

UCSF Neurosurgeon Will Be Next Vice Chair of the Senate

Meeting in Los Angeles on May 29, the Academic Senate's Universitywide Assembly elected Lawrence Pitts, a professor of neurosurgery at UC San Francisco, to be the next vice chair of both the Assembly and its executive body, the Academic Council. As such, Pitts will assume the vice chair's post this fall and succeed in fall 2003 to the position of chair of the Assembly and the Council — the most important offices in the statewide Academic Senate.

Pitts has had extensive Senate service, both at San Francisco and statewide. He was chair of the UCSF Senate from 1999-2001, vice chair of the division for two years before that, and chair of UCSF's Faculty Welfare Committee from 1993-1996. He was chair of the statewide University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) in 1995-96 and currently is a member of UCFW's Task Force on the Future of UC Health Plans. In 2000, he chaired a group that revised the UC Health Corporate Compliance Plan — a difficult task in that the document that resulted had to ensure that UC's medical centers followed Medicare billing practices, but did not unduly burden UC's clinical faculty or violate their rights.

A native of Louisiana, Pitts received two S.B. degrees — in electrical engineering and industrial management — from MIT. After spending two years as Radio Officer on the USS Northampton, he obtained his M.D. from Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine in 1969. He came to UCSF for his internship and residency and joined the UCSF faculty in 1975 as an assistant professor in the Department of Neurological Surgery.

Pitts specializes in surgeries on a type of brain tumor known as an acoustic neuroma; since 1979, he has operated on more than 700 patients who have the disorder. He is recognized for his expertise in brain and spinal cord injury, and was chief of neurosurgery at San Francisco General Hospital Medical Center for nearly 20 years.

(Please See: New Senate, Page 8)

At UC Merced, No Faculty Yet, but Plenty Of Faculty Work for a Senate Task Force

By the time UC Merced opens its doors in the fall of 2004, dozens of faculty from across the UC system will have contributed countless hours to the development of the University's tenth campus, with their roles ranging from advising on the best chemistry lab layout to defining the UCM student experience. The statewide Academic Senate's Task Force on UC Merced is the most important and visible faculty group playing a role in shaping UC Merced. Functioning as a shadow UCM Senate, it has drawn upon the expertise of faculty colleagues from every UC campus to help it fulfill its charge.

The Task Force membership includes a chair, nine divisional representatives and

leaders from six systemwide Academic Senate Committees — Graduate Affairs, Academic Personnel, Educational Policy, Research Policy, Planning & Budget, and the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools — along with the chair and vice chair of UCM's own CAP and the vice chair of the Academic Council. Designated a "special committee" of the Senate by action of the systemwide Assembly, the Task Force was established three and a half years ago. Since that time, more than 40 faculty have served on it and the UCM CAP.

When the Task Force received its charge from the Senate in September of

(Please See: Helping, Page 5)

Rising Health Care Costs Will Be Felt at UC

As a bellwether of changes to come, consider that the California Public Employees' Retirement System recently announced that the premiums it pays for health insurance could jump 15 percent to 41 percent next year for plans that do not cover Medicare patients. CALPERS, as it is known, is watched nationally because it buys health coverage for 1.2 mil-

lion employees, retirees, and dependents, making it the nation's second-largest public purchaser of health care behind the federal government.

The question for employers these days is not whether premium increases will occur; it is how big the rate hikes will be and what proportion of these increases will be passed along to employees either through higher co-payments and premiums or reduced benefits. The University of California is not immune from this trend.

The UC Academic Senate's University Committee on Faculty Welfare has been keeping a close watch on the national and California health care environment, an environment that likely will remain chaotic over the next several years. As part of its shared governance role, UCFW has been working in close consultation with UC's Department of Human Resources & Benefits (HR&B). In 1999, UCFW created a Task Force on the Future of UC Health Plans and charged it to work with HR&B to find ways to buffer the University from the effects of the volatile health care marketplace, thus helping ensure that UC faculty and staff will continue to have first-rate health care coverage, as measured by quality of care, access, and cost.

Spurred by a variety of factors, including skyrocketing pharmaceutical costs,

(Please See: Health Care, Page 8)

Notice Editor Leaving

The Academic Senate is losing the services of an outstanding staff member, David Krogh, who is retiring at the end of this month from the University to become a full-time writer. He has written, in the past, a popular biology textbook. While we all wish him a successful writing future, we will definitely feel the loss of his expertise in the Senate Office. He was the Editor of *Notice* and also of the electronic newsletter to the faculty. He assisted in running the Academic Council meetings and he served as the personification of institutional memory. We wish him a very productive and satisfying retired life.

