

Council Resolution Calls for Assistance To P&T Committees

Asked to conduct judicial-style hearings while rarely being legal professionals, the members of the University of California's Privilege and Tenure Committees have felt themselves in need of help in recent years. In March, the Senate's Academic Council agreed that they should get it. Acting on a recommendation from the Senate's Universitywide Privilege and Tenure (P&T) Committee, the Council voted to endorse a set of resolutions that may result in campus P&T committees getting aid from several sources: From UC faculty who are attorneys, from private attorneys hired to help the committees, and from judging services whose professionals can conduct hearings. The first of these recommendations is within Senate control, while the second and third will require the agreement of — and financial support from — UC's General Counsel's office.

Apart from these recommendations, the Council also accepted a UCP&T proposal under which UCP&T would be empowered to review campus disciplinary or grievance decisions in cases in which a chancellor has disagreed with — and perhaps overturned — the decision of the campus P&T committee. As things stand, the Senate's role in such cases is concluded once the campus P&T committee has made a recommendation to the chancellor. Under the proposal, the universitywide P&T Committee could undertake an evaluation of a given case after the chancellor has made a decision; it would make a report on such cases not only to the chancellor, but to UC's president, along with the campus P&T Committee. Either a campus P&T committee or a chancellor would be permitted to request such a UCP&T review under the recommendation.

Privilege and Tenure Committees are the University of California's central mechanism for adjudicating disputes or disciplinary cases that involve faculty. The committees are empowered to issue findings on three broad categories of cases: Grievance cases, in which a faculty member believes his or her rights have

(Please See: Privilege, Page 2)

1998's Admissions Figures Make Visible The Impact Affirmative Action Had on UC

When the University of California's campuses released their figures on 1998 undergraduate admissions last month, the news managed to surprise hardly anyone, but to dishearten almost everyone. Freshman admissions of underrepresented minority students were down — at some campuses dramatically down, though systemwide the declines were much more modest.

When it came to the question of how to interpret these numbers, however, the responses were varied.

"Many underrepresented minority students not offered admissions here would have succeeded here," said UC Berkeley Chancellor Robert Berdahl, an affirmative action supporter, in announcing UCB's figures. "I believe this will be a loss for Berkeley and, if these students leave the state, a loss for California."

Some proponents of affirmative action saw in the figures nothing less than a "resegregation" of higher

education, with many black, Latino, and American Indian students now shut out of some of the nation's most prestigious institutions. Other observers wondered about a segregation *within* UC, as the system's two most selective campuses, Berkeley and UCLA, showed the greatest drop in minority admissions, while Riverside and Santa Cruz were the only campuses to register increases.

Meanwhile opponents of affirmative action saw in the figures evidence for a claim they have been making for years: That affirmative action was not just one factor among many in minority admissions, but a predominate factor for many minority students. UC Regent Ward Connerly saw in the data a "smoking gun" that proved this assertion. Both Connerly and California Gov. Pete Wilson said the minority admissions rates were unacceptable, but both felt that the change to a race-blind admissions process was laudable in that

(Please See: Admissions, Page 4)

Bigger Distributions Likely Next Year

Major Modifications in Works for System That Governs Regents' Endowment Funds

The method the University of California has employed for decades to distribute much of its endowment money underwent some significant modifications last month, with the practical results of these changes likely to follow this summer. The modifications approved stand to bump up, in the near term, the "payouts" provided from some of UC's endowment funds, and they stand to make UC more attractive to potential donors. Beyond this, they will make more money available on campuses for fund-raising activities. It is unclear, however, whether in the long run the changes will provide endowment beneficiaries with more or less money and there is a risk that the changes will

result in less stable payouts — in payouts whose dollar amounts may be less in a given year than they were the year before.

