam, and the former Subject A Requirement is now named University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement, as proposed by UCOPE and UCEP in 2002-03, approved by the Academic Council and passed by a special Assembly E-mail ballot in February 2004.

Writing Examination Administration. Pursuant to its charge of oversight of standards for administering UC's writing examination, UCOPE received updates and discussed with its regular consultants from UCOP Student Academic Services many writing exam-related issues, including competing of bids for the exam administration contract, concerns about exam fee increases, and preliminary electronic testing models and electronic scoring alternatives being considered as possibilities for future efficiency and/or cost-savings. UCOPE members share concerns about the cost of exam administration, including the significant costs associated with the annual exam reader weekend; however, the Committee deems the reader sessions to be important for norming process and for programmatic accuracy and consistency, and favors retaining these sessions. UCOPE also favors retaining (for an indefinite period) existing hard copy readings simultaneously with any new pilot electronic exam reading or scoring that might be adopted in the near future.

2004 Writing Examination Essay/Prompt Selection. UCOPE completed its annual selection of the essay/prompt to be administered in the 2004 Subject A examination [Note: the former exam name was used because booklets had been printed well in advance of Assembly approval; however, the new exam name will be used hereafter] by accepting unanimously one passage from among a selection of six passages presented by Subject A Examination Chair George Gadda that were selected previously by the Subject A Examination Subcommittee. This exam essay/prompt selection is a confidential committee action.

2004 Subject A Examination Passing Standard/Norming the Subject A Examination. UCOPE members discussed pretest essays provided by the Subject A Examination Committee

Chair and agreed unanimously on all pretest essay scores assigned by that Committee. Norming sets a pass/fail standard that is used by readers in scoring exams.

Collection of data on how students satisfy UC's writing requirement. It is difficult to retrieve and separate data on how students satisfy the writing requirement, since there are multiple ways to do this. It is thought that all the ways in which a student satisfies the requirement should be reported, as well as the student's success in subsequent coursework that requires writing. The main question is whether students are placed correctly in writing/English courses so they can function. There is no system-wide policy on how many times a student may repeat a course until a passing grade is achieved, nor data on the effect on GPA of including both non-passing and passing grades.

Honors credit for Standard Level International Baccalaureate (IB) Courses in writing/language arts. UCOPE did not come to a conclusion or make a recommendation on whether a score of 5 in the Standard Level IB exam is acceptable for satisfying the UC Entry Level Writing Requirement, as is the score of 5 in the Higher Level IB exam. A subcommittee was charged with reviewing materials and drafting a recommendation for the Committee to consider by E-mail. This awaits receipt of additional information to be sent from IB.

English as a Second Language (ESL) Subcommittee. A consultant from the ESL Subcommittee will attend UCOPE meetings to participate in discussion and consult when UCOPE reviews essay prompts and selects essays and to advise on other ESL issues and language diversity issues, to present the ESL perspective and a report from any ESL Subcommittee meeting. UCOPE would like to see ESL as well as writing expertise among its membership; however, only a few Senate members system-wide are involved in ESL programs.

ESL Subcommittee held one meeting this year; ESL Subcommittee Chair Jan Frodesen (who also serves on the IMPAC Project ESL Subcommittee) reported on its deliberations to UCOPE. Individual campus reports on ESL issues, enrollment trends, program achievements and developments, and problems and concerns were provided. ESL Subcommittee's scope includes both lower and upper division undergraduate students and also those who teach undergraduate students (including TA certification). The ESL Subcommittee is concerned about a growing population of students (called Generation 1.5) who have been educated in the US and whose families speak a language other than English at home, who exhibit writing difficulties and need special attention from writing program courses. Their special needs are being discussed throughout higher education systems and on the national level. ESL Subcommittee remains concerned about outsourcing ESL courses to Community Colleges. While many Community College programs are well articulated with the UC ESL programs, courses with variable quality and unworkable high enrollments remain in some colleges. Students seem quite adept in seeking these out and circumventing the system. Just how substantial this problem may be should be evaluated by IMPAC, with possible safeguards suggested.

Class Size for Writing Classes. UCOPE wrote an advisory to the Academic Council [5/21/04] on Class Size in the UC system. Its report addresses and provides information on national standards on writing class sizes, data on comparison institutions, and recommends a cap of 20 students for first year writing (the national standard), and no more than 15 students for basic

writing. UCOPE emphasized the importance of maintaining and monitoring this standard as a budgetary priority. At UCOPE's request, the issue of class size was referred to UCEP.

