ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM, PRIVILEGE AND TENURE

TO: Members of the Academic Senate, San Francisco Division

The Committee held two meetings during the year 1966/67 to conduct the following items of business:

I. Discussion of Restrictive Fellowships (such as Title IV - NDEA)

It was the consensus of the Committee that such restrictive fellowships were undesirable. Accordingly, the Chairman expressed this view at the Universitywide Committee meeting.

II. Consideration of Change in the Title of "Associate"

After extensive consideration, the Committee advised against modifying conditions surrounding the present title of "Associate" at this time.

The Chairman or a representative of the Committee was present at all Universitywide Committee on Academic Freedom meetings.

A representative from the San Francisco Campus, Professor Robertson Pratt, attended the Universitywide Committee on Privilege and Tenure during the year 1966/67 since there was no separate committee on this Campus.

Respectfully submitted,

D. Brodie
Mrs. A. Ingmire
J.B. Lagen
A. Schuchard
J. Hopper, Jr. - Chairman

May 29, 1967
TO: Members of the Academic Senate
San Francisco Division

From: Alan Goldfien, Vice Chairman
Academic Freedom Committee, San Francisco Division

THE ATTACHED INFORMATION HAS BEEN RECEIVED FROM
THE LOS ANGELES DIVISION AND IS CIRCULATED TO
YOU AS REQUESTED.
4 September 1969

Professor R. M. Featherstone
University of California Medical Center
San Francisco, California 94122

Dear Professor Featherstone:

The enclosed material is forwarded to you with a request by the Department of Philosophy at UCLA that it be circulated to faculty members of your Division.

Sincerely yours,

Lowell J. Paige, Chairman
Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division
September 16, 1969

To: President Charles Hitch  
Chancellor Charles E. Young  
Professor F. A. Sooy, Chairman, Academic Council  
Professor Lowell J. Paige, Chairman, Los Angeles Division

From: Peter Thorlev, Chairman  
Committee on Academic Freedom  
Los Angeles Division of the Academic Senate

I assume that among other documents on the case of Miss Angela Davis the report of our Divisional Committee on Academic Freedom has already come to your attention. Of course we drew up our resolutions not knowing of Miss Davis's reply to the Chancellor's letter or even that she would reply, but I believe I can speak for the Committee as a whole--certainly for the quorum with which I have been in contact--in saying that her disclosure of her Communist Party membership in no way affects our judgment of the case or of the principles involved. We believe that all candidates for employment or promotion should be judged on their academic qualifications alone, and not on their political or other affiliations.

cc: Chairmen, Divisional Committees on Academic Freedom
4 September 1969

TO:  LOVELL PAIGE, CHAIRMAN
     ACADEMIC SENATE

FROM:  PETER THORSLEV, CHAIRMAN
        COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The Academic Freedom Committee has been requested by members of the Department of Philosophy and by yourself to investigate and report to the Senate: (1) on the possible infringement of academic freedom involved in the Administration's refusal to sign the final papers for the summer appointment of Miss Angela Davis in the Department of Philosophy; (2) on the general issue of whether or not the Regents Resolutions of 1940 and 1949, which the Regents invoked in this case in spite of their seeming inconsistency with the Standing Order of April, 1969, are consonant with the principles of academic freedom.

First, as to the particular case of the appointment of Miss Davis: it is evident to the Committee that the Department and the Administration acted in perfect good faith and in accordance with proper academic procedures in the negotiation and signing of the contract for Miss Davis' appointment as Acting Assistant Professor. The question of her alleged political affiliations was never raised, and even had it been, it would have been irrelevant on the general grounds of academic freedom, especially in view of the reaffirmation of these principles in Standing Order 102.l, which states that "no political test shall ever be considered in the appointment or promotion of any faculty member or employee." Therefore, the Committee deems it both immoral and illegal for the administration, on direction of the Regents, to withhold Miss Davis' summer fellowship, which was understood by both parties, from the first, to be a condition of employment--an understanding expressed both orally and in writing by the Department and by the Administration.

On the more general issue of academic appointments and confessed or covert political affiliations: the Committee holds that any action in compliance with the Resolutions of 1940 and 1949 is inconsistent with the principles of academic freedom, and that these Resolutions should therefore be disavowed. Similar rules and regulations which make membership in the Communist Party in itself sufficient grounds for exclusion from University faculties have been declared unconstitutional in the courts, and have been repudiated by Academic Senates, most recently by the Los Angeles Division in the Resolution passed in June, 1969.
The only argument for such rules which might seem on the face of it to have any merit is that some political affiliations can perhaps be used as evidence that the appointee is committed to party dogma and to prejudged conclusions which might frustrate free and impartial inquiry. This is not really a matter of political affiliation, but of the qualities of mind-openness and impartiality of the prospective appointee, and such qualities are certainly legitimate considerations in matters of academic appointments. On this point, however, the Committee maintains that such attributes should be judged on the basis of the appointee's past academic performance rather than on the basis of his affiliations. To investigate into or use personal political commitments or beliefs for the purposes of academic appointment is repugnant to the basic principles of a free university. An instructor's academic performance is a matter of public record, and it is surely on the basis of his public record that he should be judged.

This Committee will therefore move the following resolutions before the next meeting of the Academic Senate:

That the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division, request the Administration to sign the final papers for Miss Davis' appointment without further delay, and to withdraw the letter asking her to disclose her political affiliations.

That the Academic Senate request that the Regents rescind those Resolutions of 1940 and 1949 which make political affiliation a consideration in academic employment.
To the Faculty of the University of California:

A serious violation of the academic freedom of a member of our faculty is taking place. On behalf of the Philosophy Department, UCLA, I am sending you this account of the matter.

Last April, Miss Angela Yvonne Davis* was offered, and accepted, a teaching position and a summer research appointment in the Philosophy Department at UCLA, both to take effect July 1, 1969. These decisions were made in accordance with established University procedures. Miss Davis was furthermore assured that a continuation of her appointments for a second year would depend only on the adequate performance of her duties during the first year. The UCLA Administration signed Miss Davis' Employment Form for the teaching appointment on May 9, 1969. At the request of the Academic Personnel Office the form authorizing payment of Miss Davis' summer research stipend (Change in Employment Status Form) was not submitted at this time; indeed, it was not until June 20 that the Department was informed that the Change in Employment Status form should be submitted.

On July 1, 1969, William Tulio Divale, a UCLA student, wrote a column in our campus paper, The Daily Bruin, trying to justify the fact that he had been working as an undercover agent for the FBI. In the course of his column he alleged that the Philosophy Department had hired a member of the Communist Party as an Acting Assistant Professor. He did not name the person to whom he referred.