The modifications that are coming about in UC's endowment policies can only be understood within the broader context of financial giving to UC. In 1996-97, the University received more than \$726 million in private support, an amount that put it second (behind the Salvation Army) among U.S. institutions that receive private donations. This amount far exceeds that given to any other higher education institution, though, on a per-student basis, giving to UC ranks well below the level achieved by elite private institutions. About 75 percent of the donations to the University are so-called "current use" gifts, meaning money that is intended to be spent within a year of its receipt. The balance of the gifts are for UC's endowments, meaning gifts whose principal grows over time

(Please See: Endowments, Page 3)

Inside Notice: EAP Directors; Commitment to UC

Additional Level of Review Called for When Committee, Chancellor Disagree

Privilege & Tenure: New Forms of Support Recommended

(Continued from Page 1)

been violated (including the right to fair consideration in tenure review); disciplinary cases, in which a chancellor has alleged a faculty member has violated UC's Faculty Code of Conduct; and early termination cases, in which untenured or tenured faculty have been proposed for termination prior to the expiration of their contract.

P&T Committees can seek informal resolutions to some complaints, but even simple grievance cases often involve a hearing with the faculty member who believes his or her rights have been violated. Disciplinary cases stemming from a formal complaint by a chancellor nearly always result in full-blown P&T hearings that resemble courtroom proceedings, complete with witnesses, and introduction of evidence.

Help From UC Legal Faculty

On the three UC campuses that have law schools, one or more law school faculty generally will serve on the campus P&T committee. These faculty are not acting as legal counsel to the committees, but they do provide a legal expertise that the committees find helpful in carrying out their deliberations. Campuses without law schools, however, generally do not have access to such faculty. This is the situation intended to be remedied by one of the Council's recommendations. The statewide Senate will now be setting up a "Panel of Counselors," meaning a group of UC faculty with legal training whose members could be called on to serve on the P&T committees of campuses other than their own. Faculty would come to such service through appointment by the Committee on Committees of campuses that have law schools. What kinds of roles would such faculty play?

"This would be entirely up to the P&T Committee on the requesting campus," says Ed Rubin, chair of UCP&T and prime mover behind the change. "They could be full-fledged members of the committees, they could come in and consult on individual cases, they could serve ex-officio. The only thing they can't do is serve as an attorney."

In a second action, the Council approved language that calls on the University to provide funds for campus P&T Committees to retain outside

counsel on a fee-for-service basis. The most likely use for such an attorney would be in formal disciplinary hearings in which the competing sides have their own attorneys — a private defense attorney hired by the accused faculty member and a "prosecuting" attorney, supplied by the General Counsel's office, who represents the administration. Heretofore, the General Counsel's office has also provided an attorney for the P&T Committee itself. The problem with

NEWS IN BRIEF

EAP DIRECTORS NAMED

University of California faculty who will serve as on-site study center directors for the University's Education Abroad Program (EAP) have been named for terms that will begin July 1. These faculty will be among those who will serve some 1,800 UC students who will study in over 100 host institutions in 35 countries in the coming year.

Study Center Directors advise and place students in classes at host campuses, determine credit for courses taken, provide grades and are responsible for student well-being. The directors assist with placements for reciprocity students at UC campuses and maintain relations with partner institutions. The Academic Senate's University Committee on Education Abroad Program (UCEAP) is responsible for choosing the study center directors.

The following UC faculty have been appointed as new EAP Study Center Directors. France: (Lyon/Grenoble), Jean-Jacques Courtine, French & Italian, Santa Barbara; Germany: Gail K. Hart, German, Irvine; Hungary: Thomas Timar, Education, Riverside; India: Juan Campo, Religious Studies, Santa Barbara; Italy: Pasquale Verdicchio, Literature, San Diego; Israel: Naomi Janowitz, Religious Studies, Davis; Japan (Meiji Gakuin): William Bodiford, East Asian Language & Culture, Los Angeles; Japan (Tokyo), Masako Ishii-Kuntz, Sociology, Riverside; Mexico: Georg Gugelberger, Literature & Languages, Riverside; Russia: Tim McDaniel, Sociology, San Diego; Southeast Asia: Howard Wang, Biology, Santa Cruz; Spain: (Madrid), Jose Monleon, Spanish & Portuguese, Los Angeles; and United Kingdom/Ireland (London): Donald Crawford, Philosophy, Santa Barbara.

this arrangement, in the view of UCP&T and the Academic Council, is that it does not allow for an adequate separation between the General Counsel's "prosecuting" and "P&T" attorneys, who may have differing interests and yet are employees of the same unit. What the Council recommended, therefore, was that the University pay for private-sector attorneys who would aid the P&T Committees. The Council's position on this has been forwarded to the General Counsel's office for its consideration.

