

In Collaboration Across Campuses, History Sets the Pace

Last April, the chairs of the history departments at the University of California did something for the first time ever: they all met in one place. Their gathering, coming about at a history retreat held at UC San Diego, was symbolic of a shift that has occurred in history departments across UC within the last couple of years — a shift that shows some signs of being duplicated in other disciplines. It is that UC history departments are interacting with one another in ways they never did before. Chairs are sharing information on their faculty hiring and graduate education plans; students are taking televised courses taught by faculty from half a dozen UC campuses; faculty and graduate students from sub-disciplines within history are getting together regularly for face-to-face meetings.

To be sure, there is nothing entirely new about any of this; departments on different campuses have cooperated in academic programs in the past and, even within history, UC faculty from various sub-disciplines have been getting together for years. Yet many UC history faculty are confident that, in terms of scale and degree of organization, what is going on now has no precedent at UC.

"Three years back almost none of this was happening," says UC Davis History Chair Ted Margadant. "There has been a major change."

Among the developments taking place are the following.

- Getting together last November, the UC history chairs decided to organize a conference this May that will bring together 50-60 UC historians for the purpose of discussing research agendas and graduate education. One specific topic that will be covered is the nature of UC offerings in global history, an emerging sub-discipline that holds promise of making graduate students who are trained in it more marketable.

- Campuses have begun to shape their faculty hiring based on information gained in these kinds of meetings. For example, UC Santa Barbara History Chair Sarah Cline notes that, at such a

(Please See: Intercampus, Page 3)

At UCLA, a Seismic Financial Shift To 'Responsibility Center' Management

The University of California, Los Angeles is overhauling the way it manages its money. In an enormous, multi-million-dollar effort, begun more than five years ago, the campus is shifting to a system intended to make its schools and colleges the masters of their own fates to a greater extent than ever before.

There are many components to this change, but underlying them is a transition to "Responsibility Center Management" (RCM), a system that, depending on who is talking, stands to unleash academic creativity or turn universities into "widget-makers."

"The ultimate goal is to give units more freedom on how to budget their income," says Abdelmonem Afifi, dean of UCLA's School of Public Health. If RCM at UCLA works as intended, he says, "it would give deans, working together with faculty, the opportunity to think more broadly about how to spend money."

Senate's Assembly Meets at UC Irvine

A change in the UC Santa Cruz undergraduate grading system, a new degree for UC Berkeley and discussions of admissions, academic personnel issues, and the ongoing analysis of the statewide Academic Senate were among the topics taken up by the Senate's Universitywide Assembly as it met on February 27 at UC Irvine.

The meeting, the first of two for the Assembly this year, also included remarks and a question-and-answer session with President Richard Atkinson and an update from Academic Council Chair Duncan Mellichamp on various issues now confronting the Senate.

Responding to questions from Assembly members, the president noted that the University "is under tremendous pressure from the legislature" to

(Please See: Senate's, Page 2)

Inside Notice: High School Standards In Math and English

Conversely, a faculty critic of RCM, Leslie Rothenberg of the UCLA Medical School, says, "I can't figure out where this helps the academic enterprise, but I can think of ways it could hurt it."

For the UCLA faculty as a whole, the judgment to date on RCM is mixed. Aimee Dorr, chair of the UCLA Academic Senate, says that, following more than a year of full faculty participation in the development of the system "you can't characterize the faculty as feeling any one way" on the RCM issue, though the range of faculty opinion, she says, seems to run from "very negative to slightly positive."

UCLA will initiate some components of its new system on July 1, one day after UCLA Chancellor Charles Young leaves office. One of the questions being asked on the campus, therefore, is whether RCM and its related changes will survive at UCLA under a new chancellor, given that Young has been the driving force behind the initiatives.

For faculty and staff from other UC campuses, UCLA's transition to RCM has raised the question: Will this system be coming our way soon? Thus far, the answer seems to be no, as other campuses seem content simply to watch and learn from the UCLA experience, or at most to run some RCM simulations. Susan O'Hara, director of budget for UC Davis, says that, in the course of developing a new campus budgeting process, UCD noted a number of attractive features to RCM but that, with further investigation, "We've become more hesitant to leap into it with both feet. We're by no means convinced that it's a perfect fit for us."

