

Notice

A publication of the
Academic Senate,
University of California
Volume 24, No. 1, December 1999

News for the UC Faculty

Notice, Returning With This Issue, Will Be Joined by Other Senate Publications

Seeking to communicate more effectively with its various constituencies, the statewide Academic Senate is putting into place a four-part communications plan that will result in new forms of Senate communication, along with some old ones.

This issue of *Notice* represents one of the familiar forms of communication faculty and other UC community members will henceforth be receiving from the Senate. Joining *Notice* will be a new form of communication, a twice-yearly electronic letter from the chair of the statewide Academic Senate that will be going to all Senate faculty in the system who have e-mail. Another new form of communication, the *Statewide Senate Report*, will be an e-mail message sent out six times during the year to all faculty who are, or have recently been, active in the statewide Senate — or to any Senate member who wishes to be put on the publication's mailing list. Finally, the statewide Senate is upgrading its web pages to make them more useful and easier to navigate. The old statewide Senate site is up at present (at www.ucop.edu/senate), but a remodeling of this site is ongoing.

The statewide Senate decided to make the change to new forms of communication to broaden its channels of communication with the UC faculty and other UC community members. "For years, communication from the Senate was pretty much limited to *Notice*," says statewide Senate Chair Lawrence B. Coleman. "*Notice* is a fine publication, but we wanted to take advantage of the new technologies to reach out to constituencies."

With the communications change, *Notice* will be coming out fewer times per year than in the past: four issues will be sent to faculty during the academic year, whereas eight were previously. All issues will be printed and sent directly to faculty mail boxes, though *Notice* is available on the web as well. For the past several years, print distribution of *Notice* has been spotty on the Berkeley campus and nearly non-

(Please See: Senate, Page 6)

UC in the Nation's Capital: Under One Director and, Soon, Under One Roof

Back in 1988, then-UC President David Gardner had an idea: Why not establish a University of California Center in Washington, D.C.? It would help facilitate student study in the nation's capital, thereby encouraging careers in public service, and it could bring under one roof the UC research and teaching efforts going on in Washington. Eleven years and one recession later, the University has this center in its sights.

In the last two months, the University has passed two milestones on this long road. In September, UC appointed its first-ever director of the University of California Center in Washington, D.C. He is UC Davis faculty member Larry Berman, a former chair of the Department of Political Science at UCD. Then in October, UC broke ground on an 11-story structure that will become, by June of 2001, the UC-DC Center — the one roof housing all UC activities in Washington. At present, UC undergraduates studying in the capital live in an apartment-style

hotel in Arlington, Virginia. In the future they will live where they learn as residential facilities are being made a part of the UC-DC Center. At present, the University's Federal Governmental Relations unit is housed in offices removed from UC's rented academic center. In the future, it too will be brought into the new UC-DC Center. The new building will also house the Washington, D.C. operations of the UC's Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation (IGCC), which is attempting to establish closer links with policy groups and policy makers in the nation's capital. Finally, there are about 11,000 UC alumni living and working in the Washington, D.C. area; with the opening of the UC-DC center, the University will have a University-owned gathering place for them.

What all this adds up to is an expanded presence for the University in the nation's capital. Director Berman says

(Please See: UC in DC, Page 3)

A Year into a Major Reorganization, the UC Irvine Senate Considers the Results

The Academic Senate at UC Irvine doesn't have a Committee on University and Faculty Welfare anymore. Nor does it have Committees on Academic Freedom, Affirmative Action, or Emeritae/i. In the place of all four committees, the UCI Senate Division now has a single Council on Rights, Responsibilities, and Welfare. Other changes have taken place in the Irvine Senate Division as well. Where once it had a 37-member Executive Committee, it now has an eight-member Cabinet. Where once it had a 111-member Representative Assembly, it now has a 61-member Divisional Senate Assembly. The Divisional Vice-Chair now succeeds to Chair of the division, whereas before there was no succession; both officers used to serve for two years, but they now serve for just one.