The third proposal approved by the Council stems from a recommendation made originally by the General Counsel's office. It is that UC enter into a contract with a professional judging service in order to obtain "hearing officers" for campus P&T Committees. Such professionals generally are retired judges or attorneys with extensive experience in conducting hearings. This would be their role for P&T Committees, as committee judgments would still be left strictly to the committee members. This recommendation also has gone to General Counsel's office for its review.

Case Reviews by UCP&T

A second Privilege and Tenure resolution approved by the Council has to do not with help for local P&T committees, but with the nature of Privilege and Tenure review at UC. Current UC policy in disciplinary cases is that chancellors lodge charges with P&T committees against individual faculty, alleging violations of the Faculty Code of Conduct, after which P&T Committees hold hearings on the charges and issue findings. However, these findings are advisory to the chancellor, who may decide to overrule the committee. Depending on the severity of the sanction the chancellor recommends, the case may then be closed or may move to the president or Regents for a final decision. What the Council has recommended is that, in cases in which a chancellor disagrees with a P&T finding, the chancellor may request that the statewide P&T Committee (UCP&T) undertake a review of the dispute and issue a report on it. In cases in which the chancellor has moved to overturn a P&T decision, the campus P&T committee itself could ask for such a review. UCP&T would provide a report on its evaluation of such cases to the chancellor in

(Please See: Privilege, Page 6)

Endowments: Regents To Be More Active in Setting Payout Rate

(Continued from Page 1)

and whose earnings fund programs specified by the donor.

Endowment gifts to UC can be thought of as going to one of two destinations: To any of the nine independent campus foundations of the University, or to what is known as the Regents General Endowment Pool or GEP. In both cases, donors are likely to specify that their gift go to support a specific campus program—an endowed chair or a scholarship, for example. The difference is that money that comes to campus foundations is managed and distributed by them, while funds that come to GEP are managed and then distributed to the campuses by the Treasurer's Office of the UC Regents.

When given a choice, UC fundraisers generally channel endowment donations into the campus foundations. As a result, in 1996-97, endowment gifts and pledges to the campus foundations were almost double those given to the Regents' GEP. The Regents pool has been around since 1933, however, meaning that gifts were flowing into it long before any of the campus foundations existed. As a result, the market value of the assets in the GEP was more than \$3.1 billion as of last June, while the market value of the foundation assets was about \$852 million. These aggregate figures mask significant differences among campuses, however; in general the older the campus, the larger the proportion of its assets that will be in the GEP. More than 80 percent of UC Berkeley's endowment is in the GEP, while for UC Irvine, the figure is 41 percent.

More Money for Fundraising

The recent actions taken by the University with respect to endowments have solely to do with GEP funds. Two major changes were approved by the Regents at their March meeting, one of which is very simple: The board voted to allow a portion of GEP payouts to be used to offset costs that campuses incur in administering GEP-funded endowments. A given campus might have hundreds of endowments that are funded with GEP money. In essence, the Treasurer's Office writes checks each year to the campuses for each of these endowments. Campuses incur costs, however, in administering them—in setting up the selection process for a student scholarship, for example, or in

distributing funds for endowed chairs. Until now, these costs have been covered with chancellor's discretionary funds. With the change approved by the Regents, GEP payouts will be used to cover these expenses, thus freeing up the chancellor's discretionary money to be used for additional fund-raising. What the Regents approved was an agreement in principle to make this change; what remains is for the campuses and the Regents to agree on a definition of reasonable administrative costs. One figure that has been mentioned is 0.15 percent of the endowments' market value, though it is possible that the rate may differ by campus.