Math competencies and evaluation of mathematics placement practices—campus practices.

UCOPE received reports from its campus representatives on how math placement is handled at the campus level. It is difficult to obtain individual campus information. Additional campus numerical data about test use and cutoffs (adjusted) would be useful to have. Most campuses administer a math diagnostic test (e.g., MDTP); however, the passing grade is different on every campus, as are the courses that students are assigned to meet math requirements.

Additional business. UCOPE received and discussed the following reports that are outside its specific charge and duties:

- Report of the International Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) Literacy Panel, “Digital Transformation, A Framework for ICT Literacy” from Educational Testing Service.
- iCampus MIT Online Assessment Tool (iMOAT)—part of a preliminary examination of the possibility of electronic administrative work for writing exams in the future.

UCOPE Representation. UCOPE was represented on additional Committees, Task Forces and Work Groups this year, including ICAS, and ICAS ESL Subcommittee. UCOPE Chair Arvan Fluharty was a member of ICAS, attended an IMPAC meeting, and also sat in on an IMPAC ESL group session. UCOPE approved slates of members of the ESL and Subject A Subcommittees (to be completed where vacancies occur). The Subject A Subcommittee will discuss a name change that will better reflect changes in writing exam and writing requirement names.

Acknowledgement. UCOPE benefited from regular consultation and reports from the following consultants: George Gadda, UCLA Writing Director and Chair of the Subject A Examination Committee; Susan Wilbur, Director of Undergraduate Admissions; Jeanne Hargrove, Subject A and High School Articulation Coordinator, Student Academic Services; and UCOPE's ESL Subcommittee Chair Jan Frodesen, who is an Academic Senate member from UCSB. UCOPE also consulted with Academic Senate Vice Chair Blumenthal on issues facing the Senate this year and Academic Council Executive Director María Bertero-Barceló on Senate office procedures and Committee business. UCOPE thanks Lecturer M. Cecilia Freeman (UCSC) who represented the ESL Subcommittee at one UCOPE meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Arvan Fluharty (LA), Chair
Robert Jacobsen (B)
Richard Levin (D)
Susan Carole Jarratt (I)
Ali Sayed (LA)
Deborah Willis (R)
Pamela Sample (SD)
Henry Sanchez (SF)
Susan McLeod (SB)

Roz Spafford (SC)
Lawrence Pitts (*Ex officio*, Academic Senate Chair)
George Blumenthal (*Ex officio*, Academic Senate Vice Chair)
Barbara Sawrey (Member *ex officio*, as Chair of BOARS)
Alfred Ngaw (Graduate student representative)
Enrico-Jose Mangahis (Undergraduate student representative)
Jan Frodesen, Chair, ESL Subcommittee
Louisa Tapley-Van Pelt, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE (UCP&T)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

In accordance with Senate Bylaw 195, the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure (UCP&T) considers general policies involving academic privileges and tenure. In addition, the committee constitutes special Hearing Committees for disciplinary cases and maintains statistical records of the grievance, disciplinary, and early termination cases taking place on each of the campuses.

UCP&T met once during the 2003-04 academic year. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Divisional P&T Activity Survey

As specified in Senate Bylaw 334.B, each divisional P&T committee is required to submit a statistical summary of its cases to UCP&T annually. Last year UCP&T created a "Divisional P&T Activity Survey" form, which must be completed and submitted by each campus P&T committee to fulfill this requirement. The committee reviewed and discussed the results of the 2002-03 Divisional P&T Activity Survey, the first year of statistical information collected from the divisional committees. The committee's discussion focused on the usefulness of the information, difficulties with completing the survey, and the accuracy of the results. Reorganization and minor changes to the Divisional P&T Activity Survey form were made as a result of suggestions from the members for clarification and improvement of the survey.

Divisional P&T Committee Issues

The structure of and procedures followed by the divisional P&T committees vary significantly from one another. To gain a better understanding of these differences and to identify possible best practices, each UCP&T member reported on the composition of and procedures followed by his/her divisional P&T committee. Members also provided advice and related their experiences with a number of procedural and organizational issues concerning divisional P&T committees.