On July 9, in a report by Ed Montgomery in the San Francisco Examiner, Miss Davis was named as the person to whom the column in the Bruin had referred. However, Montgomery described her, not as a member

* Miss Davis' curriculum vitae is as follows:

Born: January 26, 1944
1961-63 - Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts.
1963-64 - The Sorbonne - Certificat de la littérature française Contemporaine.
1965-67 - Johann Wolfgang von Goethe Universität, Frankfort, Germany. Studied philosophy under Theodor W. Adorno - Major work in field of German Idealism.
9/67-12/68 - University of California, San Diego; M.S., Philosophy.
9/68 - Passed Ph.D. qualifying examination, Philosophy.
10/69-6/69 - Teaching Assistant, University of California, San Diego - Currently working on dissertation concerning problem of violence in German Idealism under supervision of Prof. Herbert Marcuse.
of the Communist Party, but as "a known Maoist". Montgomery also alleged that Miss Davis has been "active in the SDS and the Black Panthers..." Neither the striking discrepancy between the Divale and Montgomery accounts nor the reference to other groups was explained. Nor was any substantial evidence offered for the allegations about Miss Davis.

Neither article created a public stir. We know of no other public allegations regarding Miss Davis' political affiliations.

Yet on July 11, two days after the Examiner article appeared, The Regents of the University of California, at their regular meeting, instructed the Administration to determine whether Miss Davis is a member of the Communist Party. They directed the Administration to report its findings at their meeting in mid-September. Miss Davis' Change in Employment Status Form for her summer research appointment had not, as of July 11, been signed. To this date it remains unsigned.

Certain University statutes and resolutions bear on this case, as do some recent decisions by the United States Supreme Court.

1. In 1940, and again in 1949, The Regents resolved that membership in the Communist Party shall disqualify one from becoming a member of the Faculty of the University of California.

2. In June, 1969, The Regents adopted a Standing Order reinstating their power to pass on tenure appointments in the University. However, in the course of that Order (102.1) they also stated that "No political test shall ever be considered in the appointment and promotion of any faculty member or employee."

3. In June also, the UCLA Academic Senate adopted, by vote of 696-151, a resolution of "warning to the campus administration, faculties, departments, and concerned Senate committees not to allow The Regents' recent withdrawal of campus control over academic promotions and appointments at the tenure level to result in any implicit or explicit self-censorship which permits the question of the political acceptability of candidates to intrude itself into the review process."

4. The Supreme Court, in the case of Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 385 U.S. 589 (1967), struck down New York statutes that made membership in the Communist Party grounds for disqualifying one from teaching in a public institution—in this instance, the State University of New York at Buffalo. Relying on the Keyishian and other decisions, the California
Supreme Court, in Vogel v. County of Los Angeles, 60 Cal. 2d 18, 64 Cal. Rptr. 409 (1967), invalidated a section of the California Constitution requiring public employees to sign an oath disclaiming membership in any organization that advocates the violent overthrow of the Government.

These court decisions appear to establish the legal impropriety of disqualifying anyone from university employment on grounds of membership in the Communist Party, or any other political organization. Moreover, The Regents' Standing Order 102.1 can be construed as superseding earlier Regental resolutions prohibiting the employment of Communists. Yet by their actions The Regents have set foot on a path which leads to a violation of Miss Davis' rights, to a disregard of the courts' rulings, and to a confrontation between themselves and a major portion of the University's faculty.

Up to August 20th, despite many meetings and communications between members of the Philosophy Department and the Chancellor, it was not certain whether the Administration would sign Miss Davis' Change in Employment Status Form. But on the afternoon of the 20th, after meeting with representatives of The Regents, the Chancellor informed the Philosophy Department that he had been directed by The Regents (by their interpretation of their action of July 11) to take no steps affecting the employment status of Miss Angela Davis pending further action by The Regents following their receipt of the information which they instructed the Administration to obtain concerning the appropriateness of her employment under the terms of the Regental policy barring appointment of members of the Communist Party.

In a letter dated August 26, 1969, the Chancellor repeated that he had been directed by The Regents to take no further steps affecting the employment status of Miss Davis. He went on to say,

"I must report to you that the investigation I am required to make includes forwarding to her a copy of the original letter sent to her on July 16, 1969, and to which you make reference in your letter of August 7, 1969."

The letter in question contained the sentence,

"I am constrained by Regental policy to request that you inform me whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party."
It was sent to Miss Davis on July 16. Miss Davis, however, no longer resided at that address, and hence the letter was returned undelivered and was not sent again at that time.

I, as the Chairman of the Philosophy Department, have throughout urged that Miss Davis should not be questioned regarding her alleged membership in the Communist Party. I have throughout also taken the position that the summer research employment represents a valid University obligation, and that the Change in Employment Status Form ought to be signed without delay. These positions were affirmed on August 22, 1969, in a resolution (full text attached) passed by unanimous vote of those active members of the Department who were then in Los Angeles. In the same resolution the Department also declared that it will not cooperate with any inquiry into Miss Davis' political affiliations, or any further review of her qualifications otherwise than in accordance with normal University procedures. We mean to adhere both to orderly procedure and to established law, despite higher official actions that go contrary to both.

Members of the Committees on Academic Freedom and on Privilege and Tenure of the Los Angeles Division of the Academic Senate, and officers of the American Association of University Professors, have been fully informed of these events. Since Montgomery, in the Examiner article, alleged that Miss Davis is a member of the Black Panthers, members of the Department have also been in communication with UCLA's Committee of Black Faculty and Administrators. Colleagues representing diverse viewpoints have, when informed of the matter, expressed strong agreement with the Department's position. An interested faculty group is making plans for litigation designed to enjoin the University Administration from pursuing the path of confrontation on which it has set foot.

Donald Kalish, Chairman
for the Department of Philosophy,
UCLA
RESOLUTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, AUGUST 22, 1969

Miss Angela Davis was offered a teaching position and a special summer research appointment, both to take effect July 1, 1969. These actions were taken after full review and confirmation by appropriate agencies in accordance with established University procedures. Miss Davis was furthermore assured that a continuation of her appointments for a second year would be contingent only on the adequate performance of her duties during the first year. We therefore urge that the University's contractual obligations be honored without further delay.

Moreover, we can see no good reason why further review of Miss Davis' qualifications need be made at this time. In particular, we oppose and will not cooperate with efforts to secure any information that pertains to Miss Davis' political affiliations, nor will we cooperate with any effort to review Miss Davis' qualifications otherwise than in accordance with normal University procedures. Any political inquiry would damage the very basis on which a great university must rise; would violate first amendment protections recently affirmed by the Supreme Court (in the case of Keyishian vs. Board of Regents, 1967); and would be absolutely incompatible with the Regents' Standing Order 102.1, passed earlier this year, which flatly states that "No political test shall ever be considered in the appointment and promotion of any faculty member or employee".

The Soviet Union has imposed political tests on many of its most creative individuals. It is sad that a comparably illicit use of power to impose a test of political conformity must be resisted here on the Los Angeles campus of the University of California. That this illegal and immoral act is official does not make it less an intrusion on the orderly and reasoned processes by which our University has traditionally done its business. If relevant officials persist in their present course of action, the belief that the University of California is a place where reason holds sway will be proved a myth.