—Chand Viswanathan
Chair, Academic Council

Commentary from the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity

Excellence Requires Diversity: Leading UC into the 21st Century

Why is it so critical to the fundamental mission of the University that it reflect the diversity of the society in which it lies? We may start with the very definition of the word “university.” Its roots suggest “a society . . . , or community regarded collectively” (OED). Indeed, the core of “university” has the same Latin origin as the core of “diversity.” Diversity becomes an issue for a university when the varied members of the society in which it is embedded are not fully included. It becomes not a collective community, but an exclusionary community. Such a university does not satisfy a fundamental defining quality. This is particularly true of a public university, whose very existence depends on serving the state that founded it. Clearly, an excellent University could not long live with this problem and remain worthy of the description.

A compelling demonstration of why diversity is important to the future of the University comes from fundamental principles in the natural living world. A successful species or population requires genetic diversity – to help it adapt quickly to changing circumstances. If the percentage of closely-related individuals rises too high, the group becomes vulnerable to damage or extinction from a danger that would not be so critical in a more diverse population. The same can be said of ideas: when points of view become too narrow or ingrown, they are increasingly at risk of becoming sterile, wrong, or irrelevant. They will be superseded by ideas drawn from a more diverse setting or group. Excellence and diversity are fundamentally related if we wish to attain the highest standard of intellectual endeavors.

Ours is an institution whose fundamental ethos is to collect the very best minds. For it to allow an increasing fraction of the talent pool to lie untapped is intolerable. This can only lead to a decline in excellence. A diverse faculty is more attractive not only to the larger pool of faculty candidates, but to the best students as well. The faculty provides examples to aspire to. Students and new faculty should be able to find role models and mentors from whom they can most fully benefit, and who will play an active role in advancing their future careers. Although we would prefer it were not so, gender, culture and ethnic identity play some role in this – it is not coincidental that the cur-

rent faculty reflects to a large degree the faculty of the previous generation. There is, regrettably, a negative effect from looking around and finding very few people to easily identify with.

Since a lack of diversity is currently apparent (and getting worse relative to our community), we must vigorously and proactively work to fix it. The Table below summarizes the current numbers. The prodigious amount of new faculty hiring that will take place in the next decade (a number approaching 80 percent of the current faculty) provides a welcome opportunity to help ensure that we stay at the top. It must be a fundamental goal of our faculty searches to attract and retain talented members from all parts of society, in full measure. In building our new faculty, success must be explicitly evaluated regarding diversity with as much weight as any other criterion. Our current performance makes that clear. The behavior of the University sets a powerful example for broader society – we should be in the lead, rather than waiting for the crisis to worsen. A failure to do so will constitute clear evidence that our current lack of diversity has already cost us true excellence. The larger community will ultimately come to feel that it must force change upon us if we cannot manage it ourselves.

The various campuses have already begun to develop strategies for addressing these goals. It is crucial that “best practices” be documented and disseminated

for all. We must enrich our methodologies, and tailor them to the specifics of each discipline. Our goal should be an integrated approach to recruitment and retention both on individual campuses and systemwide. UCAAD will promote the communication of good ideas and methods between campuses, but the main push must come from each campus internally. Each Chancellor should adopt increasing diversity in the faculty as a fundamental goal, and institute administrative procedures that promote it. Explicit procedures and performance goals must be formulated and monitored.

In the end, however, it is at the department level where the culture must embrace the goal of faculty diversity. The Academic Senate (through appropriate committees) must play a strong role in this, helping develop and disseminate methodologies that we faculty can embrace. Departments that are already doing a good job must share their wisdom, and departments that are not should be held accountable and helped in the process of change. Incentives must be provided which promote this process. No quotas need be set, nor standards lowered. When truly fair and open procedures are followed (with conscious or unconscious biases fully removed), the fact that all groups are equally talented can operate unimpeded, and diversity will result naturally. With open eyes, diversity is seen as an obvious and integral part of the excellence to which we are all striving.

A Brief History of Diversity Percentages

	California 1991	California 2001	UC Students 2001	UC Faculty 2001	UC Faculty 1991
White Men	28	24.5	25.0	66.5	75.0
Women (all)	50	50.0	51.5	24.0	18.5
Asian American	9	11.0	35.0	11.5	7.9
Hispanic/Latino	26	32.5	8.5	4.7	4.1
Afro-American	7	6.7	3.5	2.5	2.2
Native American	0.6	1.0	1.0	0.4	0.3

Notes: Percentages are slightly rounded. There has been a little progress on diversity for white women during the last decade, and Asian Americans are now represented proportionately. There has been essentially no progress for the other groups. White men are over-represented on the faculty by almost a factor of 3, while Hispanics are under-represented by a factor of 8. Data can be found at: <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/datamgmt/welcome.html>

From General Education to Senate Membership to the Role of CAP, a Variety of Issues Confronted Senate Divisions in 2001-02

What issues have been most pressing for UC's campus or "divisional" Senates this year? To find out, Notice spoke with the divisional chairs at each of UC's campuses. Their remarks are presented below.