Proposed Revisions to SBL 336.B.4

Senate Bylaw 336.B.4, which governs disciplinary cases, states that "No disciplinary action may commence if more than three years have passed between the time when the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee knew or should have known about the alleged violation of the Code of Conduct, and the delivery of the notice of proposed disciplinary action." The interpretation of this statute of limitations has been problematic on at least one campus, and therefore the committee considered potential options for clarifying this bylaw. Two problematic phrases were identified as potentially in need of clarification: "Chancellor's designee" and "should have known."

Three options for UCP&T action were considered: (1) request that the Rules and Jurisdiction (R&J) committee make a legislative ruling on the bylaw; (2) write a report indicating UCP&T's interpretation of the bylaw; and (3) revise the bylaw. The committee agreed that the most effective method for clarifying the bylaw would be to revise it. UCP&T submitted a proposal to

revise Senate Bylaw 336.B.4 to the Academic Council in August for consideration and action during the 2004-05 academic year.

Other Reports

The Committee also reviewed and wrote opinions on the following policies and proposals:

- Proposed New Policy on Conflicts of Interest Created by Consensual Relationships
- Proposed Revised Policy on Sexual Harassment and Procedures for Responding to Reports of Sexual Harassment
- UCAAD's Proposed Revisions to APM 210, 240 and 245

Acknowledgment

UCP&T wishes to acknowledge the assistance and support of its Committee Analyst, Kimberly Peterson, and administrative consultants: Maria Shanle, University Counsel; and Sheila O'Rourke, Executive Director of Academic Compliance and Special Assistant to the Provost.

Respectfully submitted:

Carolyn Martin Shaw (SC), Chair
Jeffrey Knapp (B)
Norman Matloff (D)
Paul Micevych (LA)
Kathleen Montgomery (R)
Duncan Agnew (SD)
Ruth Greenblatt (SF)
Geoffrey Rutkowski (SB)
Kimberly Peterson, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY (UCORP)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-04**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

As specified in Senate Bylaw 200, the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) is responsible for fostering, formulating, coordinating, and revising general research policies and procedures and advising the President on research. UCORP held seven meetings and one teleconference meeting during the 2003-04 academic year. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs)

Throughout the year UCORP discussed concerns about the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs). In May the committee cosigned a letter, drafted by UCPB, which reaffirms previous UCORP and UCPB recommendations to establish formal review procedures for the Cal ISIs. UCORP also devoted a portion of one meeting for each committee member to present a brief report on the current status and functioning of the Cal ISI that is affiliated with their campus. Common issues for the Institutes were identified and discussed. Members suggested that conducting and presenting these campus reports on the Cal ISIs become an annual UCORP event. At the same meeting Associate Vice Provost Susanne Huttner reported to the committee on the mid-launch administrative review of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs). Two representatives from the Academic Senate were invited to participate in this review and Chair Janis Ingham served as UCORP's representative. One major issue that was highlighted by the review and continues to be a priority is the need for operating costs for the Institutes and that the source of these operating funds will not encumber resources normally designated to the advancement of faculty research (e.g., indirect cost recovery).

Multicampus Research Units (MRUs)

In accordance with the University-wide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (the "Compendium"), UCORP participated in the Academic Senate's evaluation of the reports of the 15-Year Reviews of two Multicampus Research Units (MRUs): the Pacific Rim Research Program (PRRP) and the President's Initiative for Research in the Humanities (PIRH). UCORP supported continuation of these MRUs and made a number of recommendations for their improvement. UCORP also discussed possible changes to the MRU program and review process, including exploration of potential new sources of funding and/or termination of some MRUs.

Problematic Restrictive Clauses in Research Awards ("Strings")

In July 2003 the Academic Council issued a charge to UCORP to broadly review research-funding policies at UC. In response to this charge, the committee consulted with the faculty and administration, at the system-wide and campus levels, to identify both appropriate and problematic restrictions and requirements ("strings") occurring in research awards, as well as the various policies and principles that are currently used to guide the University's decisions to accept or reject these conditions. UCORP invited several guests to discuss the various issues pertaining to restrictions and requirements placed on university research by sponsors: Brad

Barber, Assistant Vice President – Institutional Advancement; Michael Eisen, Professor and Public Library of Science (PLoS) Cofounder, Berkeley; Joyce Freedman, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Research Administration and Compliance, Berkeley; David Mears, Director, Research Administration Office; Geoff O’Neill, University Counsel; and Barbara Yoder, Research Administrator – Policy Development, Research Administration Office.