Inside Notice: Fall Assembly Meeting; Senate's Johnson Award

All these changes have come about through a reorganization of the UCI Senate, begun in the spring of 1997 and agreed to unanimously by the UCI Representative Assembly at its meeting of May 1998. Because the changes started taking effect in the fall of 1998, many have now been in place for about a year. How has the Irvine Senate changed, and how have these changes worked out?

All parties are agreed that it was former UCI Senate Chair Arnold Binder who was the prime mover behind the reorganization. Binder recalls that in 1996-97, he perceived the Irvine Senate to be in need of revamping along several lines. There seemed to be too many UCI committees, as evidenced by the fact that a couple of them hadn't met in years. Meanwhile, other committees seemed to be overworked. The division rarely had a quorum at its Assembly meetings. Faculty came to the divisional chair's position without having served any apprenticeship

(Please See: Irvine, Page 4)

Statewide Assembly Meeting Task Force Granted Authority over UCM Courses and Curricula

Meeting in October at UC San Diego, the Senate's Universitywide Assembly set up a mechanism by which the Senate will approve courses and curricula for the University's newest campus, UC Merced.

The meeting was the first of the year for the Assembly, which is the governing body of the statewide Academic Senate. During the meeting, presided over by Assembly and Academic Council Chair Lawrence B. Coleman of UC Davis, Assembly members also heard reports from Larry Hershman, UC's vice president for budget, and from Fred Spiess, chair of the Senate Task Force on UC Merced.

The Task Force figured in the piece of legislation approved by the Assembly. A change to Senate Bylaw 116.B made clear the means by which the Senate can approve courses and curricula for a campus, such as UC Merced, that does not yet have a functioning Senate division. As revised in October, SBL 116.B says that, for such campuses, the Universitywide Assembly is empowered to exercise all functions of the Academic Senate normally vested in Senate divisions. The Bylaw then goes on to state that the Assembly may delegate its authority in this area to one or more "standing or special committees of the Academic Senate." Following approval of the Bylaw change, the Assembly named the Task Force on UC Merced a special Assembly committee, charged with approving courses and curricula for UCM.

The Assembly also considered a proposed change to SBL 165, the establishing Bylaw for the Senate's University Committee on the Education Abroad Program (UCEAP). The committee had proposed language that would explicitly broaden its charge to include work on "issues of international education" that lie outside the scope of the Education Abroad Program. The Assembly was supportive of the general concept, but believed the wording of the proposed change needed revision; it thus voted to "recommit" the issue to UCEAP for further consideration, expressing the hope that the proposal might come back to the Assembly at one of its later meetings this year.

Two more Assembly meetings have been scheduled for this year, one on February 23 at UC Berkeley and a second on May 24 at UC Los Angeles.

News in Brief

CHILD CARE PROPOSAL

UC's Office of the President currently is considering a proposal, developed by the Senate's University Committee on Faculty Welfare, that calls for affordable child care to be made available to UC faculty on or near each UC campus. The proposal recommends that UC's campuses subsidize such child care by providing facilities and maintenance expenses for them.

The proposal is contained in the report *UC Policy on Child Care* developed by the Faculty Welfare Committee (UCFW) over the course of two years of fact finding and deliberation. (The report can be found on the web at www.ucop.edu/senate/childcare.html.) In June, the Academic Council voted to support the proposal and forwarded it to President Atkinson, with a request that it be reviewed by the chancellors and within UCOP.

UCFW has long felt that provisions for child care services should be part of basic, broadly-conceived support offered by the University of California to students, administration, and faculty. (The proposed policy primarily concerns faculty, but notes that any child care plan should result in "a comprehensive strategy that also addresses the needs of students and staff.")