Change in Calculating Payouts

The second change approved has to do with the means of calculating the payouts that will be provided from GEP funds. For decades, the GEP has had an "income-only" payout policy, meaning that the money paid to GEP endowment beneficiaries came solely from dividends, interests, royalties and the like—from income generated by investments the Treasurer's Office made with GEP funds, as opposed to any increase in the market value of the assets. What the Regents approved in March was a shift to a "total return" spending policy, meaning a policy that provides GEP payouts based on a combination of income and capital appreciation.

Several ramifications flow from this change. First, existing policy has meant that the payout rate of the GEP has for decades been on "autopilot," as several observers have described it. The Treasurer's Office has simply paid out all the income derived from GEP assets; when the dollar figure of this payout is divided by the market value of the assets in the GEP, it yields the payout rate, which currently stands at 3.4 percent. With the change to the new policy, the UC Regents will be *deciding* on a payout rate annually by looking at such things as market and inflation predictions. One of the first tasks before the board and the administration is to decide on a process for setting this rate and then to decide on what this coming year's rate will be. In short, the change to total return makes the Regents much more active players in fixing GEP distributions.

Second, the change is intended to eliminate a problem—largely one of perception among potential donors—that stems from current practice. Under

an income-only policy, the payout *rate* will shrink in times of significant growth in the market value of assets. If a GEP-held stock costs \$100 per share in one year and pays a 3-percent dividend, but then appreciates to \$150 in the second year while holding dividends constant, the GEP payout rate from this stock drops from 3 percent to 2 percent. This roughly describes what has been happening with the raging bull market in the last few years. The beneficiaries of the GEP endowments arguably have not suffered because of this. The *dollars* paid out from the GEP to endowment beneficiaries have grown steadily over time. But the current GEP rate of 3.4 percent is a good deal lower than the 4-5 percent rate that is the norm for most institutions, the majority of whom operate under a total-return policy.

A Tough Sell in Fundraising

The result of this is that UC fundraisers face a tough sell when talking to potential donors whose funds would be coming to the GEP. Indeed, Roy Aaron, the president of the UCLA foundation says the old policy was "creating confusion on the part of donors" who were faced with a choice between giving to GEP or any of the UC campus foundations, all of whom operate on total-return. Whatever the realities of dollar-payouts, Aaron says, potential donors are confronted with two figures that seem very clear to them: If they give to UC through the GEP, 3.4 percent of their gift will go to their endowed program this year; if they give to another institution or a campus foundation, up to 5 percent of their dollars will be spent this year.

Payouts Likely to Increase

Perception aside, there is likely to be a real change in GEP payouts in the short-term if, as many observers expect, the Regents set a payout rate of between 4.5 and 5 percent, based on a five-year rolling average of GEP assets. How much the payout would increase to any given endowment would be a function of these and other variables, but one administration official thought that payouts to older endowments might jump by about 10 percent in the coming year.

Whether total-return will provide a similar benefit in the long run is another question. Simulations run by the

(Please See: Endowments, Page 6)

Admissions Figures: 'Decline-to-State' Students Cloud Picture

(Continued from Page 1)

it had done away with a system of "artificial preferences" that had been unfair to whites and Asians and demeaning to the achievements of underrepresented minorities. Both placed the blame for the numbers on California's K-12 educational system, which they said has been failing disadvantaged students.

Making sense of the plethora of numbers that was produced regarding admissions was difficult because the figures had a large question mark in the middle of them, stemming from the fact that UC experienced a substantial increase this year in the number of student applicants who declined to state a racial identity. There were 2,181 such students in 1997 but 6,346 in 1998. At UC Irvine there were more than 1,400 "decline-to-states" this year, out of 11,700 admits, whereas last year there were only 442 decline-to-states. The number of self-identified black students that UCI admitted dropped from 303 in 1997 to 246 this year—a sizable change, but one that would disappear entirely if blacks were significantly overrepresented in the decline-to-state increase.