The above resolution was approved unanimously at a meeting of all available members of the Philosophy Department. Those present were:

John Bennett        Thomas Hill
Donald Kalish       David Kaplan
Arnold Kaufman      David Lewis
Richard Montague    John Perry
Gandra Peterson     Richard Wasserstrom
Robert Yost

The following members of the Department, not present at the meeting of August 22, have since registered their approval of the resolution:

Montgomery Furth       Herbert Morris       Wade Savage
TO: Members of the Academic Senate
San Francisco Division

From: Alan Goldfien, Vice Chairman
Academic Freedom Committee, San Francisco Division

THE ATTACHED INFORMATION HAS BEEN RECEIVED FROM
THE LOS ANGELES DIVISION AND IS CIRCULATED TO
YOU AS REQUESTED.
4 September 1969

Professor R. M. Featherstone
University of California Medical Center
San Francisco, California 94122

Dear Professor Featherstone:

The enclosed material is forwarded to you with a request by the Department of Philosophy at UCLA that it be circulated to faculty members of your Division.

Sincerely yours,

Lowell J. Paige, Chairman
Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division
To: President Charles Hitch  
Chancellor Charles E. Young  
Professor F. A. Sooy, Chairman, Academic Council  
Professor Lowell J. Paige, Chairman, Los Angeles Division  

From: Peter Thorlev, Chairman  
Committee on Academic Freedom  
Los Angeles Division of the Academic Senate

I assume that among other documents on the case of Miss Angela Davis the report of our Divisional Committee on Academic Freedom has already come to your attention. Of course we drew up our resolutions not knowing of Miss Davis's reply to the Chancellor's letter or even that she would reply, but I believe I can speak for the Committee as a whole--certainly for the quorum with which I have been in contact--in saying that her disclosure of her Communist Party membership in no way affects our judgment of the case or of the principles involved. We believe that all candidates for employment or promotion should be judged on their academic qualifications alone, and not on their political or other affiliations.

cc: Chairmen, Divisional Committees on Academic Freedom
TO: LOVELL PAIGE, CHAIRMAN
ACADEMIC SENATE

FROM: PETER THORSLEV, CHAIRMAN
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The Academic Freedom Committee has been requested by members of the Department of Philosophy and by yourself to investigate and report to the Senate: (1) on the possible infringement of academic freedom involved in the Administration's refusal to sign the final papers for the summer appointment of Miss Angela Davis in the Department of Philosophy; (2) on the general issue of whether or not the Regents Resolutions of 1940 and 1949, which the Regents invoked in this case in spite of their seeming inconsistency with the Standing Order of April, 1969, are consonant with the principles of academic freedom.

First, as to the particular case of the appointment of Miss Davis: it is evident to the Committee that the Department and the Administration acted in perfect good faith and in accordance with proper academic procedures in the negotiation and signing of the contract for Miss Davis' appointment as Acting Assistant Professor. The question of her alleged political affiliations was never raised, and even had it been, it would have been irrelevant on the general grounds of academic freedom, especially in view of the reaffirmation of these principles in Standing Order 102.1, which states that "no political test shall ever be considered in the appointment or promotion of any faculty member or employee." Therefore, the Committee deems it both immoral and illegal for the administration, on direction of the Regents, to withhold Miss Davis' summer fellowship, which was understood by both parties, from the first, to be a condition of employment--an understanding expressed both orally and in writing by the Department and by the Administration.

On the more general issue of academic appointments and confessed or covert political affiliations: the Committee holds that any action in compliance with the Resolutions of 1940 and 1949 is inconsistent with the principles of academic freedom, and that these Resolutions should therefore be disavowed. Similar rules and regulations which make membership in the Communist Party in itself sufficient grounds for exclusion from University faculties have been declared unconstitutional in the courts, and have been repudiated by Academic Senates, most recently by the Los Angeles Division in the Resolution passed in June, 1969.
The only argument for such rules which might seem on the face of it to have any merit is that some political affiliations can perhaps be used as evidence that the appointee is committed to party dogma and to prejudged conclusions which might frustrate free and impartial inquiry. This is not really a matter of political affiliation, but of the qualities of mind-openness and impartiality of the prospective appointee, and such qualities are certainly legitimate considerations in matters of academic appointments. On this point, however, the Committee maintains that such attributes should be judged on the basis of the appointee's past academic performance rather than on the basis of his affiliations. To investigate into or use personal political commitments or beliefs for the purposes of academic appointment is repugnant to the basic principles of a free university. An instructor's academic performance is a matter of public record, and it is surely on the basis of his public record that he should be judged.

This Committee will therefore move the following resolutions before the next meeting of the Academic Senate:

That the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division, request the Administration to sign the final papers for Miss Davis' appointment without further delay, and to withdraw the letter asking her to disclose her political affiliations.

That the Academic Senate request that the Regents rescind those Resolutions of 1940 and 1949 which make political affiliation a consideration in academic employment.
To the Faculty of the University of California:

A serious violation of the academic freedom of a member of our faculty is taking place. On behalf of the Philosophy Department, UCLA, I am sending you this account of the matter.

Last April, Miss Angela Yvonne Davis* was offered, and accepted, a teaching position and a summer research appointment in the Philosophy Department at UCLA, both to take effect July 1, 1969. These decisions were made in accordance with established University procedures. Miss Davis was furthermore assured that a continuation of her appointments for a second year would depend only on the adequate performance of her duties during the first year. The UCLA Administration signed Miss Davis' Employment Form for the teaching appointment on May 9, 1969. At the request of the Academic Personnel Office the form authorizing payment of Miss Davis' summer research stipend (Change in Employment Status Form) was not submitted at this time; indeed, it was not until June 20 that the Department was informed that the Change in Employment Status form should be submitted.

On July 1, 1969, William Tulio Divale, a UCLA student, wrote a column in our campus paper, The Daily Bruin, trying to justify the fact that he had been working as an undercover agent for the FBI. In the course of his column he alleged that the Philosophy Department had hired a member of the Communist Party as an Acting Assistant Professor. He did not name the person to whom he referred.

On July 9, in a report by Ed Montgomery in the San Francisco Examiner, Miss Davis was named as the person to whom the column in the Bruin had referred. However, Montgomery described her, not as a member

* Miss Davis' curriculum vitae is as follows:

Born: January 26, 1944
1961-63 - Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts.
1963-64 - The Sorbonne - Certificat de la littérature Française Contemporaine.
1965-67 - Johann Wolfgang von Goethe Universität, Frankfort, Germany. Studied philosophy under Theodor W. Adorno - Major work in field of German Idealism.
9/67-12/68- University of California, San Diego; M.S., Philosophy.
9/68 - Passed Ph.D. qualifying examination, Philosophy.
10/68-6/69- Teaching Assistant, University of California, San Diego
- Currently working on dissertation concerning problem of violence in German Idealism under supervision of Prof. Herbert Marcuse.
of the Communist Party, but as "a known Maoist". Montgomery also alleged that Miss Davis has been "active in the SDS and the Black Panthers..." Neither the striking discrepancy between the Divale and Montgomery accounts nor the reference to other groups was explained. Nor was any substantial evidence offered for the allegations about Miss Davis.