The use of Responsibility Centered Management in academia dates from the 1970s, though Hans Jenny, who has written extensively on higher education finance, says that it has private-industry antecedents stretching back to the 1930s. It is used today at such institutions as Michigan and Indiana Universities and the University of Southern California.

The essential theory behind RCM is that schools and colleges — the "responsibility centers" of RCM — would

(Please See: RCM, Page 4)

NEWS IN BRIEF

UCSF CHANCELLOR SELECTION

An advisory committee has been named to assist President Atkinson in his selection of a new chancellor for UC San Francisco. Joseph Martin, UCSF's current chancellor, announced last November that he will leave his post as of July 1 to become dean of the Harvard medical faculty.

Academic administrators, students, staff, and alumni representatives will sit on the 18-member committee, along with six UC regent representatives and five UC faculty. In chancellorial searches, however, faculty members on the advisory committee serve as a separate screening panel, working with the president to narrow the field of candidates.

The faculty panel members are, from UCSF, Charlene Harrington, professor of social and behavioral sciences in the School of Nursing; Irwin Kuntz, professor of pharmaceutical chemistry; and Karin Vargervik, professor and chair of dental growth and development. Other faculty members are Klea Bertakis, chair of family practice at the UC Davis Medical Center; and Murray Goodman, professor of chemistry and biochemistry at UC San Diego. The UCSF administration is represented by Haile Debas, dean of UCSF's School of Medicine.

CALL FOR LECTURE ABSTRACTS

UC faculty from all nine campuses have been invited to submit abstracts and applications for the University's 1997 Wellness Lecture Series. Under the Wellness Lecture program, six faculty will be selected to present hour-long lectures, in October 1997, on means of improving the health of Californians through prevention and other strategies. The lectures may be related to specific populations, defined by age, ethnicity, geography, culture, activity, occupation, or risk behavior. Lecturers selected for the series will be awarded \$3,000 honoraria, with an additional \$1,000 to cover research assistance and editing expenses.

Both Senate and non-Senate faculty may submit abstracts for the lecture series, which is sponsored by the California Wellness Foundation and UC's Office of the President.

Lecturer applications may be obtained from campus Sponsored Research or Contracts and Grants Offices. The deadline for submission of abstracts and application packets is April 4. Further information may be obtained by calling (510) 987-9320.

Regents, Senate Endorse Content Standards For High School English and Mathematics

What should California high school students be taught in English and mathematics? A broad consensus seems to have been reached on this question recently, as educators, parents, and business people across the state have agreed to a set of English and math "content standards" that have been developed over the past year. The question now is, what effect will this consensus have on the actual education of California high school students?

The notion of developing English and math standards came from the California Education Roundtable, which brings together the chief executives from K-12 and the major branches of higher education in the state. In October 1995, the Round Table called for a consensus on what should be taught in math and English to all California high-school students — not just those bound for college. The Round Table then appointed two task forces to begin drafting a set of standards. These groups, composed of a range of K-12, community and university representatives (including a number of UC faculty) finished their first draft last September, delivering a 100-page document that outlined recommended course content in several broad areas of English and math, with examples supplied in each area.

In February, the UC Regents joined a growing list of governing bodies that have endorsed a final version of the standards. The UC Senate's Academic Council has also endorsed them, as has the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (representing UC, CSU and the Community Colleges) and the California Education Roundtable itself.

It is one thing, however, to have standards agreed to, but another to have high schools actually adopt them. For the foreseeable future, the Regents were told in February, all that state educators can do is make sure that school districts are aware of the standards and hope that the districts will choose to utilize them. A process is in place for adoption of standards by the State Board of Education, but even if this occurs, existing state law calls only for voluntary adoption of the standards by school districts. State Superintendent of Public Instruction Delaine Eastin, a prime mover behind the standards, told the Regents in February that "It is absolutely imperative that these become mandatory."