Indications are, however, that, if anything, UC's figures understated the decline in minority admissions. UC San

Diego determined that most decline-to-state students were white or Asian, while UC Berkeley's Berdahl said that "if history is any guide," the Berkeley decline-to-states were "probably disproportionately white and Asian." Other UC administrators thought that this was probably the case throughout the system.

Even without factoring this possibility in, the admissions figures showed how dramatically affirmative action has been affecting admissions on some campuses. Last year, with affirmative action in place, UC Berkeley admitted 562 black freshmen; this year it admitted 191. In a single year it went from being the UC campus that admitted the highest number of black students to the campus that admitted the lowest number. Overall, the campus' underrepresented minority admissions plunged by 55 percent. A similar story played out at UCLA, where the number of black students admitted dropped by 43 percent (from 488 to 280), while the number of Chicano/Latino students dropped by 33 percent (from 1,497 to 1,001). At San Diego there was a 40 percent decrease in the number of underrepresented minority students admitted; by running simulations, the campus determined that, had affirmative

action remained in place, there would have been an 8 percent increase in the number of such students.

The bright spots for UC were UC Riverside and UC Santa Cruz. UCR realized an impressive 42 percent increase in black students admitted and a 47 percent increase in Chicano/Latino students. UCR's Vice-Chancellor for Enrollment, James Sandoval, believes the increases can be attributed in part to a successful UCR recruiting program that sends current UCR minority students out into area high schools, and in part to UCR's high existing proportion of Chicano/Latino students (15 percent last year), which he believes makes Chicano/Latino high school students feel comfortable on campus. Meanwhile, Santa Cruz increased its underrepresented freshman cohort by more than 8 percent.

Across the system, there were several ways of measuring the change. Students are free to apply to more than one UC campus and this year they applied to an average of almost three. Such a system means that students will get admissions decisions from more than one campus. Using this "admissions decisions" yardstick, UC's number of

(Continued on next page)

UC Black and Chicano/Latino Freshman Admissions: Totals and As A Proportion Of All Freshman Admissions, Fall 1997, 1998

Campus	Black Admits 1997	Black Admits 1998	Chicano/Latino Admits 1997	Chicano/Latino Admits 1998
Berkeley	562 (6.8%)	191 (2.4%)	1,266 (15.4%)	600 (7.6%)
Davis	518 (4.0%)	332 (2.5%)	1,626 (12.4%)	1,302 (9.7%)
Irvine	303 (2.7%)	246 (2.1%)	1,412 (12.4%)	1,291 (11.0%)
Los Angeles	488 (4.7%)	280 (2.7%)	1,497 (14.3%)	1,001 (9.6%)
Riverside	241 (3.5%)	342 (3.9%)	1,039 (15.0%)	1,528 (17.3%)
San Diego	373 (2.8%)	203 (1.6%)	1,427 (10.7%)	979 (7.5%)
Santa Barbara	438 (3.0%)	375 (2.8%)	2,215 (15.2%)	1,701 (12.6%)
Santa Cruz	223 (2.4%)	219 (2.1%)	1,159 (12.5%)	1,245 (12.2%)
Unduplicated Total*	1,509 (3.5%)	1,243 (2.8%)	5,685 (13.2%)	5,294 (11.9%)

The numbers in parentheses express the proportion of black or Chicano/Latino students within each campus' total pool of admitted students. Thus, in 1997 black students accounted for 6.8 percent of all freshmen admitted at UC Berkeley. Figures include students who declined to state their race.

*Represents the number of students who gained admission to at least one UC campus. The sum of admissions granted by all UC campuses is higher, since students may apply to more than one campus.

(Continued from previous page)

positive admissions decisions regarding black students declined by 31.7 percent from last year to this. (Campuses made 3,146 positive decisions regarding black applicants last year, compared to 2,188 this year.) Meanwhile, the number of positive decisions regarding Chicano/Latino students declined by 18.1 percent.