Berkeley, David Dowall, Chair — The main thing we've focused on is the development of a strategic academic plan for the campus. We haven't done a plan for over 20 years. We made a commitment to working on this now because of the pressures of Tidal Wave II, the campus' unique situation of massive seismic upgrading, and the fact that up until now we haven't had an academic plan to guide our physical redevelopment. We now have a draft plan that's been circulating among faculty, staff, and students and we've gotten a lot of comments on it. We're going to take those comments back and revise the plan. This has been done through a joint Senate-administration committee, called the Strategic Planning Committee, that's been working for nearly two years. It is producing the report and will also make recommendations on implementing the plan. I think the committee is committed to the importance of a strategy for expanding both housing and instructional and research facilities in and around the campus. The chancellor seems positively disposed to the plan — he seems eager to get it and run with it. As a collateral benefit, this effort has given the Senate an opportunity to develop an effective collaborative process with the administration.

We also have had a continuing concern this year about how Berkeley is going to implement what we're calling "regularized" [state-supported] summer instruction. There is still a lot of concern about how we do that. We also have continuing concerns about promoting faculty and administrative diversity on the campus.

Parking is a big issue here because we are losing spaces. It isn't so much the cost of parking at Berkeley; it's the lack of space. You don't have a parking space; you have a license to hunt for a space.

Davis, Jeffery Gibeling, Chair — I'd put at the top of the list a set of continuing revisions to our academic personnel process. This started in 1999 when two committees completed work that led to divisional Bylaw changes in 2001. This year we've been working on implementing those changes. The principal changes

in this area have been, first, that the campus redelegate additional personnel decisions from the central administration to the deans of the schools and colleges. Our campuswide Committee on Academic Personnel makes decisions on promotion cases, but we are in the process of redelegating to the deans decisions on all merits, with the deans receiving advice from the local Faculty Personnel Committees that exist in each school and college. The theory behind this change is that better informed decisions are made when the decision-making bodies are closer to the disciplines.

A second major change in this area is that we have passed legislation that will allow faculty to appeal recommendations that come from either local personnel committees or CAP. One of the key recommendations we had was that each unit should develop a set of criteria — a written statement of general standards for advancement in a discipline. The appeals process would then allow faculty to make an appeal if they thought these standards weren't being followed in a personnel decision. If a recommendation came from a local personnel committee, the appeal would be heard by CAP; if the recommendation was originally made by CAP on a promotion case, we have recommended the use of an ad hoc appeals committee. We're trying to work through the procedure that would enable us to identify an appropriate appeals committee without creating a new standing committee that would be like a Supreme Court.

The third major change in this area is the creation of a group called the Academic Personnel Advisors — a small committee of faculty who can provide advice to faculty regarding how the personnel process works: whether to file an appeal, where to file it, and so forth.

We are in the midst of considerable discussion about undergraduate writing requirements, and this ties into Unit 18 Lecturers and proposals by the Dean of Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies to change the way that composition courses are delivered. We recently had a town-hall type Divisional meeting to discuss how a Division proceeds when there are administrative decisions that have clear academic implications, especially in terms of reducing resources to small academic units. So

we are in fairly early stages of thinking about our composition requirements and how we can best deliver a curriculum for them — where the lecturers for them are housed, and whether there should be a greater role for postdoctoral faculty fellows and graduate students to deliver these courses together with Senate faculty. All of this is evolving against the backdrop of labor negotiations, which takes it out of the realm of a purely academic issue.

Irvine, James Given, Chair — Overall I would say one of the issues that's closest to the heart of the UCI faculty is increasing the number of graduate students. If you set aside our medical school, UCI has, I think, the lowest percentage of graduate students in the system. Because we are growing, we need to grow graduate student enrollment faster; otherwise our graduate student percentage declines even more. So, this is something the Senate has devoted a lot of time to. This year it's been mostly a matter of trying to cooperate with the administration in implementing suggestions that were laid out in a task force report last year. The most striking thing in this implementation is that the administration set aside an additional \$1 million for graduate fellowships and is making a major effort to secure more affordable graduate student housing. Graduate student enrollments increased about 17 percent this year. And we are anticipating about a 10 percent increase for next year.

One ongoing issue this year has been evaluating the restructuring of the Senate that we went through three years ago. Right now we elect virtually everybody in the Senate, but we're probably moving in the direction of appointing far more people to service in the Senate; it's proving to be quite difficult to recruit two people to run for every position.

It looks like the Committee on Academic Personnel may be in for some major changes — at least we've been talking about the possibility. Right now all the members of CAP are elected, but there is talk of appointing them. CAP has recommended that its size be increased from nine to 11. The Executive Vice Chancellor has proposed delegating a certain number of merit actions to the deans of the various schools, meaning CAP would deal with

(Please See: This Year's, Page 4)

This Year's Senate Issues: Looking across the UC System

(Continued from Page 3)

big career reviews, promotions, disputed merit increases, etc. We've been talking informally about these issues all year; now we're beginning to move toward a more formal debate.