Neither article created a public stir. We know of no other public allegations regarding Miss Davis' political affiliations.

Yet on July 11, two days after the Examiner article appeared, The Regents of the University of California, at their regular meeting, instructed the Administration to determine whether Miss Davis is a member of the Communist Party. They directed the Administration to report its findings at their meeting in mid-September. Miss Davis' Change in Employment Status Form for her summer research appointment had not, as of July 11, been signed. To this date it remains unsigned.

Certain University statutes and resolutions bear on this case, as do some recent decisions by the United States Supreme Court.

1. In 1940, and again in 1949, The Regents resolved that membership in the Communist Party shall disqualify one from becoming a member of the Faculty of the University of California.

2. In June, 1969, The Regents adopted a Standing Order reinstating their power to pass on tenure appointments in the University. However, in the course of that Order (102.1) they also stated that "No political test shall ever be considered in the appointment and promotion of any faculty member or employee."

3. In June also, the UCLA Academic Senate adopted, by vote of 696-151, a resolution of "warning to the campus administration, faculties, departments, and concerned Senate committees not to allow The Regents' recent withdrawal of campus control over academic promotions and appointments at the tenure level to result in any implicit or explicit self-censorship which permits the question of the political acceptability of candidates to intrude itself into the review process."

4. The Supreme Court, in the case of Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 385 U.S. 589 (1967), struck down New York statutes that made membership in the Communist Party grounds for disqualifying one from teaching in a public institution—in this instance, the State University of New York at Buffalo. Relying on the Keyishian and other decisions, the California
Supreme Court, in Vogel v. County of Los Angeles, 68 Cal. 2d 18, 64 Cal. Rptr. 409 (1967), invalidated a section of the California Constitution requiring public employees to sign an oath disclaiming membership in any organization that advocates the violent overthrow of the Government.

These court decisions appear to establish the legal impropriety of disqualifying anyone from university employment on grounds of membership in the Communist Party, or any other political organization. Moreover, The Regents' Standing Order 102.1 can be construed as superseding earlier Regental resolutions prohibiting the employment of Communists. Yet by their actions The Regents have set foot on a path which leads to a violation of Miss Davis' rights, to a disregard of the courts' rulings, and to a confrontation between themselves and a major portion of the University's faculty.

Up to August 20th, despite many meetings and communications between members of the Philosophy Department and the Chancellor, it was not certain whether the Administration would sign Miss Davis' Change in Employment Status Form. But on the afternoon of the 20th, after meeting with representatives of The Regents, the Chancellor informed the Philosophy Department that he had

"been directed by The Regents (by their interpretation of their action of July 11) to take no steps affecting the employment status of Miss Angela Davis pending further action by The Regents following their receipt of the information which they instructed the Administration to obtain concerning the appropriateness of her employment under the terms of the Regental policy barring appointment of members of the Communist Party."

In a letter dated August 26, 1969, the Chancellor repeated that he had been directed by The Regents to take no further steps affecting the employment status of Miss Davis. He went on to say,

"I must report to you that the investigation I am required to make includes forwarding to her a copy of the original letter sent to her on July 16, 1969, and to which you make reference in your letter of August 7, 1969."

The letter in question contained the sentence,

"I am constrained by Regental policy to request that you inform me whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party."
It was sent to Miss Davis on July 16. Miss Davis, however, no longer resided at that address, and hence the letter was returned undelivered and was not sent again at that time.

I, as the Chairman of the Philosophy Department, have throughout urged that Miss Davis should not be questioned regarding her alleged membership in the Communist Party. I have throughout also taken the position that the summer research employment represents a valid University obligation, and that the Change in Employment Status Form ought to be signed without delay. These positions were affirmed on August 22, 1969, in a resolution (full text attached) passed by unanimous vote of those active members of the Department who were then in Los Angeles. In the same resolution the Department also declared that it will not cooperate with any inquiry into Miss Davis' political affiliations, or any further review of her qualifications otherwise than in accordance with normal University procedures. We mean to adhere both to orderly procedure and to established law, despite higher official actions that go contrary to both.

Members of the Committees on Academic Freedom and on Privilege and Tenure of the Los Angeles Division of the Academic Senate, and officers of the American Association of University Professors, have been fully informed of these events. Since Montgomery, in the Examiner article, alleged that Miss Davis is a member of the Black Panthers, members of the Department have also been in communication with UCLA's Committee of Black Faculty and Administrators. Colleagues representing diverse viewpoints have, when informed of the matter, expressed strong agreement with the Department's position. An interested faculty group is making plans for litigation designed to enjoin the University Administration from pursuing the path of confrontation on which it has set foot.

Donald Kalish
Chairman
for the Department of Philosophy,
UCLA
RESOLUTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, AUGUST 22, 1969

Miss Angela Davis was offered a teaching position and a special summer research appointment, both to take effect July 1, 1969. These actions were taken after full review and confirmation by appropriate agencies in accordance with established University procedures. Miss Davis was furthermore assured that a continuation of her appointments for a second year would be contingent only on the adequate performance of her duties during the first year. We therefore urge that the University's contractual obligations be honored without further delay.

Moreover, we can see no good reason why further review of Miss Davis' qualifications need be made at this time. In particular, we oppose and will not cooperate with efforts to secure any information that pertains to Miss Davis' political affiliations, nor will we cooperate with any effort to review Miss Davis' qualifications otherwise than in accordance with normal University procedures. Any political inquiry would damage the very basis on which a great university must rise; would violate first amendment protections recently affirmed by the Supreme Court (in the case of Keyishian vs. Board of Regents, 1967); and would be absolutely incompatible with the Regents' Standing Order 102.1, passed earlier this year, which flatly states that "No political test shall ever be considered in the appointment and promotion of any faculty member or employee".

The Soviet Union has imposed political tests on many of its most creative individuals. It is sad that a comparably illicit use of power to impose a test of political conformity must be resisted here on the Los Angeles campus of the University of California. That this illegal and immoral act is official does not make it less an intrusion on the orderly and reasoned processes by which our University has traditionally done its business. If relevant officials persist in their present course of action, the belief that the University of California is a place where reason holds sway will be proved a myth.

The above resolution was approved unanimously at a meeting of all available members of the Philosophy Department. Those present were:

John Bennett  Thomas Hill
Donald Kalish  David Kaplan
Arnold Kaufman  David Lewis
Richard Montague  John Perry
Sandra Peterson  Richard Wasserstrom
Robert Yost

The following members of the Department, not present at the meeting of August 22, have since registered their approval of the resolution:

Montgomery Furth  Herbert Morris  Made Savage
The Academic Freedom Committee considered two formal questions during the 1980-81 academic year.

Suggested changes in the Statewide Senate Manual (p. 75(f) A.2 and p. 75(g) D.2), designed specifically to protect handicapped students and faculty from discrimination, were reviewed by the Committee at the request of R. L. Crouch, Chairman of the University Committee on Academic Freedom. The Committee found no objection to the revisions.