In its analysis, UCFW concluded that child care will play increasingly significant roles in recruitment and retention of UC faculty, as well as in creating a work environment in which faculty can be most productive. All of UC's campuses report that they are unable to serve all faculty parents who apply for child care. UCFW believes the provision of on-site care for infants and toddlers to be especially crucial. A survey conducted by UCOP found that seven of UC's "comparison-eight" universities provide child care for all employees, with all seven subsidizing child care by, at a minimum, providing the use of buildings.

UCOP senior management worked closely with UCFW in the development of the child care report. With the receipt of the UCFW proposal on the subject, a joint Administrative/Senate task force may be set up to review the issue and make recommendations on it.

SENATE AWARD NOMINATIONS

Seeking to honor one of its own, the Academic Senate is asking for names of UC faculty who have made notable contributions to the work of the Senate.

Once every two years, the statewide Academic Senate bestows the Oliver Johnson Award on a UC faculty member who has made outstanding contributions to Senate governance. The award will be given this academic year, with announcement of a recipient to be made in May at the meeting of the Senate's Universitywide Assembly. Faculty on any of UC's campuses may nominate a Senate member for the award by contacting their divisional Committee on Committees. The award's first recipients were Elliot Brownlee of UC Santa Barbara and Carlton Bovell of UC Riverside who jointly received the honor in 1998.

Oliver Johnson, a professor of philosophy, emeritus and longtime Senate activist at UC Riverside, made a substantial gift in 1996 to the systemwide Senate, the earnings from which are used to fund the award that bears his name. The Oliver Johnson Award provides a cash stipend to a faculty member who has "performed outstanding service to the Senate." Any UC Senate member may be nominated for the award, with the exception of faculty who have served during the last three years on the statewide Senate's Academic Council (which makes final decisions on award recipients.) Further information on the award may be obtained by contacting any divisional Committee on Committees.

EDUCATION ABROAD POSITIONS

UC's Education Abroad Program is seeking UC faculty to serve in three of its foreign study centers beginning in 2001. The program is also seeking a faculty member who can serve as its Associate Director of Academic Affairs.

Two-year UCEAP appointments, running from January 2001 through June 2003, will be made this year for EAP directorships in Costa Rica and Chile, while a one-semester directorship appointment will be made for Japan.

Tenured faculty, including emeriti and lecturers with security of employment, are eligible to apply for the positions. Applications may be obtained by contacting Edward Reynolds, Universitywide EAP Office, at reynolds@uoep.ucsb.edu. Applications are due by February 18, 2000.

Letters of application for the associate director position should be sent by February 1, 2000 to the Search Committee for Associate Director, Academic Affairs, care of John Marcum, EAP Universitywide Office, University of California, Santa Barbara CA 93106-1140.

UC in DC: New Director Is Named, New Center Is Coming

(Continued from Page 1)

he believes the new facility should become, among other things, “a center for intellectual life.” If a UC faculty member testifies before Congress, he says, why not host a seminar or an open house connected to the subject of the testimony? Members of the California congressional delegation could be invited to such events. Book signings for UC Press offerings could be held in the facility. Further, he says he intends to build “intellectual bridges” in the capital. UC scholars often take sabbaticals at one of the many think-tanks that exist in Washington. Why not take advantage of this and have UC students attend a faculty member’s seminar at a Brookings Institution or an American Enterprise Institute? Such activity could end up forging lasting links in the capital.

UC undergraduates have been going to Washington, D.C. for many years under the aegis of programs organized by individual campuses. (By the fall of 2000, all eight general UC campuses will have UC-DC programs in operation.) With the development of the University of California Center in Washington, D.C., the University’s operations in the capital will become more like the University’s operations in California: Campuses will keep their individual programs, but coordination among these programs will be increased in an effort to make the whole of the UC-DC operation greater than the sum of its parts. Berman, whose appointment is with the Office of the President, is the person responsible for seeing that this happens.