We've been cooperating with the administration in coming up with a strategic plan for the campus — something that is more than just a fat paper document that no one ever looks at again. We have been trying to formulate concrete goals for UCI as it grows to build-out in this decade. We'd also like to come up with viable measures that we can use to assess whether we're close to those goals. Finally, we'd like to come up with strategies that would get us to those goals.

Los Angeles, John Edmond, Chair — We have appointed a special Senate-administration group that is looking at the semester versus the quarter system. Its task is not to recommend one or the other, but to come up with all of the advantages and disadvantages of both. These findings will then be made available to both the administration and to the Senate committees that wish to opine on the academic calendar. This fact-finding group is looking at everything from the academic and budgetary aspects of the calendar right through to how it affects athletic programs. Our approach seems to have allayed a resistance to proceed and a suspicious attitude, namely the concern that "This is a done deal; we're going to the semester system." This decision has not been made.

Then of course we've been working on SAT I and admissions testing. But this is only part of the admissions work we're doing. We are still working hard on comprehensive review. There seems to be an idea that, because the Regents approved comprehensive review, work on it has been completed. But there is still a lot to be done at the campus level.

We have made a substantial effort this year involving Senate faculty in a meaningful way in the budget process. In preparing for the budget cuts that are likely to be coming, we have put a lot of effort into ways the Senate can be effective in joint governance in understanding academic priorities and related budget issues. At UCLA, we have a Council of Faculty Chairs, made up of the chairs of all the Faculty Executive Committees (FEC) for each of UCLA's Schools. What we've done starting this year is to hold what in effect

are budget workshops with each of these committees. We have done about six schools so far, out of a total of 16 units. These workshops involve the Senate's Council on Planning and Budget, with one member of CPB being a specialist for a particular school, though not a member of that school. We have meetings that last slightly over two hours whose main purpose is to allow FEC faculty in each school to understand that they have a role in advising the dean or provost about academic priorities, and how this relates to the budget, whether that means planning for growth or dealing with deficits. At the end of the day, decisions get made by academic administrators, not by the Senate — this is understood by everyone. But the faculty have a role to play in analyzing, advising, and suggesting alternative approaches to the academic and budgetary issues under discussion.

Finally, we've done a fair amount this year in trying to improve communication on campus about what the UCLA Senate means to our 3,000 faculty. We've created a virtual publication, called *Voice of the Faculty*, which is on our website [at www.senate.ucla.edu/SenateVoice/Issue1/newsletter1.htm].

Riverside, Irwin Sherman, Chair — Of course, the announcement of Chancellor Orbach's departure was one of the biggest items we dealt with this year. The selection of a new chancellor has been uppermost in our minds. The Chancellor-designate met with the Senate's advisory committee last week. I think that most of the members of the committee were quite pleased with her selection and with her views on where UCR should be going. I think the President should take some comfort in the fact that his selection was endorsed by the faculty.

Like most campuses, we have had considerable discussion this year regarding changes in the use of the SAT I examination. We had a Senate Town Hall Meeting on that issue. We have also had considerable discussion about the proposal for expanding the number of freshman seminars. Because we are growing so fast, we have been in ongoing discussions with our Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and his Assistant Vice Chancellor with regard to the issue of teaching space. One of the outcomes of that is that there is going to be a closer mapping of plans for teaching space coincident with growth of student numbers.

This year, Chancellor Orbach's view was that UCR's increases in enrollment are going to be funded, but that UCR will have to work carefully on managing this growth and on allocating the resources that will accompany it. I think that most of our future plans are contingent upon how many additional students actually enroll and how we will accommodate those numbers in terms of faculty hiring and the start-up packages that go with it. I think there's some concern about whether our building program will be able to meet our needs.

The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs believes that we may need to become selective in our admissions in the near future. I don't know whether the faculty are going to be supportive of that, but this possibility has been raised with both the Senate and the Chancellor-designate.

San Diego, Michael Bernstein, Chair — The issue of SATs and admissions testing was way up on our list of issues this year. At a divisional meeting in May we acted on two motions regarding admissions testing.

Another issue for the San Diego Division has been the approval of a new degree, the Master of Business Administration degree and the creation of a graduate faculty for our new Graduate School of Management. There is a search now underway for a founding dean of the school, but the Senate is still very much involved in evaluating the curriculum proposal, the financial plan, and so forth.

Enrollment management is also a big issue for us. We have a lot of very popular departments on the campus and some of them have now called successfully for capping enrollments because they don't have enough staff or facilities to handle all the students. This is going to become a bigger issue over time as the campus grows, so we have established a Senate-administration task force that, beginning this summer, will start to develop some principles for how and when enrollments may be limited in particular major programs.

