Notice

A publication of the Academic Senate, University of California
Vol. 22, No. 3, December 1997

NEWS FOR THE UC FACULTY

Who is Eligible to Attend UC? Wealth Of Data Come from New State Study

What proportion of California's various high school populations are eligible to come to the University of California? In November, the University got a cart-load of information on this subject in the form of a long-awaited report from California's Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). Some of the major messages from the report were that not as many California high school students are fully eligible for UC as state educational policy requires; that the proportion of black students eligible for UC is not only low but dropping; and that there is a very large pool of students — including minority students — who would be eligible for UC if they simply took all the SAT tests the University requires.

The question of eligibility for the University is different from the question of admission. To be eligible for the University means to be minimally eligible, a status that brings with it a guarantee of admission to a campus of the University, though not necessarily to a student's campus of choice (or to a major of choice within any campus). The central question before CPEC was: What proportion of the state's public high school graduates meet the minimum standards of eligibility for UC and for California State University?

The commission's means of answering this question was to collect the transcripts of about 15,000 randomly selected 1996 high school graduates and then turn the transcripts over to UC and CSU with a request that they make a determination as to whether each of the graduates selected was eligible for admission. A determination of who actually was eligible among this group of students presumably then yields the proportion of all graduates who are eligible for admission to the institutions. For UC, the proportion who are eligible turned out to be 11.1 percent, while for CSU it was 29.6 percent.

These numbers stand in contrast to two clear standards imposed by

(Please See: CPEC, Page 4)

In Close Vote, Regents Approve Domestic-Partner Benefits for UC Faculty and Staff

The University of California is not usually a center of high drama, but it briefly became one last month as the UC Regents approved, by the narrowest of margins, domestic partner benefits for University faculty and staff.

The Regents decision came in the form of a 13-12 vote in which those in favor of the benefits prevailed only because of a last-second abstention by a Regent who earlier had seemed to oppose the proposal before the board. More fundamentally, the benefits measure prevailed despite the determined opposition of California Gov. Pete Wilson who, just hours before the final discussion of the issue was to begin, appointed two new Regents who then went on to side with him on the measure. The governor's actions prompted Lt. Gov. Gray Davis — like Wilson, an ex-officio Regent — to say he was "offended by this effort to make midnight appointments" in an attempt to "pack this board at the last moment." Though the governor lost, he told the press following the meeting that he doesn't believe "we've seen the last of this," though he was not specific about what may come next.

The close-margin by which the measure was approved did nothing to diminish the sense of elation felt by those University faculty and staff who supported domestic-partner benefits at UC. The Regents' vote was welcomed nearly universally by the UC faculty which, through the Academic Senate, has formally supported such benefits since 1994. Last year's Academic Council Chair, Duncan Mellichamp, whose request to the Regents last spring was instrumental in bringing about the board's deliberations, said the Regents' vote was "a vote for fairness and competitiveness," as UC will now join the ranks of first-tier academic institutions offering such benefits. He noted that the faculty did not get all it

(Please See: Domestic, Page 3)

California's 'Virtual University' Aims to Be A Digital Center for Higher Education

This coming May, the State of California will inaugurate a digital-age adjunct to its higher education efforts as it opens the California Virtual University (CVU).

The name of the new entity may be something of a misnomer, since there are no plans for CVU ever to be a stand-alone, degree-granting university. At root, it will be a website with some content of its own and with links to the websites of most of the higher education institutions in California. Beyond this, in line with the goals of the CVU, the three public California higher education institutions will seek funding from the state for the development of on-line courses and for some upgrading of on-line infrastructure.

The hope is that the existence of such a system will bring about an educational synergy in California, prompting institutions to increase the transferability of their courses and bringing about the development of on-line educational tools and courses useful throughout higher education.

The CVU had its beginnings in a 1996 decision by the Western Governors Association to form a degree-granting, on-line institution called the Western Governors University. After receiving advice on this project from state educators, California Gov. Pete Wilson decided that California would not be a part of it, but instead would form its own, limited "virtual university." Through an executive order issued last April, Wilson established a "design team" for the CVU. Initially made up strictly of higher education administrators, the team came to include faculty from all the segments of California higher education after concerns about the original makeup of

(Please See: Virtual, Page 3)

Inside Notice:
Davis Says No To Semester System

Following Senate Vote, UC Davis Abandons Semester Proposal

A negative vote by the UC Davis Senate has prompted the UCD administration to shelve a proposal for converting the campus from a quarter-system to a semester-system. Saying that "the faculty must be our principal guide on the question of changing the academic calendar," Davis Chancellor Larry Vanderhoef announced on December 9 that he would not pursue the conversion, which he first proposed at a campus convocation in September.