Recession Blocked Progress

The construction of a UC-owned center in the capital was a development that seemed ready to be put in place following President Gardner’s 1988 recommendation. What got in the way was the California recession of the early 1990s; the project was put on hold while the University struggled to keep its existing facilities open. In the intervening years, UC has run its academic operations in Washington out of space it rents in a building on M Street. The idea of a UC-owned structure was revived with the better economic times of the mid-1990s, however, and now construction is underway. The new building, located at Scott Circle, three blocks southeast of DuPont Circle, will cost about \$25 million, with \$14 million of this coming from “residential” funding that will be covered ultimately by the fees students pay to live in the center. When completed, the center

will have classrooms, offices, eight floors of residential space, two computer rooms, and an exercise facility.

The core of the UC-DC academic operation has always been its undergraduate program. Though UC does run an internship program in the summer months, during the academic year all UC undergraduates in the capital — 167 of them currently — participate in a three-part academic program: They go to an internship during the day; they enroll in a research seminar, the ultimate product of which is a research paper of about 30 pages in length; and they take an elective

A New Center in London

Washington, D.C. isn’t the only place that UC is expanding its presence. On October 20, a ribbon-cutting ceremony was held in London for the California House, a facility that is a joint project of UC and the California Trade and Commerce Agency. For UC, the facility will serve as the London headquarters for the University of California Press and for an expanded Education Abroad Program in Great Britain; in addition, it will function as an outreach center for the nearly 5,000 UC alumni living in Great Britain and other parts of Europe. The California Trade and Commerce Agency, which promotes the economic growth of the state, will use the facility as a new center of operations. California House is located at 8 St. James’s Place.

course, taught in the evening at UC’s existing facility by a UC faculty member. With the completion of all three program components, students get at least 12 quarter-units of credit, which means they can make normal progress toward their degrees while in Washington. How well does the program work?

“Yesterday I sat in on a meeting of the secretaries of education for the different states in Brazil,” says Pat Boyer, a psychology major at UC Santa Cruz whose internship is in the office of the U.S. Secretary of Education. A returning student who worked for many years in a local school district, Boyer will graduate in the spring from UC Santa Cruz with a degree in psychology. Her internship fits in with her long-term goal of working in educational psychology. The internship makes up only part of her working day in

Washington, however. After work she comes to UC’s facilities to attend her elective class — a course on representations of the Holocaust taught by UC Davis English Professor Michael Hoffman. On the weekends, she has taken part in UC-sponsored trips to such historical sites as Harpers Ferry, W.Va., and the Antietam battlefield in Maryland. Overall, she says, the experience has been just what she’d hoped for.

A fellow student of Boyer’s, UC Davis senior Yating Liang, seconds Boyer’s evaluation of the program, but cautions that “they work you hard, because they want you to get the most out of your program.” Liang is doing her internship with a nonpartisan foreign-policy institute called the Atlantic Council of the United States. She notes that she works at the Council from 9 to 5, then spends three hours in class at the UC center, after which she takes a city train back to her apartment in Virginia. This makes for a long day, but she says she would recommend the program to most students. (Berman notes that the time-burden Liang speaks of will be lessened when, in the new center, students will go by elevator from their classrooms to their living rooms.)

Campus-Based Programs

Education and research at the Center are mostly campus-based now and will continue to be when the new facility opens. Each campus has (or will soon have) its own “Washington Center,” meaning an administrative apparatus that operates both on the campus and in Washington. With a few exceptions, students come to Washington by applying through these centers, each of which has a faculty director who may be in residence in Washington or on campus. Students initially work through the centers to line up internships, though the universitywide office in Washington may get involved in this early on. The research seminar that a student takes will be taught by a Washington-based faculty member or teaching assistant from that student’s campus. The elective courses that students take, however, might be taught by faculty from any of UC’s campuses.