An arguably more important statistic, however, is the change in the number of minority students who were admitted to at least one UC campus, whether or not they were turned down by others. Using this “unduplicated” measure, underrepresented minority students accounted for 15.4 percent of all admitted students this year, compared with 17.6 percent last year, a decline of 12.5 percent. This is the relevant figure when the question is: How many fewer minority students were offered a UC education this year, as compared to last? This aggregate figure masks an important difference between black and Chicano students, however. As a proportion of total admissions, black admissions declined by 20 percent from last year to this whereas for Chicanos the decline was 8 percent.

All these figures take into account only the “first stage” of admissions; yet to come is a second stage in which decisions are made about students who are UC-eligible, but who were not admitted in the first round to the campus of their choice.

In response to their first-stage campus figures, a number of UC Chancellors and admissions officers noted that the third major component of the admissions process is enrollment and that they would now work to enroll as many admitted minority students as possible — a targeting that is allowed under both the UC Regents’ Resolution SP-1 and California’s Proposition 209.

Apart from this, UC is greatly increasing its outreach efforts to disadvantaged K-12 schools as a means of trying to increase minority admissions. In addition, many UC campuses have been trying to choose items from the mix of UC admissions criteria in a way that is at once race-blind and that yet can yield an increase in minority students. Berkeley’s Chancellor Berdahl might have been speaking for several somber chancellors and admissions officers, however, when he said to the press that “if we fail to take race into account [in admissions] it’s difficult to see how any process will yield results different from what we see today.”

Notes from the Chair: Commitment to UC

Over the past few months, the outside professional activities of University of California faculty have once again become a focus of attention. One stimulus for the renewed interest in this subject has been the success of a consulting group that counts several UC Berkeley faculty among its founders and senior professionals. These faculty, economists and lawyers, have demonstrated a capacity to generate substantial outside income by working with highly visible corporate clients — so much so that their firm recently was able to stage a successful initial public stock offering.

From all accounts, the work of the Berkeley faculty in this enterprise is within the bounds of UC policy. Either they have been released part-time from their teaching and research responsibilities or their consultation has not exceeded the number of days per year allowed to full-time UC faculty. But their success, which in some cases is measured in the tens of millions of dollars, has nevertheless generated controversy. The questions that have been raised — applicable to faculty in general — concern the potential for a “conflict of commitment” between University work and outside professional activities. The question is whether there comes a point at which such engagements weaken or compromise a faculty member’s commitment to his or her University responsibilities. There are some who argue that tighter policies are needed to control the amount of income potential, assure allegiance to the University, and curtail any drain of intellectual energy from within the system.

Last month, President Atkinson put together an Administrative Task Force on Conflict of Commitment, co-chaired by UCOP Provost Jud King and UC’s Senior Vice President for Business and Finance, Wayne Kennedy. Their charge was to determine whether UC’s current policies are adequate to ensure that no conflict exists between the outside activities of faculty and staff and their responsibilities as UC employees. Their report, just recently forwarded to the President, proposes a number of possible considerations for improving existing policy. Among their recommendations are suggestions for expanding the nature of the faculty’s annual report on outside activities and financial interests; clarifying the situations for which prior approval of professional activities may be necessary; and clarifying the conditions around professional leaves of absence for entrepreneurial purposes. They also note that there may be merit in consolidating our many policies within one integrated document. The report will be discussed on campuses, with the expectation that policy changes may be recommended in the near term.

I’m confident that we faculty are united in the view that our primary commitments of time and energy must be devoted to the teaching, research, and public service that constitute our charge. It is essential that we are accessible to students, and that we participate actively in the academic programs of our departments and campuses. But we must likewise guard against policies that would too severely limit the faculty’s outside professional activities, as such restrictions could do the University great harm.