We have had task forces that have delivered reports this year on two important issues: gender equity and faculty recruitment and diversity. The reports of these groups are still being reviewed on campus, but there is going to be a lot of activity around these reports, a lot having to do with what we expect of our deans in

(Please See: Campus Senate, Page 6)

Helping to Develop a Campus: The Task Force on UC Merced

(Continued from Page 1)

1998, planning for UC Merced was in its earliest stages, and a Chancellor had not yet been named. Members were mandated to “carry out the kinds of review, approval, and consultative activities” that devolve to any campus Senate, and to “formulate a process for the development of an Academic Senate Division for the Merced campus.” Under the leadership of past Task Force Chair, Fred N. Spiess (UCSD), and current Chair, Peter Berck (UCB), this group has made important decisions that will have a lasting impact on UCM.

Inculcating Shared Governance

One of the Task Force’s priorities has been to inculcate the principles of shared governance into the ethos of the tenth UC campus. Soon after receiving their mandate, the members of the Task Force drafted a comprehensive concept paper regarding the initial development of the campus that was submitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). In the paper, members noted that the new UC campus had an obligation to “build on the strengths that have made [the University of California] the outstanding public university in the world. [Those] strengths are not particularly in the University’s programs, but rather in the manner in which the University operates [whereby] administration and faculty merge together to build academic strength through shared governance . . .”

From their very first meeting with the UC Office of the President’s lead administrator, Carol Tomlinson-Keasey, Task Force members made clear their belief that they should serve on all of the UCM planning groups and committees that were appointed — academic, physical planning, senior personnel searches, administration, etc. Participating in these committees and recruiting other Senate members to assist with this task meant more work for the members, but on a new campus, where all planning is closely interrelated, the Task Force believed it was essential for the Senate to have a voice in all of the discussions. Once Tomlinson-Keasey was appointed chancellor, the Task Force worked to ensure its ongoing involvement, across the board, in the usual shared governance mode. It has since become a major advising group for building the new campus.

With shared governance as its cornerstone, the Task Force’s vision for UC

Merced was built upon three major concepts: 1) that the General Education component would be the “defining educational element of UCM”; 2) that the educational experience would be on a human scale; and 3) that interdisciplinary collaboration in research and instruction would be emphasized. Members decided that the best way to achieve these goals was to institute a college-type system and to create permeable barriers between disciplines.

The Task Force was unwavering in its support of a college system for UC Merced from the outset. In a 1999 memorandum to the chancellor on a college concept, the Task Force noted that the college structure would “help students feel that they are facing a friendly and manageable entity in which both faculty and administration care about their success.” At the same time, the college structure would allow for a diversity in, and evolution of, the General Education curriculum, the Task Force felt, and would provide an opportunity to deliver courses in small group settings, which would further support student success. A college system was subsequently adopted for UC Merced. Although its exact nature has yet to be defined, everyone agrees that it will not be residentially based, since the intent has always been to integrate, as much as possible, UCM’s residential, transfer, and commuter students. Thus, the colleges will be located in a student commons area, rather than centered on residential housing. In fact, space has already been set aside in one of the initial three buildings (the Library Building) for the first college.

The campus will open with three divisions and no departments. Task Force members recognized that the creation of permeable barriers between the disciplines was most easily achieved within a divisional framework, and therefore recommended that UC Merced begin with three divisions, one for Engineering, another for Natural Sciences, and a third for Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts. The idea of gathering the Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts under one umbrella arose from a systemwide workshop on the humanities at UC Irvine, which was organized by one of the Task Force members in early 1999. The argument for a shared administrative structure was that it would provide more opportunities for communication across the traditional disciplinary boundaries, and that it would foster the development of an integrated interdisci-

plinary General Education program. As the faculty increase in number, department-like structures, as envisioned by the founding deans, will evolve within the divisions. By that time, the notion of intellectual integration and interdisciplinary collaboration should be well ingrained in the academic culture of UC Merced.

Gifts and Academic Searches

Task Force members have been key participants in two additional areas: academic searches and gift opportunities. The Task Force has assumed the departmental role in the academic hiring process. With the help of other UC faculty, Task Force members assist with the ads, serve on search committees, vet files, meet candidates, and make recommendations. The Task Force has also had a close collaboration with UCM’s Vice Chancellor for Advancement, Jim Erickson, on both the establishment of endowed chairs, as well as on other major gift opportunities. Members advise on the appropriateness of the donor’s preferred disciplinary areas, approve chair descriptions, and recommend on naming opportunities. To date, UC Merced has 15 endowed chairs — a record for any new campus.

Before the Task Force goes out of business, its last and perhaps most important job will be to mentor the founding UCM faculty in the ways of UC shared governance. While some of the new faculty may already be familiar with the concept of shared governance, many of those coming from outside the UC system will not be. Bylaws for a UC Merced Senate have been drafted, and there is a transitional start-up plan. That plan will be implemented as soon as the first member of the founding faculty is on board.