According to their authors, the standards would narrow the gap between

what is expected to be taught to high school students in general, as compared with that proportion of high school students who are bound for college. The English task force recommended course content in six areas: reading; writing; grammar, conventions and usage; speaking and listening, literature; and using information. The mathematics task force also recommended standards in six areas: number sense, symbols and algebra, measurement and geometry, functions, data analysis, and mathematical reasoning. The standards specify only the nature of what should be taught to students, not the levels of performance they should reach in given areas. A draft copy of the standards can be viewed at the World Wide Web site: <http://www.otandni.us/certicc/standards.html>

Senate's Assembly Meets at UC Irvine

(Continued from Page 1)

build a 10th campus. Such a campus could probably admit no more than 1,000 students by the year 2005, he said, and grow to no more than 5,000 by 2010. Its existence, he said is contingent upon UC being provided sufficient additional state funding for it. Atkinson also said he sees no prospect of significantly lowering UC's student-faculty ratio. The ratio was allowed to slip from 17.6:1 to its current 18.7:1 during the difficult budget years of the early 1990s.

In a discussion of academic personnel issues, John Poulos, chair of the University Committee on Academic Personnel, told Assembly members that his committee has decided against recommending to the administration the creation of Steps IX and X in the full professor rank.

Poulos also said that UCAP is looking into the degree to which the Senate on some campuses "is giving up its authority for recommendations on merits and promotions." Some campuses provide the administration only with a departmental review of candidates for normal merit increases, he said, with the decision after this left strictly to the administration. Assembly members agreed that Los Angeles and Berkeley seem to represent the extremes on this issue, as Berkeley's CAP or "Budget" Committee

(Please See: Assembly, Page 6)

Intercampus Collaboration: History Departments Lead the Way

(Continued from Page 1)

gathering, “We shared information about who was doing what [at UC] and it was clear that African history was not high on the priority list of FTE plans of the other campuses. It was apparent that we could begin building in that direction.” The department has gone on to draw up a five-year hiring plan that includes doing just that. UCSB has also discussed implementing with Berkeley a “TA exchange,” under which history TA’s from one campus would spend time studying on the other.

- Sub-disciplines within history are now getting together so often it is difficult to keep track of the meetings. UC medieval historians are now meeting twice a year, Margadant says; historians of science held a three-day workshop in January for all graduate students and faculty in the field at UC and Stanford; and Latin American historians held a conference at UC Irvine last month in which graduate students gave papers and emeriti gave presentations on changes in the field.

- One sub-discipline, British history, has since 1995 been offering a live, televised seminar once a year to graduate students on as many as six UC campuses. The original idea, as British historian John Phillips of UC Riverside says, was to “expose all of our graduate students to all of our specialists.” The course has been modified over time as faculty have learned what works and what doesn’t in such an offering, but Phillips remains convinced that the course is valuable not only for graduate students, but for faculty as well.

“I feel for the first time that I’m working with my colleagues in British history around the system at least as closely, maybe even more closely, than I’m working with colleagues in my own department,” he says.

Why did interactions such as these begin sprouting up among the UC history departments? One answer, all parties are agreed, is technology, meaning not only television but the Internet and e-mail. Course syllabi can now be posted on the Web and department chairs can communicate with all their counterparts at the touch of a button.

Beyond this, however, the developments in history represent a kind of high-water mark for an effort initiated several years ago by UC’s Council of Vice Chancellors (COVC). The Council has acted as a kind of facilitator for interdepartmental interactions, not only in

history, but in foreign language, anthropology, the arts, and physics as well. In some cases, such as anthropology, nothing has come of this, while in others, such as history and physics, substantial interactions are underway. (Next month at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, faculty from every physics department at UC, as well as the three UC-managed DOE labs, will attend a two-day conference whose topics will range from the state of physics as a discipline to UC campus and labs cooperative ventures.)

COVC Action Following VERIPs

The Council of Vice Chancellors’ role in this process began in the wake of the budget disasters and VERIPs of the early 1990s. “At one of our meetings we started talking about how, as we rebuilt from the VERIP losses, we could make wiser decisions if we knew of each other’s plans,” says UC Berkeley Vice Chancellor Carol Christ.