UCORP’s findings and recommendations were included in a final report, “Problematic Restrictive Clauses in Contracts, Grants, and Gifts for Research,” which was submitted to the Academic Council in July. In addition to this report, the committee developed a separate “Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources” in response to recent attempts by various groups within the University to ban research funding from companies associated with the tobacco industry. This resolution was endorsed by the Academic Council on July 21, 2004 and transmitted, along with UCORP’s report, to President Dynes (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/researchstrings072304.pdf>).

Sensitive but Unclassified Technical Information (SUTI)

After receiving feedback from various system-wide committees and divisional senates, UCORP revised its “Resolution on Sensitive but Unclassified Technical Information (SUTI),” which advocates for SUTI to be treated according to the University’s existing policy on classified research. This revised SUTI resolution was adopted by the Academic Council at its November 24, 2003 meeting and forwarded to President Robert Dynes

(http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucorp/suti_resolution.pdf). In January, Academic Council Chair Lawrence Pitts received a response from President Dynes indicating that he was supportive of the resolution (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucorp/suti_presresponse.pdf).

Topics of Discussion

UCORP members devoted significant portions of their meetings to discussions on selected research- and policy-related topics.

ACSCONL

The committee received regular updates on the activities of the Academic Council Special Committee on the National Laboratories (ACSCONL) of which UCORP Chair Janis Ingham is a member. Members made suggestions for topics for ACSCONL’s white papers and tested the electronic survey on laboratory management before it was sent to the faculty.

Export Control Regulations

Consultants from the Office of Research and Research Administration Office reported to the committee on issues related to federal export control regulations. Compliance with these regulations is critical because violation can result in civil and criminal penalties for both the faculty member and the University. Under the export control regulations, actions that can be considered an export and may require a license include: shipping or carrying items subject to controls out of the U.S.; releasing “technical data” to a foreign person in the U.S. or abroad; providing technical assistance or training of a foreign person in the U.S. or abroad; and performing research in embargoed countries. Technical data receive an exemption from these

licensing regulations if they are considered “publicly available” or result from “fundamental research” in which no restrictions on publication or access were accepted.

In an effort to find out what is being done on the individual campuses to inform faculty about these export control regulations, UCORP members communicated with their Vice Chancellors for Research and reported to the committee on their findings. The committee agreed that the University must improve the information and resources provided to the faculty about export control regulations and compliance.

Homeland Security Research

Cory Coll, Director of Laboratory Collaborations, and Cathie Magowan, Director of Science and Technology Research Programs and Initiatives, informed UCORP of several funding opportunities available to the University community for homeland security research. The Office of Laboratory Management has worked together with the Office of Research in coordinating joint UC/National Laboratory initiatives in the area of homeland security research.

Integrated Safety & Environmental Management System (ISEM)

Lawrence Coleman, Vice Provost for Research, and David Belk, ISEM Program Manager, briefed the committee on a project of the Environmental Health and Safety (EH&S) Directors to implement the Integrated Safety and Environmental Management System (ISEM). This new environmental management system is based on the system currently used at the National Laboratories and differs from UC’s current system because the environmental and safety controls are tailored specifically to the activities of and materials used in each research laboratory. UCORP members provided feedback and expressed concerns about the new system. The campus EH&S Directors intend to visit each divisional senate’s Committee on Research for further feedback on how best to rollout this project and to seek volunteers for piloting the program.

Other Reports and Recommendations

The committee also reviewed and wrote opinions on the following policies and proposals:

- Reports from the Task Force on Faculty Instructional Activities
- Report of the Graduate and Professional School Admissions Task Force
- Metrics for Faculty Instructional Activities at the Graduate Level
- Cooperative Extension Specialists “Equivalent Status” Proposal
- UCAAD’s Proposed Revisions to APM 210, 240 and 245
- Proposed Senate/Administration Task Force on DANR
- Professorial Step System Task Force Report
- Academic Senate Website Policy
- Budget Planning Priorities

UCORP Representation

The Chair, Vice Chair, or a member represented UCORP on the following Committees during the year: Academic Council, Academic Council Subcommittee on the National Laboratories, Council on Research, Industry-University Cooperative Research Program Steering Committee, National Laboratories President’s Council, and National Laboratories Science and Technology Panel.