Although the search for the initial 15 faculty is well under way, it will be another year or two before UCM has enough faculty of its own to support an independent Senate. Until then, Task Force members and UC faculty from across the system will continue to contribute their time and expertise to the launching of UC Merced, and to ensure that shared governance remains a vital part of this new enterprise. The campus is slated to open in the fall of 2004 with 60 faculty and 1,000 students — 900 undergraduate and 100 graduate.

To learn more about the Senate’s Task Force on UC Merced, visit its website at <http://www.ucop.edu/senate/ucmerced/>

Campus Senate Issues: Divisional Chairs Look Back and Ahead

(Continued from Page 4)

these areas. Some deans are very active, some are not, but we have no uniform expectations of them, and that's where I think the Senate is going to get involved.

Finally, there was a significant study this year, undertaken by faculty, staff, and administrators, regarding staff recruitment, retention, and morale. On the basis of their work, a major report was produced that is now being reviewed by the Senate and other campus constituencies. I see some of the report's findings pointing toward a significant role for the Senate, particularly concerning faculty-staff interaction and staff workload expectations.

San Francisco, Daniel Bikle, Chair

— One issue, which now seems to be resolved, concerns the involvement of the Senate in the budget processes of UCSF's four schools. Up until fairly recently, UCSF budgets were prepared by the Deans of the schools, sent to the Chancellor and then reviewed first by the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance. They then went to the Executive Budget Council for input before being sent back to the Chancellor. Following this the Deans had the opportunity to discuss their budgets with the Chancellor, one on one, after which the Chancellor made decisions and sent those decisions back to the Deans. So, with the exception of the fact that there are three Senate representatives on the Executive Budget Council, there was very little Senate input into this process.

About two years ago, our Senate's Planning and Budget Committee put together a proposal that involved the Senate in a much more active way. This initially met with a fair amount of opposition from the Deans, but we have now agreed to a process that the Deans are comfortable with, in which the faculty councils of each school are charged with interacting with their individual Deans to formulate budgets. One big advantage of the new system is that it provides a way to look for synergies among the priorities of the different schools.

Another issue that has been important for us involves conflict of interest. A series of events on our campus alerted us to the fact that conflict of interest can exist among *basic* scientists as well as clinical scientists with respect to dealings with commercial enterprises. So last fall I

formed a task force charged with developing a conflict-of-interest policy that will deal with both clinical investigations and basic science. This task force is still at work; it's a great group with wide campus representation, and I have no doubt that what we get will be quite well thought out.

A third issue that we're concerned with is the culture of UCSF with respect to faculty hiring and support. Many of the young folks who are being recruited to UCSF are put into series that do not confer Academic Senate membership even though they are qualified for such series. In fact, in the clinical departments, there have been very, very few appointments not just into ladder-ranks series, but into the In-Residence and Professor of Clinical X series [which confer Senate membership]. The upshot is that less than half our faculty are in the Senate. So, now we have formed a Senate-administration task force that is examining why this problem has developed and how it can be reversed.

Finally, the Senate has been very actively involved in the discussions as to where to place and how to configure the new hospital, a process precipitated by state law regarding seismic upgrades. Multiple options abound, all with profound impact on the academic program. This has been a wide-open discussion with good faculty-administration interactions.

Santa Barbara, Richard Watts, Chair

— We've been discussing a reorganization of the Senate for over two years now. The large-scale effect of this will be a consolidation of a lot of our committees into broader councils. After the reorganization plan was approved by our legislature several months ago, we were faced with rewriting Bylaws. We found, not too surprisingly, that in doing this, people began to wake up and realize that we were actually reorganizing. After some further consulting, we got the Bylaws up for consideration at a special May 30 meeting of our Legislature. The meeting had the largest attendance of any of the Legislature meetings I have presided over in the last four years. The Bylaws were approved by a large margin and will thus take effect on September 1.

At that same special meeting, we had a lengthy, heated debate regarding revision of our General Education program. This initiative has been under consideration for over two years. We are trying to clarify our requirements; in particular, we're trying to get them defined in a way that would limit

the number of courses that are used for GE into a small number of very high-quality courses that are explicitly designed for non-majors. We've tried to revise GE in such a way that most of our majors, including those from engineering and L&S, would be able to do one GE program. After the long debate, our Legislature approved a motion to accept the new GE program by a very slim margin of only one vote, and we also approved a motion to send the proposal to the entire faculty for a mail ballot. We are presently discussing the best timing to proceed with a mail ballot since we are so near to the end of the spring quarter.

We have also been very involved in UCSB's development of its state-funded summer program. We have been through one summer of that already, in which oversight was largely invested in a joint Senate-administrative committee that's called the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Year-Round Enrollment. That group includes the Chair and Vice Chair of our Educational Policy-Academic Planning Committee, as well as some Deans and Department Chairs. The Advisory Committee has taken a strong leadership role in establishing policies for summer-session and providing oversight on how the budget for summer is handled.