In mail balloting that concluded on December 3, 810 UCD faculty said they preferred to remain on the quarter system, while 251 said they'd prefer to convert to the proposed "early" semester system, which would have begun in August and ended before Christmas. Eighty-six of the division's 2,066 eligible voting members expressed no preference. Of the eligible voters, more than 500 are emeriti; fewer than 20 percent of emeriti voted, however, meaning that about 1,150 of some 1,500 active faculty cast votes in the balloting.

The Senate vote was one of several advisory votes held on the issue; Academic Federation (non-Senate) faculty voted narrowly against the change, while Davis students were overwhelmingly against it. The campus' Staff Assembly favored the change by a slight margin.

Despite the negative vote, the Davis Senate seems to be in good agreement with the administration that there are a number of campus problems that the proposed conversion might have helped, but that now need to be addressed by other means. Davis Provost Robert Grey and Senate Chair Bryan Miller have agreed to a process by which Senate and administration will divide these issues and then get to work solving them.

Among the issues that the administration hoped to deal with through a conversion is that of a financial loss the campus suffers because of the unusually low academic load taken on by UCD students. UC receives funding from the state for so-called full-time equivalent (FTE) students, defined as a student taking 15 units of course-work per quarter. For each FTE, the state provides $7,000 in funding. At UCD, however, the average undergraduate takes fewer than 13.5 units per quarter. The disparity between this figure and the 15-unit FTE funding threshold means that the campus "must now teach approximately 11 students to earn funding for 10," as Provost Grey put it, with the shortfall having implications for everything from facilities to number of faculty hired.

Grey did not make the case that the semester system per se would solve UCD's problem. Rather, he believed it was the process of conversion that would help, as it would provide the faculty with an opportunity to undertake a comprehensive consideration of whether UCD students are receiving enough unit-credit for the course work they do. Such a consideration is difficult to do piecemeal, he said, since a change in course credit instituted by a given academic unit stands to affect other units as well.

Letters to Notice
Effects of Prop. 209

To the Editor:

In response to the letter of Michael J. Glennon [*Notice*, November 1997, p. 2], Proposition 209 says that the University "shall not discriminate against" African-Americans and other racial, ethnic or national origin groups. Prop. 209 also says that UC shall not "grant preferential treatment to" Anglo-Americans as well as other ethnicities. These prohibitions require remedies and one cannot remedy discrimination against African-Americans (or against a white male) if African-Americaness (or whiteness) is disregarded.

Prop. 209 says absolutely nothing about prohibiting the use of racial, sexual, ethnic and national origin categories in the elimination of preferences. In fact, the Bakke case would have been insoluble without addressing the fact that he was white and male.

Prop. 209 nullifies the Regents' rules in so far as the latter totally prohibit the use of ethnicity (or sex) as a criterion for applying a legal remedy. The suppression of information about ethnicity, etc., would block desegregation as well as the application of Prop. 209.

Prop. 209 requires that preferential treatment not be given to Europeans (caucasians) or Anglo-Americans or any other group in any aspect of public education. This means, among other things, that the curricula in many fields such as law, economics, history, political science, philosophy, and literature be reviewed to eliminate any discrimination or preferential treatment.

Prop. 209 will have a very radical impact on all aspects of the University. *It requires a level playing field for all ethnicities and nationalities and that will require remedial action.*

—Jack D. Forbes
Native American Studies, Davis

News in Brief

February Assembly Meeting

The Senate's Universitywide Assembly will hold its second meeting of the academic year on Tuesday, February 24, at UC Irvine. Agenda materials will be sent out to Assembly representatives prior to the meeting.

At the Assembly's first meeting of the year, on October 29 in Berkeley, Assembly members heard from, and asked questions of President Atkinson; received a report from UC Provost Judson King on UC's recently signed Department of Energy laboratory management contracts; heard from Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools Chair Keith Widaman on admissions issues; and considered at some length the question of course add/drop policies on the campuses and systemwide.

The Assembly concluded that it did not want the statewide Senate's Committee on Educational Policy to draft a systemwide add/drop policy, though it did vote, almost unanimously, that "the Academic Senate should reclaim jurisdiction over the add/drop policy" on all UC campuses. On some campuses, the administration has assumed responsibility for this policy.