A member of the nursing school faculty presented a question of potential violation of academic freedom, specifically, of being obliged through administrative pressure to change grades in a course for which grades had been determined by academic criteria and already submitted to the registrar. The Committee's response was unanimous in asserting that, if the faculty member were obliged to change the grades against her will, a violation of academic freedom would be involved.

The specific criteria for translating examination points or percentages into course letter grades were indicated in the course syllabus as "to be determined at the end of the course by the instructor". Near the end of the course, a substitute instructor responded to a student's questions, about grading, in a contradictory and ambiguous way, interpreted by the students to mean that the grading method (curve - vs - percentage categories) providing the most advantageous grade for the students would be used. When the responsible faculty member used a normative curve, the students protested.

A formal grievance hearing led to the determination that (a) The course syllabus should have stated what the specific grading method would be, (b) The substitute instructor's comments could reasonably be assumed by the students to constitute a verbal contract, and that the contract was broken by the grading method used, (c) The grade should be changed to reflect a 90%, 80%, 70% cutoff point for A, B, and C grades respectively, and (d) "it is not in violation of academic freedom to recommend that grades be changed if the contract for establishing grades were broken".

No specific situations within or without the University were seen to constitute a new threat to the academic freedom of the University, its faculty or its students, including the procedures for acceptance of and resignation from University positions.

S. Baumrind
C. Brodsky
A. Jonsen
H. Wilson
J. Motto, Chair
The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget had another busy year discussing, advising and making recommendations on planning statements, budget reviews, and policy matters. The Committee feels that it serves at the heart and core of that complex process of putting into operation joint governance between academic and administrative matters. Perhaps one of the greatest achievements this past year was in that arena of open dialogue with the administrative and academic Vice Chancellors. This joint effort can best be illustrated by the several review and recommending memoranda which were jointly developed and jointly signed. There is an increasing sense of wellbeing in that the voice of the Faculty is being heard.

The Committee has also maintained open communication with the Committee on Schedule and Space and the Committee on Research. Professor John Craig served in a more formal liaison relationship with the Committee on Schedule and Space.

The following summary represents an overview of the issues which have come to the Committee this past year. There is no attempt to summarize the outcomes. It should be reemphasized that the Committee's major role is to make recommendations and to serve in an advisory capacity to the administration on planning and budget matters.

- Regents Supplemental Funds. Made recommendations to the Chancellor relative to request for and allocation of campus funds. In collaboration with the Committee on Research, worked on guidelines which might influence Presidential policy relative to campus allocation of Regents Special Funds.

- Periodic review and response to the overall progress in the campus plan for reallocation of space, including a joint academic-administrative study of classroom space.

- Guidelines for Budget Priorities. Although a coherent set of guidelines has yet to be developed, considerable time and energy was devoted to this end. It is a difficult task, and this year's Committee hopes that some of the groundwork has been laid for success in the future.

- University Planning Statement. A continuing and major agenda item for both the divisional and statewide committees. Although the Statement had little direct relevance to this campus, as it was directed primarily toward the general campuses, many of the issues were sufficiently broad to generate lengthy discussion and response.

- UCSF Budget Process. Associate Administrative Vice Chancellor Tom Rolinson developed and presented an outstanding overview of the entire budget process. This included the history, analysis of sources of funding, budget control/accounting, budget cycle, and status of systemwide funds. The presentation was extremely helpful and informative. Associate Vice Chancellor Rolinson graciously accepted our suggestion that he present an overview of the budget process at a meeting of the Divisional Representative Assembly.
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. University Planning Statement, Part II, Health Science Programs and Issues for the 1980's. Having made quite an issue over the fact that the Planning Statement, Part I, had little relevance to this campus, we rolled up our sleeves and dug into Part II. A detailed joint response (academic and administrative) was forwarded both to the statewide committee and to Vice President Fretter.

. Regents Budget Assumptions and Program Priorities. Campus recommendations were again jointly developed, signed and transmitted.

The preceding represents a summary of some of the major issues and items with which the Committee worked this past year. The Committee members have been a hard-working group over the eight meetings held, with excellent attendance. As the Chair, I wish to thank both the Senate members and the ex officio administrative officers for their serious efforts and support.

Betty Highley, Chair
John Craig, Vice Chair
Malcolm Jendresen
David Ramsay
John Starkweather
Laurel Glass, ex officio
Vice Chancellor Shirley Chater
Vice Chancellor Herbert Suelzle
Associate Vice Chancellor K. Hittelmaln
Associate Vice Chancellor T. Robinson

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
ANNUAL REPORT
1980 - 81

The duties of this committee are to appoint the Chairs and where specified in the Senate By - laws, the Vice-Chairs and all appointed members of all Senate Committees which report to the Division.

Using the following; guidelines developed during the previous year concerning the tenure of Division Chairs, the Faculty preference statement for Committee work, the need for balanced representation from Schools and Departments, and the recommendation of outgoing Chairs, the Committee recommended the appointments for the academic year 1981-82 as circulated in the "Call to the Meeting" for June 22, 1981. These recommendations were approved at the division meeting.

At the request of President Saxon, the Committee submitted the names of 11 San Francisco Faculty members and 8 Faculty members from other campuses as nominees for the Search Committee for the San Francisco campus Chancellor. The President selected three on-campus and two off-campus members from this list.
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The committee also met periodically during the year to recommend replacements for Faculty who have resigned from Committees and/or to recommend members for special committees for the Division or the State-wide Academic Senate.

M. M. Clark
T. E. Daniels
A. J. Davis
J. S. Greenspan
G. M. Grodsky
M. Grossman
R. T. Mercer
C. B. Wilson
L. Z. Benet, Chair

COMMITTEE ON HONORS, GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS
ANNUAL REPORT
1980 - 81

The 1980-81 Academic Senate Committee on Undergraduate Scholarship, Honors and Prizes, San Francisco Division, received four applications for the President's Undergraduate Fellowships. The members of the Committee granted four applications for 1980-81.

W. V. Epstein, for the Committee
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
ANNUAL REPORT
1980 - 1981

This committee is that standing committee of the San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate which considers matters pertaining to educational policy and which examines other reports, policies, procedures or issues within the University to determine whether they will have significant impact on the University's educational process. Such matters are referred to the Committee from Academic Senate officers, other committees or members, and from officers of the University administration. In addition to reviewing referred material, the Committee from time to time initiates discussion and review of topics which have clear implications for educational policy. During the past year meetings were held on the second Wednesday of each month from 2 to 4 p.m.

Major items discussed in the past year included the following:

1) Change in length of curriculum for the Physical Therapy Program
2) Systemwide undergraduate enrollment study
3) Report of the subcommittee on health sciences academic personnel policies
4) Report of the committee to study organized research
5) Proposal to change the name of the Laboratory of Radiobiology
6) Campus guidelines for implementation of systemwide policy on transfer, consolidation, disestablishment or discontinuance of academic programs and units (the Committee recommended that residencies should be included under these guidelines)
7) University planning statement for the 1980s
8) Intercampus activities fund (proposals were reviewed from this campus and suggestions for improvements offered)
9) Proposal for a Laboratory of Cell Analysis at UCSF (the need for such a laboratory was reaffirmed and the Committee urged that once established it be kept available for educational use of faculty and students as well as for research)
10) Standardization of admission requirements to UC campuses (requirements for UCSF were reviewed and inconsistencies with other campuses resolved)
11) Proposals to enhance and enrich commitment to teaching (three suggestions were forwarded to the administration)

Additional details on the above and other issues considered by the Committee during the past year are included in the minutes, which are on file in the Academic Senate Office.