This Advisory Committee was quite successful in building our state-funded summer program in its first year. In fact, by the standards of success that UCOP asked us to address in planning for that first summer, I would say we had a smashing success. Comparisons of summer session in 2000 with our first state funded summer session in 2001 indicate that our student enrollment increased by 23 percent, we increased our course offerings by 50 percent and participation of our ladder faculty in teaching summer session courses increased by 95 percent. That last figure is particularly gratifying since it is something that our Senate worked very hard to accomplish.

Santa Cruz, George Blumenthal, Chair

— One big issue facing us might be termed enrollment management, but on another level it could simply be termed "increasing graduate enrollments." The campus is growing very rapidly towards its long-range development limit, which is 15,000 students on campus. There's increased commitment both on the part of administration and Senate calling for the campus to go from roughly 10 percent

Divisional Chairs

graduate students to 15 percent. So, one of the challenges facing the campus is figuring out how to increase our graduate student population by 50 percent as we approach build-out and how to pay for it.

In a sense, these issues are subsumed in the larger issue of the long-range planning process that the campus has been undergoing this year. We're in the midst of a strategic, 10-year planning process whose central question is: What do we want to look like when we reach build-out? The graduate student issue is a piece of that, but it's only one piece. Others are what are the programs we want on campus, what new programs do we want, and how do we facilitate new programs?

A second issue has to do with hiring a faculty. Fifty percent of the faculty on campus today were not here six years ago, and fifty percent of the faculty who will be here in 2010 are not here now. One challenge that goes along with this turn-over is figuring out how to hire these faculty and pay for their enormous start-up costs. A more immediate problem is that of faculty housing, which has become a really big issue. One way this problem is being addressed is by building on-campus housing for faculty. One of the components of this is something we call Inclusionary Area D, which is slated to having something on the order of 90 three-bedroom houses on it. It's a great project and everyone's interested in it; unfortunately, it's been held up for environmental reasons. On a more immediate basis, the campus recently announced agreement to buy a suite of something like 84 privately built apartments, located across the street from the campus. The intention is to move people who are renting on-campus to these apartments and then sell the on-campus apartments as condominiums.

Next, in our undergraduate population, we are fast approaching the stage in which the number of students who want to come here roughly equals the number of spaces we have for them. In other words, we are approaching selectivity. In the last few years, there have only been UC two campuses, Riverside and Santa Cruz, that have taken any UC-eligible student.

For the Senate, this means that we have to get into place a set of admissions review criteria — the comprehensive review criteria — that we feel comfortable with. When we reach this point where we start turning away UC-eligible students, we have to have some sensible criteria by which we make those decisions.

Notes from the Chair: Political Measures

There is a dialogue that goes on continually between the University of California and California's legislators and its Governor regarding how UC should conduct its affairs. This is appropriate, given that UC is a public institution — one that is likely to receive some \$3.2 billion in operating funds from the state next year. UC's public status also makes it subject to laws and initiatives that do not affect private-sector institutions. Proposition 209 was a seismic event for UC, but for Stanford it was a nonentity. The challenge for UC administrators — and to some degree for UC faculty — is to maintain UC's preeminence as a research university and preserve its academic independence and integrity. At present, three measures are in process that give us cause for concern along these lines.

One of these measures, the Racial Privacy Initiative (RPI) would prohibit state agencies from "classifying" any individual by race or ethnicity. One might expect a number of deleterious consequences, should this measure be approved by voters. One of these consequences is that, with some exceptions, the state would no longer be able to collect data that identifies individuals by race. UC researchers who depend on such data would find their supply of it cut off prospectively, beginning on the date that RPI takes effect. More troubling is the possibility that, in contrast to colleagues at, say, Harvard or Stanford, UC researchers would be forbidden to *collect* data that classifies individuals by race. The RPI language specifically exempts "medical research subjects and patients" from this prohibition; whether this exemption will extend into other disciplines is a question still being researched by UC's General Counsel's Office.

In another issue, a joint committee of the California Legislature has been drafting a California Master Plan for Education aimed at bringing K-12 and public higher education under a single set of policies. Some of the measures proposed in a recent joint committee draft would have a significant impact on UC. For example, the panel has recommended that UC and CSU "consider both objective and subjective personal characteristics equally" in freshman admissions. Further, the committee is proposing that a "college readiness curriculum" be adopted as a default standard for state high schools, possibly meaning that UC's "a-g" course requirements would become tied to state law for the first time.

Beyond these measures, Concurrent Resolution ACR 178 has been introduced in the California Assembly which requests that the UC Regents implement "comprehensive review" in UC graduate and professional school admissions, as has been done in undergraduate admissions. The resolution asks the Regents to ensure that standardized test scores not be used as a primary criterion to end consideration of any candidate for graduate or professional school admission.