EAP Directorships

UC faculty have been invited to apply for directorship positions in the University's Education Abroad Program for 1999 through 2000. Two-year appointments for the term January 1, 1999 through December 31, 2000 are planned for Chile (Santiago) and Costa Rica (San Jose).

An EAP Study Center Director must be a tenured faculty member of the Academic Senate, a Lecturer with Security of Employment, or a Professor

(Please See: EAP, Page 6)

Domestic Partner Benefits: Approved in a Close Vote by Regents

(Continued from Page 1)

requested, as it has recommended benefits for both opposite- and same-sex domestic partners. Nevertheless, he praised President Atkinson "for having the courage to propose this and to see it through."

When the president first brought a proposal for domestic-partner benefits to the board in September, his recommendations included two items: Health benefits for same-sex domestic partners of UC employees, and new guidelines that would have given chancellors discretion to include students with domestic partners in UC's student-family housing. In November, however, the Regents were asked to consider a significantly modified domestic-partner health-benefits proposal and they concluded that they should send the student housing measure back to the administration for further consideration.

The modification of the health insurance proposal came about because of a legal challenge to the concept of providing employer-paid benefits to same-sex couples while denying them to unmarried couples of the opposite sex. In October, California's Labor Commissioner ruled, following a complaint filed against the City of Oakland, that such a benefits structure violates a section of California's Labor Code that prohibits employment discrimination based on sexual orientation. The ruling was not binding on UC, but, fearing that the University would be vulnerable to a similar judgment, the UC administration decided to broaden its definition of domestic partners. Under the language approved by the Regents, domestic-partner health benefits will be provided to UC employees "who are precluded from marriage because they are of the same-sex or incapable under California law of a valid marriage because of family relationship." Thus the University will not be providing benefits on the basis of sexual orientation, but on the basis of an "inability to marry," with the additional benefits recipients being an as-yet unspecified group of persons who are close enough blood relatives of UC employees that they are legally forbidden to marry them.

Early in December, this aspect of the issue took another turn as State Labor Commissioner Jose Millan announced that his office would sue the City of Oakland unless it agrees to extend medical benefits to unmarried opposite-sex couples. Millan told the San Francisco *Chronicle*, however, that in his judgment the domestic-partner policy passed by the Regents does not violate the state labor code's anti-discrimination provisions, given the "inability to marry" standard that underpins the UC policy.

It is unclear as yet what definition the University will use for the "family relationship" the policy mentions. Wayne Kennedy, UC's senior vice-president for administration, said late in November that "we need to go through a dialogue about this, and that's going to take some time." For this group, as well as for same-sex domestic partners, Kennedy said, the plan is to hold a special "open enrollment" period for health insurance benefits, with July 1, 1998 being the earliest date on which such benefits might be instituted.

(Please See: Domestic, Page 6)

Virtual University: Limited Role for UC

(Continued from Page 1)

the group were expressed by the state's Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS).

For the coming year at least, the University of California's participation in the CVU will be limited to a CVU website listing of some 350 courses currently offered by University of California Extension that have some "distance learning" component to them. In addition, UC may mount "learning modules" on the CVU website that have nothing to do with course-work. Carol Tomlinson-Keasey, UC's vice-provost for academic initiatives, says that UC may offer "citizen resources," such as information on patient management of various illnesses, and K-12 teacher resources, such as modules on DNA or geophysical processes.

Next year, should the state provide the funds, UC campuses will join in the effort to develop better on-line courses. The three segments of higher education in California have asked the state for $3 million per year over each of the next three years for course development, meaning a $1 million appropriation per segment per year. According to Tomlinson-Keasey, if the state appropriates this funding, UC will sponsor a competition among its faculty for virtual course development; an RFP for on-line course ideas will be sent out to faculty and the most promising ideas that are received will be funded.

What use will be made within UC of the courses developed? Since the University places a high value on the "residential" aspect of undergraduate education, it envisions virtual courses being employed only as an adjunct to its existing courses, providing more "flexibility and convenience" to certain kinds of students — those who have enrolled in the winter quarter, for example, and who have thus missed the initial course in a three-course sequence. If it could be ascertained that many students across the campuses are being hampered by the lack of availability of a given course, that course would become a good candidate to be offered on-line.

With all segments of higher education working over the next several years on the development of on-line courses, the hope for the CVU is that it will bring about an increase in the number of courses that are transferable among institutions in the state. Indeed, UC administrators are hopeful it will have this effect between the campuses of the University of California where, as Tomlinson-Keasey notes, "the highest barbed-wire" to transferability often exists. With on-line courses, students will find it much easier to take courses from an institution other than the one at which they are enrolled. And, at least in theory, an increased impetus for transferability should follow from this.