Robert Owen, Chair
R. Jon Goerke, Vice Chair
Leon Epstein
Philip Hopewell
Thomas Hunt
Ada Lindsey
Ernest Newbrun
Richard Shafer
The Graduate Council held twelve meetings during the 1980-81 academic year. The Graduate Students Association was represented by Amy Eisenfeld, GSA President-Internal Affairs. Marion Nestle, Associate Dean of the School of Medicine and Director of Human Biology Programs, and Randall Porter, Coordinator of Program Planning and Institutional Research in the Chancellor's Office, were invited to attend all Council meetings as administrative advisors.

This academic year brought the retirement of Harold Harper as dean of the Graduate Division and the appointment of Lloyd Kozloff as dean and Clifford Attkisson as associate dean. The Graduate Council looks forward to the continuation of a fine working relationship with the Graduate Division deans and staff.

The Council received several reports and documents from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, the Academic Planning Board and the Coordinating Committee of the San Francisco Senate. The results of Council discussions on these matters were relayed by the Chair to the appropriate committees and administrative offices.

Several matters were brought before the Council for action, as follows:

The By-laws of two Graduate Groups, one in Biostatistics and one in Structural Biology, were approved.

A change in the name of the Laboratory of Radiobiology to the "Laboratory of Radiobiology and Environmental Health" was also approved. The Council suggested that the director of the lab and other interested faculty take steps to form a Graduate Group in Environmental Health Sciences.

The Council approved a modification in the rules governing the study list requirements of M.D.-Ph.D. students enrolled in the Medical Scientist Training Program. The minimum graduate course load for MSTP students was reduced from twelve to eight units during the six quarters of major commitment to graduate study.

Upon the recommendation of the dean of the Graduate Division, the Council voted unanimously to raise the minimum score on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) for applicants for admission to graduate programs from 500 to 525.
The Council also advised the dean on new policies and procedures concerning the award of the University Patent Funds for graduate student research, which will become effective with the 1981-82 academic year. (Attachment 1)

The Council voted unanimously to amend By-Law 125A, which specified membership of the Graduate Council, to allow for an increase of two members. The amendment was approved by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and on June 29, 1981 was approved by the Representative Assembly of the San Francisco Division.

In addition to acting on these individual issues, the Council appointed two ongoing committees for the academic year. The Committee on Fellowships, chaired by Prof. Armitage, worked with the Graduate Division in awarding graduate fellowships. The Committee on Program Reviews was chaired by Prof. Attkisson and was charged with developing criteria and a calendar of graduate degree program reviews.

The Committee on Fellowships recommended to the Council that the deadline for fellowship applications be changed to once a year and that the deadline be moved to April 1. The Council unanimously approved this change in the fellowship deadline. The Committee reviewed a total of 183 applications for Regents and Graduate Opportunity fellowships. Awards were made to sixty-five students, totalling approximately $330,000.00. Twelve nominations for the Chancellor's Graduate Research fellowship were received and six awards made.

In the two preceding years, the Graduate Council made a major commitment to carrying out a systematic review of graduate degree programs. The Committee on Program Reviews met throughout the year to develop guidelines and criteria for reviewing academic programs, and established a calendar of reviews of all current degree programs on the campus. The calendar was adopted by the Council as a whole on April 21, 1981. The final guidelines concerning initiation and conduct of reviews were approved on August 6, 1981. (Attachments 2 and 3)

A committee to review the Ph.D. degree program in Human Development and Aging had been appointed during the previous academic year and concluded its review and issued a report to the Council in March 1981. The committee pointed out a number of weaknesses in the support base of the program, but in general judged it to be an effective and valuable part of the campus academic program. The report was forwarded to the Chancellor, the Academic Senate Chair, the chair of the department of Psychiatry, and the faculty in the Human Development and Aging program.

The matter of the physical relocation of the Human Development and Aging program to the Laguna Honda school was addressed by the review committee and was thought to be detrimental to the academic quality of the program. The Council expressed its concern to
the Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs that the removal of academic programs to off-campus sites might have a negative effect on their quality and raises issues of personal safety for students, faculty and staff located at these remote sites.

The Council's new guidelines for conducting program reviews stressed the importance of having reviewers from outside the campus in order to obtain a balanced and fair evaluation of graduate programs. Two new program reviews were initiated by the Council, and committees composed of primarily outside reviewers were appointed.

A committee to review the Doctor of Mental Health degree program visited the campus in June and submitted a report to the Graduate Council shortly thereafter. The committee report pointed out a number of substantive areas which demand attention in order for the D.M.H. program to be effective. The Council met with the interim director of the program, and the chairman of the department of Psychiatry to discuss the issues raised and the recommendations made by the review committee and the Council. The Council was quite concerned about some serious problems in the curriculum and faculty support base of the program and recommended a moratorium on the admission of new students until several conditions meant to improve the quality of the training program could be met. A final report on the D.M.H. program will be forwarded to the Chancellor and the Chair of the Academic Senate.

The committee to review the Ph.D. degree program in Immunology submitted a report in August and it is currently being discussed by the new Graduate Council.

Academic review of graduate degree programs has developed into a major responsibility of the Graduate Council. This past academic year saw the beginning of a long range plan to evaluate the quality of all graduate programs on the campus, and we have every expectation that these reviews will encourage academic excellence.

GUIDELINES CONCERNING UNIVERSITY PATENT FUNDS FOR GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

The University Patent Funds are allocated to the campus from UC patent income and are administered by the Dean of the Graduate Division. The funds are intended to support the direct costs of research conducted by graduate students for the doctoral dissertation. Funds will be awarded for scholarly merit, originality and significance of the research.

General guidelines

1. Awards are made to registered doctoral students who have been advanced to candidacy.
Annual Report of Graduate Council (con't)

2. **Funds are to be used for specific needs vital to the research project which cannot be supported by resources within the department or research advisor's budget.** In recommending the proposal for Patent Fund support, the Graduate Advisor or department chairperson must signify that the department is unable to fund the project.

3. Grants up to a maximum of $1500 are normally made for one calendar year and are administered by the student's department. Funds will be transferred to a departmental account.

4. Students must sign the standard University Patent Agreement before using the award.

5. At the end of the award period or upon completion of the project, a report of expenditures must be forwarded to the Graduate Division. Unexpended funds must be returned to Graduate Division accounts.

6. The student is expected to provide a brief report describing the results of the research project to the Graduate Division within one month after the award period is over.

**Use of funds**

Funds may be used for:

- supplies and/or equipment. Equipment becomes the property of the University of California.

- travel in connection with field research.