Acknowledgment

UCORP is grateful for the invaluable contributions made by the following members of the Office of Research: Lawrence Coleman, Vice Provost for Research; Susanne Huttner, Associate Vice Provost for Research, Major Research Initiatives and Industry-University Partnerships; Ellen Auriti, Director of Research Policy; Cory Coll, Director of Laboratory Collaborations; Cathie Magowan, Director of Science and Technology Research Programs and Initiatives; and Dante Noto, Director of Humanities, Arts and Social Science Programs and Initiatives.

Respectfully submitted:

Janis Ingham (UCSB), Chair
Max Neiman (UCR), Vice Chair
George Sensabaugh (UCB)
James Murray (UCD)
Walter Fitch (UCI)
Hans Schollhammer (UCLA)
Roland Winston (UCM)
David Salmon (UCSD)
Wendy Max (UCSF)
John Melack (UCSB)
Stephen Thorsett (UCSC)
Loren Bentley (Graduate Student, UCB)
Brad Cohn (Undergraduate Student, UCI)
Kimberly Peterson, Committee Analyst

VI. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES (None)

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

George Blumenthal, Chair

1. The Assembly adoption of “Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure” as its rules of order to govern questions of order not covered by Senate legislation. **(action)**

Academic Senate Bylaw 120. Meetings of the Assembly D. Conduct of Business 6. Parliamentary Authority, which was approved by the Assembly at its May 2004 meeting, states that

“The Assembly shall, by majority vote, adopt a set of rules of order to govern questions of order not covered by legislation. This choice of rules of order may be changed by majority vote of the Assembly, with such change becoming effective at the next meeting of the Assembly.

At its September and October 2004 meetings, the Academic Council recommended that the Assembly use the “Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure”, for all rules of order except that of *division of a Question* in matters that are not covered by Senate legislation. For the *division of a Question*, the Academic Council recommended that Robert’s Rules of Order should apply. It reads

“Division of a Question: “When a motion relating to a single subject contains several parts, each of which is capable of standing as a complete proposition if the others are removed, the parts can be separated to be considered and voted on as if they were distinct questions---by adoption of the motion for *Division of a Question* (or “to divide the question”).

The eight characteristics below apply only to the incidental *motion* for *Division of a Question*.

- Takes precedence over the main motion and over the subsidiary motion to *Postpone Indefinitely*. If applied to an amendment, it also takes precedence over that amendment...
- Can be applied to main motions and their amendments, if they are susceptible to division...
- Is out of order when another has the floor
- Must be seconded
- Is not debatable
- Is amendable
- Requires a majority vote

As a point of information, Sturgis on the other hand, allows one “To divide a motion that is composed of two or more independent parts into individual motions that may be considered and voted on separately.” But, states that under the rules governing a request for a *division of a Question*, it “Requires no vote because it is a request and is decided by the presiding officer.”

JUSTIFICATION

The Senate Bylaws require that the Assembly choose a set of rules to govern questions of order not covered by the Senate's legislation. The two main reasons for selecting Sturgis over Robert's Rules of Order are:

1. that it is simpler to read and interpret;
and,
2. that Robert's is out of copyright, which allows anyone to produce a Robert's Rules of Order, with different procedures and interpretations.

On the other hand, Sturgis is unique.

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES (Cont'd.)

A. Academic Council (Cont'd.)

2. Academic Council Special Committee on National Labs (ACSCONL) (oral report)
 - George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair
 - Cliff Brunk, ACSCONL Chair

B. University Committee on Educational Policy (action)

1. Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 544 and Senate Bylaws 170 and 180
 - Joseph Kiskis, UCEP Chair

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) recommends that Senate Regulation 544 and Senate Bylaws 170 and 180 be modified in order to aid in the seamless transfer of credit among campuses and with off-site UC academic programs and online courses. The following proposed amendments to Senate Bylaws 170 and 180 and Senate Regulation 544 were approved by the Academic Council at its June 2004 meeting, and reviewed by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J) for consonance with the Code of the Senate. Additionally, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) has approved these proposed amendments (since these changes affect both UCEP's charge and CCGA's).