Targeting certain disciplines, such as history and foreign language, COVC subsequently met with campus deans responsible for these areas and, in Christ’s words “asked them to describe the strengths of their programs and their future plans.” Seeing history as an especially promising field, COVC brought together in San Diego not only deans responsible for history, but the history department chairs and one other faculty member from each department. Seeing the value in such meetings, the history chairs subsequently decided to meet regularly on their own, with the first of their meetings being the one that took place this past November.

One other element has helped along the new intercampus collaborations: funding from the Office of the President. UCOP runs a program, called the Intercampus Academic Program Incentive Fund (IAPIF), that provides grants for inter-campus collaborations in instruction. Funded for the last three years at \$250,000 per year, the program has consistently had more money than grant requests. Sympathetic to the goal of intercampus collaboration by discipline, UCOP has used IAPIF money to fund such things as the history retreat and the upcoming physics conference. Indeed, the largest “general” IAPIF grant this year went to a four-campus curriculum development effort in global history, that will include a year-end conference.

UC’s experience with its history departments — a top-down initiative bringing about self-sustaining collaboration — provides an obvious model for

other disciplines, but it’s not clear yet what the future will hold. Roberto Peccei, dean of UCLA’s Division of Physical Sciences, does not foresee UC physicists undertaking the kind of sub-disciplinary collaboration that has occurred in history. Much of physics, he points out, is inherently collaborative, with physicists having to travel to this or that lab merely to conduct experiments. “The informal collaborative structure that exists in physics now is such that I think that in formalizing it the gain would be pretty marginal,” he says.

No Dividing of Research Territory

There is, however, more to the current collaborations than meetings of various sub-disciplines. There is, for example, the shaping of faculty hiring and graduate programs in accordance with shared information.

When COVC first started working on inter-campus collaboration, there was a hope among some senior UC administrators that communication among the campuses might lead to an explicit division of intellectual territory by campus. President Atkinson has voiced the belief on many occasions that there is no reason for every campus to strive for quality in every sub-discipline of a field. At present, however, no one foresees research specialization coming about by means of, for example, agreements struck among departments. As the UCSB decision on African history shows, however, academic programs are being shaped in more subtle ways by the communication now taking place.

“Our campus planning is helpfully informed by what we learn from the other campuses,” says Berkeley Vice Chancellor Christ. “My awareness that Santa Barbara does religious studies is going to be part of my thinking when someone says to me, ‘let’s do religious studies.’”

When the historians of science met in January in Berkeley, the subjects on the table were not collaborations or program-shaping, but rather the substance of the history of science. For Roger Hahn, director of the UCB Office for History of Science and Technology, the “most fruitful” aspect of the meeting was not what he learned about his discipline, however. Instead it was “the recognition of each other’s presence.” Simply knowing, he said, “the human resources that are available [at UC] was probably the most important by-product of the conference.”

RCM: What Are the 'Real Costs' of Running a School?

(Continued from Page 1)

be able to flourish if they were freed from the constraints imposed by conventional higher education financing. For this to happen, RCM holds, schools and colleges must be allowed to "own" both their costs and their revenues; they have to know what their *individual* costs and revenues are and they must be allowed to manage their money themselves, holding on to surpluses and paying off deficits. With this in place, the theory goes, a school is in a position to shift its resources around in creative ways.

Untangling Central 'Subsidies'

The first step in this process — coming to an understanding of a given school's costs and revenues — is much easier said than done, since traditional higher education finance has created layer upon layer of central administration "subsidies" to academic units. How can these be disentangled? RCM's answer is that a well-defined share of all *general* campus costs can be "attributed" to *specific* academic units. Thus, "costs" under RCM include not only traditional items, such as phone charges, but also such things as the number of contracts and grants transactions a school generates, and the amount of building space it uses. Commonly, UC campuses don't think of square footage as a "cost" attributable to a given academic unit and contracts and grants work usually is paid for by the campus' central administration. Under RCM, however, space is a commodity with a cost and offices such as contracts and grants become "service centers" whose activities support academic units to differing degrees — and whose costs are borne accordingly.