- biostatistical, design or data analysis consultation.

- technical assistance or services only when they cannot be performed by the student.

Funds may **not** be used for:

- books or periodicals

- travel to scientific or professional meetings

- computer time

- typing and preparation of the dissertation manuscript

Student may arrange for computer time through the use of an IUC (instructional Use of Computers) account. Call ext. 4526 for more information.
Departments will be expected to follow reasonable and prudent accounting procedures and to comply with University policy in administering Patent Funds on behalf of students. Funds may only be used for the specific student and research project approved. Funds cannot be transferred for use by faculty or students for any other project.

Information and applications

Contact Carmen Hoover at ext. 2111 for additional information.

Applications are available from the Graduate Division, S-140, and will be accepted four times a year: September 1, December 1, March 1 and June 1.

GUIDELINES CONCERNING PROGRAM REVIEWS INITIATED BY THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

Program Review Goals and Calendar

1. Reviews will be initiated in the fall quarter of each academic year according to a calendar of reviews established by the Council and the Graduate Division. A calendar of graduate program reviews was adopted by the Graduate Council on April 21, 1981.

2. Each program review will be initiated with a clear written charge drafted and approved by the Council in collaboration with the Graduate Division.

3. The principal concern of all program reviews will be the academic quality of graduate education at UCSF and the academic welfare of students enrolled in UCSF graduate programs.

Program Review Committee Membership

1. Program Review Committees (PRCs) will be selected so that the membership is tailor-made for the uniqueness of each graduate program and the specific issues relevant to each program.

2. PRC membership will reflect nationally or internationally recognized expertise in the substantive area of the graduate program to be reviewed.

3. The program review subcommittee of the Graduate Council will provide a list of nominees to the Council for review and approval. The Graduate Division will collaborate with the Council in this nomination process. Directors of programs to be reviewed will be asked to suggest potential PRC members.

4. A PRC will have a minimum of three members, with at least one off-campus member on each review committee.

5. The PRC chairperson will be a member of the UCSF Graduate Council unless otherwise recommended by the Council or program review subcommittee.
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Administration

1. The Graduate Division will provide administrative, logistical and fiscal support for the initiation and conduct of program reviews.

2. The program review subcommittee will be appointed annually by the Chair of the UCSF Graduate Council and shall be composed of Council members and the graduate student representative. The Dean of the Graduate Division (and/or designate) shall serve on the subcommittee ex-officio.

3. The Council will annually review, with the Graduate Division, the quality and usefulness of reviews completed.

Dissemination and Use of PRC Reports

1. The Graduate Council and the Graduate Division will consider PRC reports to be confidential. They will be distributed as privileged information to members of the Council and others only as agreed by the Council.

2. The Graduate Council will submit copies of PRC reports to programs under review for comment and formal response. Follow-up, independent meetings of the Council with the Chair of the PRC, and later the program director(s) will be initiated as required to fit individual circumstances.

3. The Graduate Council will formulate its own recommendations, to be submitted to the Chair of the Academic Senate, the Chancellor, the school Deans and the Academic Planning Board. This set of recommendations and documentation drawing from the PRC report will constitute the final program review report of the Graduate Council.

4. The Graduate Council will use every authorized avenue to ensure that recommendations are followed by appropriate hearings and actions.

5. Program review recommendations formulated by the Graduate Council include, but are not limited to:

   recommendations to the faculty of the program for modifications and enhancements

   recommendations to UCSF administrators for program modifications, enhancement, and resource allocation

   recommendation for suspension of admissions

   initiation of the process of disestablishment, in accordance with University of California policy and procedures

   recommendations for commendation of programs operating at high levels of quality and effectiveness.
## CALENDAR OF PROGRAM REVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Graduate Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>Human Development and Aging/Ph.D. Immunology/Ph.D. Doctor of Mental Health/D.M.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>*Medical Anthropology/Ph.D. Biochemistry/Ph.D. Clinical Laboratory Science/M.C.L.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Chemistry/Ph.D. Experimental Pathology/Ph.D. Medical Information Science/M.S., Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>Anatomy/Ph.D. Biophysics/Ph.D. Neurosciences/Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>Pharmacology and Comparative Pharmacology &amp; Toxicology/Ph.D. Microbiology/Ph.D. Psychology/Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>**Speech and Hearing Science/Ph.D. Sociology/Ph.D. Physiology/Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>Endocrinology/Ph.D. Oral Biology/M.S. Genetics/Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>Nursing/M.S., D.N.S. Medical &amp; Biological Illustration/M.A. History of Health Sciences/M.A., Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*joint degree UCSF - UCB

**joint degree UCSF - UCSB
The responsibilities of the Committee on Library include: advising the President and Chancellor on the administration of the Library at San Francisco; providing liaison between faculty and library administration on all matters of library policy; participating with the Librarian in decisions including the library budget, formulation of policy, allocation of space, and apportionment of funds; and submitting to the San Francisco Division an annual report on these matters.

The major activities of the Library Committee during 1980-81 involved providing consultation regarding possible use of Opportunity Funds for Library purposes, surveying Library user satisfaction with the UCSF serial circulation policy, and surveying the Academic Senate for advice regarding new Library plans. The Chair, as a member of the statewide Senate Committee on Library, provided input at the systemwide level.

1) Announcement of the release of special Regents funds for research ("Opportunity Funds") during the past year occasioned the submission of recommendations from many University agencies. The Committee on Library recommended use of funds for support of an interlibrary jitney service between Berkeley and UCSF and the underwriting of library database searches by students and staff. Not surprisingly, the Opportunity Funds were oversubscribed and none were applied to library support; however, jitney service between UCB and UCSF is being supported from other sources.

2) A broad survey of UCSF Library users was carried out in the Spring Quarter of 1981 to assess the level of satisfaction with the current serial circulation policy which was inaugurated two years earlier (February, 1979). Regular faculty, clinical faculty, housestaff and students were included in the mailing. The return was 429 of the 1838 questionnaires sent out (23.3%). The overall response constituted a strong endorsement of the basic policy (86.3% in favor). Forty-eight percent have better success in finding materials on the shelf under the new policy and 44% "can't compare". Approximately 50% find photocopy service "fair" but 25% to 38% find waiting and nonfunctional machines to be a significant problem. On the other hand, 84% find copy quality to be fair or good. The Committee concludes that the basic circulation policy can be strongly endorsed but that the photocopier situation, upon which the circulation policy partially depends, needs improvement. This improvement will require improved physical quarters for the Library and is one of the considerations for the last item taken up by the Committee this year (see below).

3) Planning for a new Library facility has been subjected to rather erratic priority rating by Systemwide Administration over the past several years. In June of 1981 the priority for this project was suddenly shifted to a very high level, and local administration requested input from the Library Committee. The outgoing (1980-81) and incoming (1981-82) chairs were invited to participate in several informational meetings with Associate Vice Chancellors Hittelmann and Rolinson. The need for provision of information to the faculty and the desirability of faculty input in the
planning process was agreed upon by all parties even though only a few weeks were available during the summer to prepare and disseminate the material. A package was mailed to members of the Divisional Senate the last week of August, providing baseline information on overall size considerations and site planning. Faculty were invited to send comments to the Committee via the Senate office. These comments have been referred to the appropriate Administrative officials.