Present and Proposed Wording

REGULATION 544. (Rescinded 13 May 97; En 27 May 99; Am 28 Feb 01)

- A. A UC student's home campus must permit a student in good standing to enroll simultaneously in courses offered by the home campus and in course(s) offered by another UC campus. Similarly, a UC student's home campus must also permit a student in good standing to enroll in summer courses offered by another UC campus. However, non-home campuses are not obliged to accept enrollment by students from other UC campuses. Each campus may set an upper limit on the total number of non-home campus enrollment units or courses its own student may apply toward graduation requirements.
- B. In order to ensure that the units will count toward any requirements, including unit requirements, students in residence at their home campus must inform the home campus in writing before enrolling in a course offered by another UC campus. This may be accomplished by electronic or conventional means, according to the home campus's procedures.
- C. If the student wishes a course taken on a non-home UC campus to satisfy a breadth, major, or other specific requirement (other than unit credit), he or she is responsible for determining that an existing formal agreement establishes that the course will satisfy the requirement OR for securing approval, in advance of registering, from the relevant academic unit on the home campus. If these requirements are not met, the home campus may refuse to allow the course to satisfy specific requirements (other than unit requirements).
- A. **UC courses approved by either UCEP or CCGA, as system-wide courses shall be listed in Divisional catalogues.**

Present and Proposed Wording

BYLAW 170. Educational Policy

- A. Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128. One undergraduate and one graduate student shall sit with the Committee. [See [Bylaw 128.E.](#)] The Vice Chair shall be chosen according with Bylaw 128.D.1. and 3. (Am 29 Nov 72, 7 Dec 76: Am 28 May 2003)
- B. Duties. Consistent with Bylaw 40, the Committee shall: (Am 28 May 2003)
 - 1. Consider and report on matters referred to it by the President of the University, the Assembly, a Division, or any Senate committee.
 - 2. Initiate appropriate studies and make reports thereon to the President, the Assembly, or any Division, on the establishment or disestablishment of curricula, colleges, schools, departments, institutes, bureaus, and the like, and on legislation or administrative policies of a fundamental character involving questions of educational policy. (Am 15 Jun 71)
 - 3. Approve UC undergraduate courses as system-wide courses to be listed in Divisional catalogues.**

Present and Proposed Wording

180. Graduate Affairs, Coordinating Committee on

- A. Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128. Two graduate students shall sit with the Committee. [See [Bylaw 128.E.](#)] The Vice Chair shall be chosen in accordance with Bylaw 128.D.1. and 3. (Am 6 Jun 79; Am 28 May 2003)
- B. Duties. Consistent with the Bylaw 40, the Committee shall: (Am 28 May 2003)
 - 1. Advise the President of the University and all agencies of the Senate regarding the promotion of research and learning related to graduate affairs.
 - 2. Establish basic policies and procedures for coordinating the work of the various Graduate Councils and Divisions.
 - 3. Recommend to the Assembly minimum standards of admission for graduate students [see [Bylaw 311.C.1](#)].
 - 4. Act for the Academic Senate in the approval of new programs for established graduate degrees, including the joint doctoral degrees with campuses of the California State University.
 - 5. Review proposals from Graduate Councils for the establishment of new graduate degrees that require approval of the President, to whom The Regents have delegated authority of approval, and submit recommendations thereon to the Assembly [see [SOR 110.1](#) and [Bylaw 116.C](#)]. (Am 24 May 00)
 - 6. Review standards and policies applied by Graduate Councils, and policies concerning relations with educational and research agencies.
 - 7. Approve UC graduate courses as system-wide courses to be listed in Divisional catalogues.**

JUSTIFICATION

Currently, enrolled students are permitted to take UC courses at other campuses. This applies to both summer session and any term during the academic year. For courses that are frequently taken by students from another campus, the students must normally file several forms in order to obtain credit on their home campus. In addition, courses offered at UC Sacramento or UCDC are normally approved courses but not offered on another campus. To address this issue, the following bylaw and regulation amendments empower UCEP and CCGA to approve already-existing UC courses as system-wide courses that should be included in the course information publications (or websites) provided by all UC Campuses. Such courses must already have been approved by the appropriate Senate agency on the offering campus. This permits students then to sign up for such courses without having to file additional paperwork. It also explicitly allows students to enroll in those courses offered at UC Sacramento or UCDC. These amendments are entirely consistent with [protected] bylaw 311.D.2, which states that divisions have jurisdiction over “matters concerning curricula offered within the jurisdiction of only one Division of the Academic Senate,” since these courses will now be regarded as system-wide courses.