This very push is a matter of concern for UC faculty, however. In recent discussions regarding CVU among statewide and campus Senate committees, UC faculty expressed worries that an intensive use of on-line education throughout the state will result in pressure on UC to award degrees on the basis of on-line course work or to accept large numbers of on-line courses for transfer credit.

At the least, faculty felt, burgeoning use of virtual courses might overload UC faculty with requests to review the quality of courses proposed for transfer credit. Academic Council Chair Sandra Weiss notes that ICAS will be holding a conference this coming March on the subject of intersegmental transferability issues, with part of its focus being on-line courses.

CPEC Eligibility Study: Large Group of the 'Potentially Eligible'

(Continued from Page 1)

California's Master Plan for Higher Education: UC is supposed to admit the top 12.5 of California's high school graduates, while CSU is supposed to admit the top 33.3 percent of graduates. One clear effect of the study, therefore, was to present a mandate to each institution to increase its eligibility rate.

The responsibility for this at UC rests with the Academic Senate, which has delegated authority from the Regents to set UC's basic eligibility requirements — what courses a student needs to have taken, what grade-point levels need to be achieved in these courses, and so forth. By relaxing or tightening these standards, the University can increase or decrease the proportion of the state's high school graduates who are eligible for admission to UC.

The Senate has, in turn, delegated authority over eligibility standards to its Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). The group's chair, Keith Widaman of UC Riverside, said in November that his committee has begun to consider a number of means by which UC's eligibility rate might be raised; this work is being folded into BOARS' consideration of several proposals that have been put forth recently to fundamentally alter admissions practices at UC. (See story at right.)

BOARS consideration of these issues will be aided by the data CPEC put together, which are detailed enough that they yield not only an overall eligibility rate, but information on eligibility by ethnic group, gender, area of residence in California, and on students who are nearly or "potentially" eligible for admission to UC. In nearly every one of these areas, the CPEC study had some surprises for UC, particularly when results from this study were compared to earlier studies.

With respect to gender, it turns out that 12.6 percent of female California high school graduates are eligible for admission to UC, as opposed to only 9.7 percent of the state's male high school graduates. This gap, of 2.9 percent, has been growing over time. Among 1986 high school graduates, it was 0.6 percent, while among 1990 graduates it was 1.7 percent.

On the issue of race, the news from the study was that black eligibility rates are not only low but dropping. For the 1990 class, 5.1 percent of black graduates were eligible for admission to UC while for the 1996 class the figure had dropped to 2.8 percent, a 45 percent decline. For Latinos, eligibility went from 3.9 to 3.8 percent; for whites, it held steady at 12.7 percent; and for Asians, it dropped from 32.2 percent to 30 percent.

The question of being potentially eligible for UC has to do with students who are ineligible only because they have not taken one or more of the four SAT exams the University requires of all entering students (the SAT I and three SAT II achievement tests). The CPEC study revealed that this potentially eligible pool is large and growing, a fact that is puzzling, potentially worrisome, and perhaps promising all at once.

Students can become eligible for admission to UC on the basis of grades alone if they achieve a GPA of 3.3 or better in a set of required ("a to f") courses; or they may become eligible through a combination of grades and standardized test scores if they reach certain SAT threshold scores while having a GPA in the a-f courses between 2.82 and 3.29.

UC requires, however, that every student — even those eligible on the basis of grades alone — at least *take* the SAT tests, though the question of how such students *score* on the tests does not matter for basic eligibility (though it does count for a student's admission to a campus and program of choice.) Further, there are students who would be eligible for admission on the basis of their GPA and SAT I combination, but who did not go on to take all the required SAT II tests. The pool of students who did not take one or more of the SAT tests makes up the group called potentially eligible.

The CPEC study revealed that some 9.4 percent of the state's 1996 high school graduates fall into the potentially eligible category, a figure not much smaller than the 11.1 percent of students who were fully eligible. Furthermore, the cohort of these students has grown over time: They only constituted 5 percent of the state's 1986 graduating class, and 6.5 percent of the 1990 class.

The size of the 1996 potentially eligible pool left UC admissions officers and BOARS members scratching their heads. Dennis Galligani, UC's assistant vice-president for student academic services, told the UC Regents in November that UC, CPEC and CSU have agreed to conduct a joint study to try to understand this and other puzzling results from the CPEC study (such as the drop in black eligibility). Some 89 percent of those who were potentially eligible for UC had GPA's of 3.3 or better in the a-f courses. What everyone wants to know is why such well-prepared students would not take the proper SAT exams.