Outside professional work keeps the University linked to the pulse of society, assuring that faculty bring their expertise to bear on society’s problems. And it grounds our teaching and scholarly endeavors in the realities of life. In addition, the visibility of UC faculty in the larger world serves to attract quality students and faculty to academic programs, and it increases the potential for external funding, as the likelihood of a proposal being well-received rises with a faculty member’s reputation. Outside involvement provides a mechanism to build and maintain an academy full of zest and creativity and to help retain faculty who are being pursued by other institutions. The report of the Task Force on Conflict of Commitment appears to recognize the importance of outside activities in serving the public and sharpening the professional skills of our faculty. Our challenge will be to maintain a balanced perspective as we move forward with any changes in policy.

—Sandra J. Weiss,
Chair, Academic Council

Endowments: Change to 'Total Return'

(Continued from Page 3)

Treasurer's Office show that, during a 39-year time-frame since 1958, a hypothetical \$100,000 gift would have returned almost identical amounts (of about \$416,000) to an endowment beneficiary under either an income-only or total-return policy. However, at the end of this period, the gift's principal would have grown to \$857,000 under the income-only policy, but to only \$728,000 under the total-return policy. To be sure, these results stand to change depending on the time-frame used, but they do indicate that it is not certain that total-return will do better in the long-run than income-only.

Risk in Payout Volatility

The other danger of total-return is volatility in payouts. Only once in the same 39-year period has income-only paid out less in a given year than it did the year before (and in that year because of an accounting fluke). By contrast, Treasurer's Office simulations show that a total-return policy would have yielded such declines in seven separate years during the period. The reason? Markets go up as well as down and under total-return, payouts are based in part on the

more volatile market value of assets.

Despite these concerns, the UC Treasurer's Office this year lent its critical support to a change to total-return, after several years of opposing the move.

"If the rate is chosen by the Regents and if it will make the GEP look more similar to the foundations, then I'm all for it," says UC Treasurer Patricia Small. People need to understand the volatility and other risks, she says, but on balance she's comfortable with the change. She adds however, that "people should be looking at things in terms of dollars [paid out], not percentages."

View of the Senate

Registering its opinion just prior to the UC Regents votes, the Senate's Academic Council — relying on its Committee on Planning and Budget — said that it supported the broad policy changes that were approved, but that it was concerned about the specifics of implementation — in the how the payout rate would be set, in what that rate would be, and in what proportion of GEP funds will now be going to campuses to pay for the administrative costs of GEP endowments.

Privilege & Tenure

(Continued from Page 2)

question, the campus P&T Committee, and UC's president. UCP&T would not engage in its own fact-finding in such cases, but would limit itself to a review of "the campus Committee's procedures, its adherence to prevailing University and campus rules, and the general reasonableness of its factual determinations."

Rubin acknowledges that what the Council has recommended is a level of Senate review beyond that called for in current regulations — something that might be expected to get a chilly reception from UC's chancellors. He points out, however, that the proposed policy gives chancellors, as well as P&T committees, the ability to request a further review in cases of disagreement, something that chancellors might welcome as a matter of minimizing conflict with their faculty. Beyond this, he says, the proposal would provide UC's president with another party to turn to for advice on contentious disciplinary issues, an option that would be relevant in cases in which the president either has the final say or must provide a recommendation to the Regents.

Notice

is published eight times during the academic year for the University of California faculty by the Academic Senate's Academic Council.

Sandra J. Weiss, Chair
UCOP, 22nd Floor, 300 Lakeside Drive
Oakland, CA 94612

David Krogh, Editor
Room 422, 2223 Fulton Street
UC, Berkeley, CA 94720-1020
(510) 642-6068
david.krogh@ucop.edu

Notice is available on the World Wide Web at: <http://www.ucop.edu/senate>

Voluntary Contribution Plan Update

UC Voluntary Contribution Fund Performance
As of March 31, 1998

Fund	Rate of Return, Last 12 Months	Rate of Return, Last 1 Month	Unit Price
Equity	33.14%	4.23%	\$225.2
Bond	27.22%	1.07%	\$107.0
Savings	6.18%	0.51%	N/A
ICC	7.56%	0.60%	N/A
Money Market	5.70%	0.48%	N/A
Multi-Asset	19.49%	1.98%	\$24.0