It is one thing to calculate a given unit's use of contracts and grants, but quite another to calculate its use of, say, the police department or the chancellor's office. As a result, UCLA has had to spend lots of time coming up with cost "algorithms" not only for such easily standardized costs as registrar's transactions, but for things like police service as well. (How can such a cost be apportioned? UCLA decided to give each academic unit a ranking by size on a five-point scale. As size goes up, so does the amount a given unit pays for police.)

The flip side of this is that if "real" costs can be attributed to academic units, so can "real" revenues. Part of doing this is fairly simple and no different than what exists today. Professional schools

continue to keep the differential student fees they charge, for example. Other parts are straightforward but new. For example, under RCM at UCLA, 100 percent of all research overhead funds will be returned to schools in direct proportion to the schools' generation of grant funding, whereas now the bulk of this money goes to the central administration.

Funds that fall under these descriptions account, however, for only a fraction of the money that UCLA receives from the combination of state funding and student educational fees. When one considers this remaining pool of money, the task of disentanglement presents itself again. These funds are provided to the *campus*, not to units of it, and there is no comprehensive rationale for why units receive their current allocations. In order to apportion general campus revenues, therefore, RCM institutions are obliged to come up with defensible algorithms for unit *allocations*: If factors *a-d* exist at given levels in a school, then it should receive a total allocation of *z* from this pool of campus money.

When Schools Don't Break Even

A number of factors have been taken into account in constructing these allocation algorithms at UCLA, the most important of them being the weighted student FTE of each school. When all of the factors have been taken into account, however, the revenues calculated for some schools are not as great as the *costs* attributed to them. A school in this situation does not go into bankruptcy, but instead is given what most RCM institutions call "subvention" funds. (UCLA is calling this money "judgment" funding.) The question of what this money represents is a troubling one for RCM. In some instances judgment funding may represent the "welfare" it's sometimes characterized as, while in others it is certain to represent the failure of an institution's algorithms to take into account, for example, the cost differences of educating one kind of student, as opposed to another. The value of having such a funding category, however, is that, as one UCLA administrator reportedly said, "It makes you ask the question: 'why?'"

When both allocation and cost algorithms have been agreed to, an institution has gone a long way toward creating its RCM "model," meaning a set of numbers that can show a dean or faculty member what a school's costs and rev-

enues would be, given various assumptions about enrollment, space usage and so forth.

RCM as an Informational Tool

Upon finalizing its own model, however, UCLA will part company with institutions, such as Michigan and Indiana, at which the RCM model *determines* the budgets of campus schools and colleges. Opinions differ as to whether UCLA ever intended to follow this course, but all parties are agreed that it will not do so now. Instead, the campus will use its RCM model strictly as an informational tool that will inform the judgment of the chancellor, who will continue to make final decisions on unit allocations.

This development has been welcomed by many UCLA faculty, as a good number of them had serious reservations about a "formula-driven" budgeting process, particularly since the original allocation algorithms placed overwhelming emphasis on the amount of teaching academic units did.

"You would have gotten more money just by teaching more students," says Dwight Read, chair of the UCLA Senate's Council on Planning and Budget. The prospect was thus raised of units taking on students as a money-making venture. "The faculty thought that RCM was avoiding the issue of quality," Read says. "Our committee's position was that, whatever RCM is, it has to be able to deal with the issue of quality."

Having decided against formulaic budgeting, UCLA will now see whether the hybrid it will utilize — RCM information without RCM control — can work to its advantage. John Curry currently is vice-president for business and finance at Caltech, but from 1993 to 1995 was administrative vice chancellor at UCLA and as such guided the campus' initial investigation into RCM. He has a long track record with RCM, both as an administrator (at USC) and as a consultant to such RCM institutions as Michigan and Indiana. In his view, UCLA's dual-track strategy may undercut itself.

"Insofar as it is an informational tool without a hard edge, it confuses incentives," he says. If the model yields a given result on a given school's funding, but the chancellor allocates in a dramatically different way, why would people continue to take the model seriously? More important, Curry says,

(Continued on next page)

RCM at UCLA

(Continued from previous page)

UCLA's strategy "leaves ownership with the chancellor and not with the local units." The essence of RCM is that schools not only get to keep "their" dollars, but that they can *predict* what those dollars will be. Both ownership and predictability begin to evaporate when the chancellor, rather than the model, makes the budgeting decisions.