Some faculty and administrators are worried that the potentially eligible pool may constitute an admissions "time-bomb" ticking away. If all students who are potentially eligible took the SAT exams, UC's eligibility rate would go from 11.1 to 20.5 percent, some 8 percentage points (and 40 percent) above its mandated maximum. What tightening of admissions requirements would be necessary to get the rate back down to 12.5 percent?

On the other hand, a racial breakdown of the CPEC data revealed that 4 percent of the state's black high school graduates fall into the potentially eligible pool, as do about 4 percent of Latino students — more than the 2.8 percent of black students and 3.8 of Latino students who are fully eligible. Could such students be targeted, and a sizable portion of them convinced to take the tests and then apply to UC? To some observers, the pool of potentially eligible minority students had the look of a rich source of future UC students.

Senate Committee Plays Pivotal Role In Admissions

Senate committees often have lots on their agendas, but one committee that has a particularly full plate is this year's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), the panel charged with setting UC's undergraduate eligibility standards. Last month, BOARS was handed a mandate to increase the proportion of California high school graduates who are eligible to admission to UC, given the figures from a long-awaited CPEC study on UC eligibility. Beyond this, BOARS is now considering three proposals that seek to fundamentally change admission at UC. One calls for doing away with the SAT as an admissions requirement; another calls for

Please See: Senate's, Page 5)

Senate's BOARS

(Continued from previous page)

making eligible the top six percent of the graduates of each high school's senior class; and a third — a proposed amendment to the state's constitution — would make eligible the top 12.5 percent of each graduating class.

BOARS' views would mean nothing in the face of an approved constitutional amendment (an outcome that most observers think is highly unlikely), but its judgment is critical on any admissions changes the University might institute. Under a delegation from the Regents stemming from 1884, the Senate has the responsibility of setting admissions policy at UC. Beginning in 1920, the Senate delegated this task to a group it formed called the Board of Admissions, with the "Relations with Schools" being added in 1939. BOARS is responsible for proposing to the Regents any changes in UC's undergraduate eligibility requirements, and, so far as the historical record indicates, the Regents always seem to have followed BOARS' advice. The committee consists of a chair — this year Keith Widaman of UC Riverside — a vice-chair and one representative from the Senate admissions committee on each campus.

In November, BOARS met in Berkeley in an all-day session that included presentations from the principals in some of the proposals to change UC admissions. A staff member from State Sen. Teresa Hughes office made the case for the amendment Hughes is proposing on making eligible the top 12.5 percent of each graduating class; UC Berkeley Education Dean Eugene Garcia talked to the group about the idea of eliminating the SAT as an admissions requirement (on grounds that such a move might increase Latino eligibility); and UC professors Rodolfo Alvarez and Richard Flacks made a presentation on their proposal for making eligible the top 6 percent of each graduating class.

The issue CPEC brought to BOARS, of increasing the proportion of eligible state high school students, almost certainly will result in a slight loosening of some UC eligibility requirements, with the elements in play being high school GPA in the required "a-f" courses, SAT scores, and the combination of SAT scores and GPA for some students. Widaman's group has already begun considering a number of alternatives intended to get UC to the 12.5 percent eligibility level.

Notes from the Chair: Political Pressures And the Governance of Universities

A consensus seems to be emerging that American universities are in the midst of a crisis in governance, though there is no consensus on what factors have brought about this situation. Observers have blamed the crisis on inefficiencies that accompany consultation with faculty, the dearth of capable academic administrators, or governing boards that are ill-prepared or disengaged. Recently, another explanation has gained prominence — that University governing boards are more politicized now than ever before.

This concern topped the list of discussion topics at a recent higher education roundtable sponsored by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). At that meeting, California's university and college presidents, faculty leaders, governing board members, politicians, and business CEOs were in agreement that the appointment of California's board members, and expectations for how they should perform after appointment, have become heavily politicized.

This is not to say that the problem is confined to our state. In 1996, the AGB produced a report, resulting from the work of its Commission on the Academic Presidency, whose recommendations included a specific plea to governing boards across the country: "Individual board members must remember that their primary allegiance and responsibility is to the institution and the public interest . . . not to the constituency or party that put them on the Board."