UC faculty generally come to UC’s Washington, D.C. center for a single academic term, with the campus programs “buying out” their faculty appointments during their absence. These faculty then teach undergraduate research seminars and elective courses while carrying out

(Please See: UC in Washington, Page 6)

Irvine Senate: Fewer Committees and Committee Members

(Continued from Page 1)

as a vice-chair. In addition, Binder thought, Irvine's Executive Committee was too large — and in some cases its members too distant from Senate work — to be effective. On this last point, Binder was moved to think about an Irvine reorganization because of a comparison he made. Serving as the Chair of the statewide Academic Senate in 1993-94, he had observed the workings of its executive committee, the Academic Council. Here was a model, it seemed to him, for a campus executive body: small in comparison to the UCI Executive Committee and populated solely with faculty who were very active in Senate work. The result, as far as Binder could see, was a group that made tough, reasoned decisions and stuck to them in the face of administrative opposition, often backing up the Council Chair.

With this in mind, Binder charged one Senate panel with looking at reorganization in the spring of 1997 and a second in the fall of that year. This latter group, a nine-member Restructuring Committee chaired by Irvine linguistics and philosophy Professor Robert May, designed the UCI reorganization.

Imbalance in Committee Agendas

The committee did a good deal of fact-finding in carrying out its charge, looking not only at the UCI Senate Division, but at other divisions across the system and at faculty governance structures at UC's "comparison-eight" institutions. One of the things that May's group learned was that, in a three-year time period it reviewed, some UCI committees made formal comments on more than 100 issues each, while others commented on anywhere from zero to eight issues. Not surprisingly, May notes, "cutting back on committees was very popular" among those who commented on the reorganization plan. Nevertheless, experienced committee chairs were passionate about the *issues* with which their committees dealt, wanting to see attention to them preserved in any new structure. May's group took the position that it was not out to eliminate any Senate tasks; it merely wanted to distribute those tasks differently.

In the end, what the Irvine Senate agreed to was a structure with four types of Senate bodies: action committees, governance committees, advisory panels, and councils. Action committees, such as Courses or Undergraduate Admissions, deal largely with specific issues under the

direct control of the faculty; governance committees, such as Privilege & Tenure, deal with issues internal to the faculty; and advisory panels, such as Scholarly Honors and Awards, provide faculty guidance on various issues.

This leaves the Senate Councils of which there are six: Academic Personnel; Educational Policy; Graduate; Planning and Budget; Research, Computing and Library Resources; and Rights, Responsibilities and Welfare. The Councils are distinguished from the other three types of Senate panels in that their members are elected by the division for three-year terms, while members of the other panels are appointed by the Committee on Committees for two-year terms. Beyond this, it is representatives from the Councils who, along with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the division, make up the UCI Senate Cabinet. With this change, UCI went from having a 37-member Executive Committee to an eight-member Cabinet (the six council chairs plus the chair and vice chair of the division). Whereas the Executive Committee met sporadically and had a good number of representatives who were unlikely to be deeply involved in Senate work, the Cabinet meets every two weeks and is composed entirely of faculty who have high levels of Senate responsibility. In its new configuration, the cabinet has been given the authority, in exceptional circumstances, to make decisions in lieu of the UCI Assembly on a range of action issues, though it does not have the authority to change divisional Bylaws.

Apart from this executive reconfiguration, many of Irvine's councils — along with its other committees — had their duties redefined and their names changed under the reorganization. The Council on Rights, Responsibilities and Welfare took on the work previously given to UCI's Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, Affirmative Action and Emeritae/i committees, for example, while a Council on Research, Computing and Library Resources assumed the work formerly given to separate Research, Computer Policy, and Library committees. A new Council on Planning and Budget has assumed the responsibilities of both the old Planning and Budget and Land Use and Environment Committees. In all, UCI went from having 27 standing committees with 190 members to having 17 committees with 150 members. The number of committees was reduced more sharply

than the number of committee members because some continuing committees had members added to them, either as a means of coping with an expanded workload, or in recognition of a workload that had been too high in the past. UCI's Committee on Educational Policy was judged to be in need of a doubling of its number of voting members even though its responsibilities didn't change that much under the reorganization.