Space for Rent or Sale

None of this is to say that the budgeting changes at UCLA will have no impact. Consider, for example, the question of building space. This coming year, the cost that schools will be assessed for the space they occupy will be equaled by the revenue they are granted for this space. However, under RCM, space "belongs" to given schools and colleges, and over time these units can choose to sell or rent this space to other units for money. One view is that this system will maximize the efficient use of both money and space on campus. John Curry says that "every campus I've known that has done this has discovered it had empty space." Another view, however, is that this is a prescription for increasing the inequalities between "cash-rich" units, such as medical and business schools, and cash-poor units, such as letters and science.

Beyond this, under the new system there is a greater possibility of academic units contracting for services with private companies. Under RCM, a school that didn't like the janitorial service it was getting from the UCLA "service center" could theoretically contract with an outside vendor for this work. George Letteney, director of the RCM Project at UCLA, says that administrative approval will be required for such "outsourcing," probably following discussion with one of the service-center "advisory groups" that are being set up on campus. Ultimately, however, the prospect exists of campus service centers facing greater competition from outside vendors.

Finally, there is the question of "open books" under UCLA's new system. RCM works well to the extent that members of one campus unit can be sure that the costs and revenues they are apportioned are in line with those attributed to other campus units. As such, UCLA hopes to put a substantial portion of each campus unit's financial records on line. Susan Abeles, an assis-

(Please See: RCM, Page 6)

Notes from the Chair: One University?

Is the University of California one university, a federation of individual universities, or a loose collection of sometimes cooperating academic interests? In my five years on the Academic Council I've had occasion to think about this question frequently. Indeed, I had intended to comment extensively on this topic toward the end of my term as Council Chair. A recent initiative from UC's business school deans has, however, advanced the timetable. A proposal from the deans — for raising student fees at the UCLA and Berkeley schools of business — was transmitted to the President late last month and apparently requires Regental approval this month. Should the proposal go forward, the timing of it would give the Academic Council a matter of days to provide a recommendation.

The proposal would allow the Haas School at Berkeley and Anderson School at Los Angeles to increase differential student fees for their MBA students by \$2,000 in 1997-98, by \$1,500 more in 1998-99 and \$1,000 more in 1999-00. Meanwhile the schools at Davis, Irvine, and Riverside would keep fees constant next year, and then raise or reassess their fees in the succeeding years. The upshot of all this is that, under a revised three-year plan for the schools, Berkeley and Los Angeles would have differential MBA fees of \$10,500 per year by 1999-00, while the fees at Irvine and Davis are likely to be \$6,000, and the fees at Riverside \$5,000.

Faculty may recall that the prospect of imposing differential fees at selected professional schools deeply concerned the Academic Senate when this idea first arose in 1993-94. Senate concerns were even greater when, somewhat later, Riverside proposed to phase in its business school fee increases over a longer time period than the other four campuses. Senate concurrence with this latter proposal hinged on the understanding that differences in business school fees would be temporary; probably, no one then would have supported a long-term arrangement of this sort.

The deans' recent initiative is a first in that there is no notion the fee differences being proposed are temporary. As such, this change will make explicit something that has only been implied before: that certain programs are worth a premium. More importantly, the differentially increased funding for some business programs vis-à-vis others will make it virtually impossible for the latter programs ever to "catch up" in programmatic quality, assuming that the Berkeley and UCLA deans follow through on their expressed intention to use part of the additional fees to raise faculty salaries.

This policy decision becomes crucially important as the University continues to decentralize. To make a change such as that being proposed, one has to know that the advantages of locally increased funding outweigh the disadvantages to the entire system. What disadvantages? First, the loss of collegiality that inevitably will accompany the adoption of an explicitly-tiered set of programs. Second, the prospect of *increasing* differences among schools as selected programs build themselves up further through higher fees.