Additional Information

Intercampus Course Offerings and Implementation of Senate Regulation 544 Report of the Academic Council

For decades, University of California students have been able to take advantage of the curricular resources on UC campuses other than their own by temporarily relocating to another campus either through the Intercampus Visitors Program (IVP) or the Intercampus Exchange (IE). The IVP program allows undergraduates to enroll at another UC campus for a quarter or semester, relocate to that campus to take courses, and transfer the credit back to their home campus. The IE program allows graduate students to enroll in a single course at another campus, travel to that campus to take the course, and, upon course completion, transfer the credit back to their home campus.

These mechanisms have proven satisfactory for the most part, but very few students are able to physically relocate to avail themselves of the opportunities for intercampus cooperation. With the advent of new technologies that provide distance learning for students, students can now have access to previously unavailable learning opportunities without relocating to another campus. Several years ago the Academic Senate revised Senate Regulation 544 to enable students to enroll and earn credit in any course offered on other UC campuses, on a space available basis. The revised regulation reads as follows:

SR 544:

A. A UC student's home campus must permit a student in good standing to enroll simultaneously in courses offered by the home campus and in course(s) offered by another UC campus. Similarly, a UC student's home campus must also permit a student in good standing to enroll in summer courses offered by another UC campus. However, non-home campuses are not obliged to accept enrollment by students from other UC

campuses. Each campus may set an upper limit on the total number of non-home campus enrollment units or courses its own student may apply toward graduation requirements.

B. In order to ensure that the units will count toward any requirements, including unit requirements, students in residence at their home campus must inform the home campus in writing before enrolling in a course offered by another UC campus. This may be accomplished by electronic or conventional means, according to the home campus's procedures.

C. If the student wishes a course taken on a non-home UC campus to satisfy a breadth, major, or other specific requirement (other than unit credit), he or she is responsible for determining that an existing formal agreement establishes that the course will satisfy the requirement OR for securing approval, in advance of registering, from the relevant academic unit on the home campus. If these requirements are not met, the home campus may refuse to allow the course to satisfy specific requirements (other than unit requirements).

This regulation change provides the basic building block for enabling students to take advantage of curricular resources on a course by course basis that are not available on their home campus, whether they are taking the course in-person or through various forms of distance learning. To date, SR 544 has been used relatively infrequently. In most instances decisions about how best to implement the regulation have been done on a case-by-case basis. Certain steps must still be taken in order to standardize the implementation of an intercampus instructional system so that the process runs smoothly from the perspectives of the students, the faculty, and the administrators.

With respect to SR 544, the University-wide Committee on Educational Policy of the UC Academic Senate affirms the following principles:

1. The University of California should be considered, for instructional purposes, a cooperative system that allows faculty and students to share the academic resources of sister campuses, especially when those resources are not available on the home campus.
2. New tools for distributing the curriculum at a distance through various forms of technology should not only be accepted but also encouraged and supported as one of the means by which students can enroll in courses.
3. Students and faculty should not be disadvantaged when either enrolling in or teaching intercampus courses using these new technologies.
4. All courses available to be taken by UC students under SR 544 should be treated the same, for purposes of course credit, regardless of the format (in person or at a distance) in which the course is offered.

There are a number of specific issues to consider with respect to the actual implementation of SR 544.

Registration and Enrollment:

A student seeking to enroll at a distance in an approved course at another campus should contact the registrar at their home campus and fill out the SR 544 implementation form. The registrar at each campus is charged with facilitating a seamless process by: (a) providing students a placeholder in their current registration file that acknowledges and displays the student's units enrolled elsewhere and (b) providing the means for accepting the grade and credit that is transferred from the host campus upon the completion of the course.

Ideally, the registrars should incorporate the SR 544 procedure into the regular registration process so that students can complete their course enrollments online and electronically receive the necessary documentation.

By enrolling in a course via SR 544, the student is guaranteed, at the very least, elective credit. However, SR 544 does not automatically grant any assurance that the course will count for major/college requirements. Students must seek approval through normal channels on their campuses—namely, by consulting with the faculty and/or academic advisors. Obtaining approval for major/college requirement is the student's responsibility alone.

Faculty credit for teaching students enrolled via SR 544:

Because students enrolling via SR 544 are officially registered for the course offered by the host campus, the faculty member of record receives the student credit hours for all students enrolled. In other words, the campus where the course is offered receives the credit unless there is a side agreement.

Course approval on the host campus:

Course approval is the domain of each campus Academic Senate committee. The course approval committee on the host campus reserves the right to review courses being offered with a distance-learning modality. Nevertheless, UCEP strongly affirms the value of distance taught courses, especially in curricular areas such as less commonly taught languages where valuable and strategic linguistic resources are unevenly distributed throughout the UC campuses.