B. Katzung, Chair
B. M. Alberts
J. R. Baringer
J. Norbeck
S. Øie
E. J. Shillitoe
D. P. Stites
D. Bishop, ex officio
D. J. Pascoe
N. Zinn (LAUC, SF Representative)

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE
AND TENURE
ANNUAL REPORT
1980-81

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure functions as a standing committee of the San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate to take cognizance of matters affecting the privilege or the tenure of all members of the Academic Senate, or Officers of Instruction of the San Francisco Division and to conduct hearings in individual cases. During 1980-81 the Committee was asked to comment on a series of issues of concern to privilege and tenure. In addition, the Committee chair met individually with faculty members who had requested discussion of certain academic matters which might fall within the responsibility of this committee. One petition of grievance concerning denial of tenure led to a pre-hearing and a subsequent formal hearing by the Committee, which found for the petitioner. The Divisional Chair was kept informed of the Committee's findings, which were advanced to the Chancellor who elected not to accept the Committee's recommendations but to uphold his original decision to deny tenure. In accordance with Senate policy, the findings of the formal hearing by the Committee have been forwarded to the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

G. Chierici, Chair
R. T. Mercer
S. A. Schroeder
M. D. Shetlar
W. M. Wara
During the 1980-81 fiscal year the Committee on Research discussed the following topics:

1. **Multiple-User Equipment Research Funds**: It seems that funds for both expendable supplies and permanent equipment for use in single projects are available from the Federal Government; however, multiple-user equipment is more difficult to obtain. In addition, funds will be harder to get in the future due to budget restraints. It was therefore agreed that the Committee on Research would solicit proposals, on an experimental basis for this year, for a new category of grants -- Multiple-User Equipment Research Funds.

2. **General Assistance**: The 1979-80 limit for general assistance was $3,000.00 which was based on paying a student $1,000.00 per month for three months during the summer. COR members thought that $3,000.00 was insufficient in terms of being able to provide faculty sufficient assistance with their research or to provide students with adequate work experience. It was agreed that the amount of general assistance be increased to $4,000.00 for the December 5, 1980 grant deadline. Those funded prior to that date but during 1980-81 were given the opportunity to request the increase for their 1980-81 grants.

3. **Travel Funds**: The limit for support was increased from $350 to $450.

The following is a summary of Committee on Research 1980-81 activities:

**RESEARCH GRANTS**: The Committee on Research received 207 grant request applications totalling $1,911,012, of which 138 were funded for $874,509.00. These were divided into Individual Principal Investigators and Multiple-User Equipment Research Grants.

- **Individual Principal Investigators**: 162 applications for $1,094,893 were received. The average request was for $6,758; the largest for $26,212 and the smallest for $800. 117 requests were funded for a total of $543,304. The average award was $4,643; the largest for $12,000 and the smallest for $400.

- **Multiple-User Equipment Research Grants**: 45 applications for $816,119 were received. The average request was for $18,136; the largest was for $27,890 and the smallest for $4,235. 21 Requests were funded for $331,205. The average award was $15,772, the largest $23,791, and the smallest $5,512.

**Distribution of Funds**: Funds for both Individual Principal Investigators and Multiple-User Equipment Research Grants were obtained from a variety of sources: State 19900 funds, Opportunity Funds, gifts and endowments, and funds carried forward from fiscal year 1979-80. A breakdown of the distribution is as follows:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>$ Available</th>
<th>$ Awarded</th>
<th>$ Returned</th>
<th>$ Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State 19900</td>
<td>112,756</td>
<td>121,188</td>
<td>8,432</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>178,523</td>
<td>179,661</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>573,415</td>
<td>573,619</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>1,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>864,735</td>
<td>874,509</td>
<td>11,344</td>
<td>1,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRAVEL GRANTS: The Committee on Research received 98 requests from eligible Academic Senate members for travel to present papers at scholarly meetings. The Committee is able to grant any one individual up to $450.00 every two years, and all requests were funded at a total of $40,766.

HITCHCOCK PROFESSOR: On February 23, 1981 the Committee on Research sponsored a noon lecture by Edward M. Purcell, Nobel Laureate and Professor of Physics at Harvard University. Professor Purcell was appointed a Hitchcock Professor by the University of California in accordance with the bequest of the Hitchcock family. His lecture was titled "A Physicist Looks at a Bacterium".

FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURER: John W. Severinghaus, M.D., Department of Anesthesia, was appointed the 24th Annual Faculty Research Lecturer. He presented his lecture, "pH and All That" on Monday, May 18, 1981 in Cole Hall.

OTHER ITEMS OF DISCUSSION: The Committee on Research also discussed the following items:

1. Policies and Procedures of the Committee (the latest version, dated March 3 1981 is available in the Academic Senate Office)
2. Cell Analysis Laboratory
3. Report of the Committee to Study Organized Research Units
4. Retroactive Salary Adjustments
5. Radiation Safety Guidelines
6. Subcommittee on Recharges, and
7. Request for additional members to the Committee on Research (two additional members have been requested).

John S. Greenspan, Chair
Susan R. Gortner, Vice Chair
Henry R. Bourne
Henry I. Goldberg
Michael Humphreys
C. Anthony Hunt
Roesse T. Jones
Steven J. Wissig
David Zakim
Jack Johnstone, student representative
During the academic year 1979-80, the Committee on University Extension and Continuing Education under the chairmanship of Phyllis Stern recommended that "teaching in continuing education programs be recognized as a contribution towards promotion of latter rank." During this academic year, Vice-Chancellor Shirley Chater acknowledged in a letter that the continuing education would henceforth be taken into account along with other evidence to support the four criteria for advancement and promotion. The Committee reviewed UCLA Extension standards and criteria for non-degree programs as a possible guideline for standards at UCSF. It was recommended by the Committee that this paper be forwarded to the campus committee on continuing education. Dean Lucy Ann Geiselman of Continuing Education and Health Sciences reported to the Committee on University Extension and Continuing Education that the campus committee on continuing education did not feel this document was applicable for continuing education in health sciences. The Committee on University Extension and Continuing Education is in agreement with this recommendation.

The Chairman of the Committee on University Extension and Continuing Education attended the campus-wide meeting on March 25, 1981. That committee was addressed by Keith Sexton, University Dean on University Extension, who pointed out that enrollment in continuing education programs has decreased over the past two years. He pointed out that several divisions of the University have significant deficit spending in the area of continuing education and are tapping the statewide reserve. The University-wide committee discussed the UCLA Extension's standards and criteria for non-degree programs, and several members pointed out that they have adopted this document as the standard for their campus. It is apparent the health sciences university is unique in that many agencies and committees provide a multi-layered review system for evaluating courses in continuing education in the health field.

Respectfully submitted,

L. Z. Benet
J. G. Lipson
E. Rosinski
S. Silverstein