Substantial concern has been expressed that the UC Regents may have fallen prey to the pitfalls of partisanship last month during their debate over extending benefits to domestic partners (see story on page 1). People on both sides of the issue seem convinced that politics took control of the governance process during these discussions. It was the first time in recent history in which every Regent was in attendance (including the governor and all the other state officials who serve ex-officio). Also, two new Regents were appointed by the governor a few hours before the board was to vote on the issue and legislators came to address domestic partners benefits during the public comment period. One might conclude that these factors simply reflect the strong sentiment about this issue in society as a whole. But what is troubling to many observers is the possibility that a few Regents voted as they did because of political pressures to do so.

The critical question is how to keep the University isolated from political struggles. Many believe that we would decrease politicization if the Regents were elected by popular vote, but I believe that such a change could actually exacerbate the problem, since Regents who are elected might constantly be courting favor with powerful people or constituencies. Nevertheless, the Regents do need to be selected with out undue reliance on favoritism or party affiliation.

Our board has been given the constitutional independence it needs to exercise judgments without political interference. So what really matters is the time each Regent takes to carefully weigh the implications of various policy decisions. At root, the governance of the University rests on the inner strength and integrity of each Regent. Fortunately, UC's Board of Regents has many strong, autonomous, values-driven members who are not afraid to act according to principles and in the University's best interests, regardless of the personal consequences engendered by their actions. These invaluable Regents could be found on either side of last month's debate on domestic partners. But if our Regents yield their integrity to political pressures, then the future of the University will be on shaky ground.

—Sandra J. Weiss
Chair, Academic Council

Domestic Partners: Benefits are Taxable

(Continued from Page 3)

In the two days of discussions that the Regents held on domestic partners in November, it was never clear, until the final vote was counted, how the board would come out on the issue. Gov. Wilson's opposition to the measure was based on three premises: That domestic-partner benefits provided by a state agency have the effect of "devaluing marriage"; that despite its constitutional autonomy, UC should not be providing benefits that are not offered by other state agencies; and that in approving benefits for same-sex couples, UC would be opening itself up to lawsuits and a probability that it would have to provide benefits to all unmarried partners, thus "doing serious damage to the institutions of marriage and the family."

Most of the 11 Regents who voted with the governor voiced support for some or all of his ideas. Regent Frank Clark, for example, said the University had no right to provide benefits that are not accorded to the other branches of state government, while Regent Tom Sayles said the University was trying to "correct discrimination with further discrimination" (against unmarried heterosexual couples). Arguing for extension of the benefits was Regent Ward Connerly, who asserted that "there are certain values that transcend even the institution of marriage." Are we willing to say [to our gay employees] that you don't really matter; that your rights are not as sacred to us as others?" he asked. Academic Council Chair Sandra Weiss asked the Board to "please join your Academic Senate in supporting this proposal and voting down the governor's." So important was the Regents' decision perceived to be that, for the first time in anyone's memory, the entire contingent of 26 Regents was present for a final vote on an issue, including all the ex-officio Regents from state government.

Even if the benefits the Regents approved withstand legal challenge, there is a limitation on them that is beyond the University's control, which is that the federal government treats domestic partner benefits as taxable income. In the most simple cases — involving, for example, a same-sex couple with no children — what has been taxed at other institutions is the amount an employer contributes for a domestic partner over and above what it contributes for the individual employee.

EAP Directorships

(Continued from Page 2)

Emeritus. At each site, the director administers the Study Center, assures harmonious relations with UC's partner universities and facilitates exchange provisions of agreements, provides academic and general counseling for UC students enrolled there, implements UC academic policy, and serves as Instructor of Record for all academic work undertaken by EAP students.

Applications for the Chile and Costa Rica directorships will be due Friday, February 20, 1998. Further information may be obtained by contacting Kathleen Ranney, Universitywide Office, Education Abroad Program, UCSB, (805) 893-3677, or at the e-mail address: kranney@uoeap.ucsb.edu.

Resident directorships of varying durations will be recruited in the Fall of 1998 including those for China (Beijing), Egypt (Cairo), France (Bordeaux/ Toulouse), Hungary (Budapest), Japan (Meiji Gakuin), Russia (Moscow), Scandinavia (Lund), South East Asia (Singapore), and UK/I (Northern office in Edinburgh).

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 November 30, 1997

Fund	Rate of Return, Last 12 Months	Rate of Return, Last 1 Month	Unit Price
Equity	20.84%	3.09%	$201.8
Bond	13.75%	1.59%	$101.9
Savings	6.22%	0.49%	N/A
ICC	7.60%	0.61%	N/A
Money Market	5.62%	0.46%	N/A
Multi-Asset	12.73%	1.64%	$22.6