More important is the potential of a precedent being set of fees that differ by campus — a concept that can be extended. For example, will we consider differential general fees from campus to campus in all academic programs? Differential fees within selected academic program areas? Mix-and-match combinations? Future students might have to pay a premium for selecting to study in a particular academic department on a campus that otherwise offers a general break in fees. Can anyone contemplate the effects such changes might have on enrollments and access?

Substantive questions such as these beg a procedural one: Shouldn't such an important step receive a thorough review within both the administration and systemwide Senate *prior* to implementation? If the deans' proposal ends up going to the Regents this month, this sequence of events may well be reversed. The most troubling aspect to me of this and other similar proposals in recent years is the emergence of an attitude in many quarters that academic units can operate independently and that consequences for others need not be considered. Whatever did happen to the concept of one University?

—Duncan Mellichamp
Chair, Academic Council

Assembly: Change in Santa Cruz Grading

(Continued from Page 2)

reviews every proposal for an increase in faculty salary, while UCLA handles merit reviews at many steps much more as an administrative decision.

The change in grading at UCSC had to do with giving undergraduates the option of obtaining a calculated grade-point-average. Currently, UCSC provides "narrative evaluations" of every course a student passes. For many courses, UCSC students can elect to get, as a supplement, conventional letter grades (of A, B, C, or NP for "not passed," with the latter not appearing on a student's transcript).

With the change UCSC is preparing to put into place, students who elect to receive letter grades in at least two-thirds of the courses they take will be able to get a calculated GPA upon graduation from the campus. The change is desirable, the UCSC Senate felt, because many graduate schools and the Federal Civil Service require a GPA for placement or classification. Beyond this, the UCSC Senate reports, the campus has experienced a decline in applications and admissions — a phenomenon that seems to stem in part from the concerns of prospective students over not being able

to get a GPA at the campus.

UCSC intends to extend the letter-grade option to more undergraduate courses and to add D and F letter-grade options, with these grades to be included on a student's transcript. Only this latter provision needed to be reported to the Assembly; since it raised no objection, all the changes will become effective for entering students this fall. With its action, the Assembly acknowledged its approval of the original UCSC language on narrative evaluations, authorized by the campus years ago but never entered as an approved "variance" to statewide Senate regulations until now.

In other business, the Assembly approved a new degree for UC, Berkeley's School of Information and Management Systems, set up following the 1993 disestablishment of UCB's School of Library and Information Studies. In addition to a Ph.D., the school will offer a Master of Information Management and Systems (M.I.M.S.) degree. Campuses need not come to the Assembly to offer existing degrees (Ph.D.'s, etc.) for new programs, but must get Assembly approval to offer new degrees, such as the M.I.M.S.

RCM at UCLA

(Continued from Page 5)

tant vice-chancellor for finance at the campus, says that, with the proper UCLA password, a person in one school ought to be able to go to the Internet and bring up, for example, the aggregated travel expenses from a different school. Questions of technology, data entry, and access exist, but the intent is to open up UCLA's books to a degree that is seemingly without precedent at UC.

The expense of UCLA's financial change-over has been immense. (At one time, no fewer than 19 campus committees were working on the development of the RCM algorithms alone.) In light of these costs, does RCM stand to benefit UCLA? Such a question would be hard to answer even if the campus intended to practice formula-driven RCM. John Curry, an RCM partisan, acknowledges that, nationally, no "hard benchmarks" exist to demonstrate that RCM makes campuses more efficient at educating students or performing research. Against this, however, UCLA's Letteney asks, "Would any of the institutions that have gone to RCM go off it? I think if you asked that question to USC or Indiana or Pennsylvania, the answer would be no."

Notice

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

Duncan A. Mellichamp, 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 January 31, 1997

Fund	Rate of Return, Last 12 Months	Rate of Return, Last 1 Month	Unit Price
Equity	20.64%	4.59%	\$172.47
Bond	8.61%	0.04%	\$85.96
Savings	6.23%	0.52%	N/A
ICC	7.69%	0.62%	N/A
Money Market	5.51%	0.46%	N/A
Multi-Asset	11.43%	1.82%	\$20.21