Publicity on distance offerings throughout the UC:

A system-wide Web site with listings of all courses available to any student through distance-learning technology should be set up and maintained by UCOP. Likewise, the registrars should provide students a transparent system for publicizing the intercampus offerings and the SR 544 enrollment procedure in a special section of the schedule of classes.

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES (Cont'd.)

B. University Committee on Educational Policy (Cont'd.) (action)

• Joseph Kiskis, Chair

2. Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 630 B

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) recommends that Senate Regulation 630 B, which grants an exception to Engineering students for the Senior Residency Requirement, be rescinded as set forth below. The following proposed amendments to Senate Regulation 630 B was approved by the Academic Council at its July 2004 meeting and reviewed by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction for consonance with the Code of the Senate.

Present and Proposed Wording

Chapter 2. Requirements for the Bachelor's Degree

Article 1. General Requirements

Regulation 630.

- A. Except as otherwise provided in this section and SR 614, 35 (or 24 semester) of the final 45 (or 30 semester) units completed by each candidate for the Bachelor's degree must be earned in residence in the college or school of the University of California in which the degree is to be taken. (Am 9 Mar 83; Am 23 May 01)
- B. ~~However, a student who has completed in one of the Colleges of Engineering (Berkeley, Davis or Los Angeles) the requirements of the junior year of that college may complete the requirements of its senior year, not to exceed 54 (or 36 semester) units, in residence on another campus of the University of California (Los Angeles, Berkeley, or Davis) where the required courses are available, and may then receive the Bachelor of Science degree in the College of Engineering in which that student was enrolled prior to such transfer. (Am 9 Mar 83)~~
- B.** When two or more campuses of the University of California have approved a joint program of study, a student enrolled in such a program may meet the Requirement stated in Paragraph A by completing the requisite number of units in courses offered at any or all of the participating campuses. The student's program of study must be approved by the Provost, Dean, or equivalent officer of the School ~~of~~ **or** College in which the degree is to be awarded. (En 13 May 1997)
- C.** A further exception to the rule stated in paragraph (A) above is made in the case of students who meet the residence requirement as provided in [SR 614](#).
- D.** Except when Divisional Regulations provide otherwise, a student in the Education Abroad Program, the UC Washington, D.C., Program, or the UC Center in Sacramento Program may meet the residence requirement in accordance with the following provisions: (Am 27 May 99; Am 10 Mar 04)

- i. A student who completes the graduation requirements while in the Education Abroad Program, the UC Washington, D.C., Program, or the UC Center in Sacramento Program may satisfy the requirements stated in paragraph (A) in the final 45 (or 30 semester) units preceding the student's entrance into the Education Abroad Program, the UC Washington, D.C., Program, or the UC Center in Sacramento Program. (Am 9 Mar 83; Am 10 Mar 04)
- ii. Subject to the prior approval of the department concerned, a student who is enrolled in the Education Abroad Program, the UC Washington, D.C. Program, or the UC Center in Sacramento Program may satisfy the residence requirement by earning 35 (or 24 semester) of the final 90 (or 60 semester) units, including the final 12 (or 8 semester) units, in residence in the college or school of the University of California in which the degree is taken. (Am 7 Jun 72; Am 9 Mar 83; Am 10 Mar 04)

JUSTIFICATION

Regulation 630B is out-of-date in a number of ways, and UCEP believes there is no good reason to keep it on the books. It was written at a time when the only UC Engineering Schools were UCB, UCD and UCLA, and today, the exception is never used or even known. There is no reason to give modern day Engineering students the ability to transfer for a full senior year to a second campus but earn a degree from their first. We believe the regulation to possibly be a relic from World War II.

In addition, the committee noticed a typo in the last sentence of Section C. It should read "School **or** College."

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES (Cont'd.)

C. Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) (oral report)

- **John Oakley, Chair**

An update on 04-05 UCFW activities

D. Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) (oral report)

- **Michael Brown, Chair**

An update on 04-05 BOARS activities

VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT (none)

IX. PETITION OF STUDENTS (none)

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (none)

XI. NEW BUSINESS

Next regular meeting of the Assembly: March 9, 2005. To be held either by teleconference or face-to-face on the UC Berkeley-Clark Kerr Campus.