The Office of the President has primary responsibility for speaking for the University in connection with issues such as these, but UCOP has been consulting regularly with the Senate regarding each of them. Senate input into these issues actually is more extensive than across-the-table consultation, however. With respect to the resolution on graduate admissions, the Senate's Graduate Affairs committee is undertaking a study to determine the degree to which UC *currently* adheres to the very policy the Assembly is calling for. I expect the results of this work will ultimately be transmitted to the Legislature. With respect to the Master Plan, Senate representatives sat on two of the seven "working groups" that examined different domains of state education for the joint committee, and I expect that the Senate will be sending formal comments on the plan to the committee. The concerns raised in connection with the Racial Privacy Initiative have prompted the statewide Senate to form a four-member subcommittee that will review the RPI's language and draft a report on its potential impact on UC faculty.

The Senate's role in each of these issues, while largely consultative, is nevertheless critical in that it is UC's faculty who stand to be most keenly affected by a given measure. We in the Academic Senate must remain vigilant in monitoring politically initiated measures for their potential impact on what our faculty do: teaching, research, public service.

—Chand Viswanathan
Chair, Academic Council

New Senate Vice Chair

(Continued from Page 1)

In considering Senate activity over the next two years, Pitts notes, "The brilliance and dedication of the UC faculty is second to no other university. The University, the state and education universally would benefit greatly if the faculty can be informed of the challenges and opportunities facing UC, and if they use their skill and wisdom in addressing these challenges. The faculty performs extraordinarily in their teaching and research roles — and have made UC arguably the greatest public university in the world. While the faculty and Senate are largely advisory to the University for administrative matters, their ideas often are critical in solving problems, when they express their views. I feel it is the Senate's task to inform the faculty of important issues confronting the University, and to gather and shape the faculty's opinions about how the University should move forward. The Senate leadership needs very much to hear the faculty voice in these matters."

Notice

is published four times during the academic year for the University of California faculty by the Academic Council of the universitywide Academic Senate.

Chand Viswanathan, Chair
UCOP, 12th Floor, 1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94607-5200

David Krogh, Editor
Betty Marton, Contributing Writer
Jeannene Whalen, Contributing Writer

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

Health Care Costs: Increases Will Affect UC

(Continued from Page 1)

health care insurers are now seeking the highest premium increases in a decade. Other elements playing a part in this change are expensive new technologies, increased costs for hospital care and providers, and the demands of an aging population. This year's increase in health care costs is expected to be 13.2 percent.

In the 1980s, HMOs were touted as the cost-cutting solution to then-rampant medical cost increases, and in the early-to-mid 1990s, they seemed to be just that. But some analysts claim that HMOs underpriced their products during this period in an effort to increase membership and gain market share. Premiums for HMOs are now growing faster than health care costs, as the HMOs struggle to improve their bottom line.

California's managed health care system is reinventing itself through widespread provider and plan consolidations. In 1990, the UC system as a whole offered 11 plans at one or another of its locations; today only 7 plans are available. Many health care plans, especially Medicare/HMO plans, are leaving rural and suburban areas. Medical provider groups and hospitals, citing unacceptably low reimbursement rates from their health plans, are dropping out of many managed care plans. And multiple legislative pressures, particularly in areas of medical management and litigation, are adding fuel to the inflationary trend.

After a decade of \$5-\$10 office visits and low out-of-pocket costs, UC employees have come to expect good quality care at relatively low prices. On average, UC health plan members pay about 6 percent of their total medical premiums, whereas nationally, most employees pay at least 15 percent of the medical premium for single

coverage and up to 30 percent of the premium for family coverage. While UC employees' premium costs for 2002 have remained relatively stable, co-pays increased on UC plans as the gap widened between UC's health care budget allocation and the spiraling health plan premiums. Expectations are that employee cost-sharing will continue to rise through the near term.

For fiscal year 2001-02, the state budget allocation for UC's Health & Welfare programs was set at 9 percent. A combination of strong negotiations with plans and moderate increases in copayments allowed UC to continue to pay a major share of the premium. For UC's 2002-03 health programs, the initial state budget allocation has been reduced from 10 percent to 6.7 percent. Against this, UC might be confronted with premium hikes that could jump an average of 25 percent.

At the urging of UCFW, a Flexible Spending Account for health care expenses should be reinstituted not later than January 2003. The program will allow employees to set aside pre-tax dollars to cover specified out-of-pocket expenses such as co-payments, deductibles, orthodontics, or laser eye surgery. Employees' health insurance premium costs already are deducted by UC on a pre-tax basis.

Options and long-term strategies to help the University navigate this changing environment will be developed as HR&B continues to work with the UCFW and its Task Force and other groups with health care expertise.

In its effort to help educate UC faculty and employees about the severity of the ongoing health care crisis, the UCFW has posted a discussion paper on the Academic Senate web site. "Health Care Costs: Trends and Relationships to Insurance Premiums" can be found at: <http://www.ucop.edu/senate/current.html>