The modifications in the Irvine Senate have also included a revamping of the membership in the division's Assembly. Before last year, UCI had a 111-member Representative Assembly, whereas with the reorganization, it has a 61-member Divisional Senate Assembly. The old Assembly was made up almost entirely of representatives from the "faculties" of Irvine's schools. By contrast, voting members in the new Assembly include all the chairs of both UCI's councils and its action committees. The representation from the school faculties, meanwhile, has been drastically reduced. With these two changes, the Assembly has moved in the same direction as UCI cabinet: it is a body that not only is smaller than its predecessor, but that, in theory at least, is better informed as well, as a higher proportion of its members are faculty with extensive Senate experience and responsibilities.

Why the Assembly Change?

The rationale for this Assembly change, Restructuring Committee Chair May notes, was that Irvine "wanted to have a higher level of debate within the Assembly. Under the old system, it was apparent that people who attended were not well-prepared when they came to the meetings." A survey of several Senate divisions conducted by the statewide Academic Senate found that the nature of Assembly meetings is perceived as a real problem by Senate faculty. Assembly meetings are often the first exposure that faculty have to the Senate on a campus; younger faculty who attend the meetings report being turned off to the prospect of Senate work by what they perceive as a lack of informed discussion at the meetings accompanied by an over-emphasis on procedural detail.

So how have the UCI Senate changes worked out? May says it is too early to tell about many aspects of the reorganization, but one component of it has, in his view, been an obvious success. That is the change to the eight-member cabinet. "The old

(Continued on next page)

UCI Senate Change

(Continued from previous page)

Executive Committee might have gone for an extended period between meetings," he says, and attendance at it was unpredictable owing to its large size. With the Cabinet, he says, UCI has acquired the nimble, well-informed body that former divisional Chair Binder had in mind. May notes, however, that the Cabinet structure has not yet been put to the test in the manner envisioned for it — and may not be in the near future. "We've undergone a change here to an administration [under Chancellor Ralph Cicerone] that is much more respectful of the Senate" than its predecessor, May says. "Also, we're in a period of growth," which tends to make more resources available. The value of the Cabinet structure, he says, should become most apparent when conditions are not so favorable, particularly when the Cabinet "needs to be a ballast" against administrations that are less interested in listening to the Senate.

May believes that the reduction in the number of UCI Senate committees has probably worked well, though this is a little less clear. "We had so many committees dealing with small things before," he says. "If we're going to take shared governance seriously, we can't ask people who are very busy to give time if they think that time is going to be wasted." May argues that folding the work of several smaller committees into the portfolio of a single larger committee stands to increase, rather than decrease, the attention given to issues once dealt with by the smaller groups. Under this view, the attention the Senate gives to libraries or research or computing policy ought to increase under the new system.

Not everyone is confident this is the case, however. John King, a UCI faculty member with a long history of involvement in library and other Senate issues, says that, in a consolidation such as this one, "instances in which the Senate is overlooking an area will not be obvious." If a stand-alone Library Committee did nothing, that fact would be apparent from the committee's annual reports and the like. If UCI's Council on Research, Computing and Library Resources did little about libraries, conversely, this would be much less apparent because the committee might be kept quite busy dealing with its other issues. "It's too early to tell, but I'm not sanguine about this," King says.

Barbara Doshier is the current Chair

Notes from the Chair: Faculty & Staff

The budget travails of the early 1990s created a large number of stresses and strains on the University and its people. In protecting the core academic mission, hard decisions were made and campuses were forced to withdraw support from important areas. Departments functioned during this period only because faculty and staff put their collective shoulders to the wheel and pushed. As the budget situation improved in the years that followed, many areas of importance to the faculty were restored. There remains, however, the perception, and perhaps the reality, that staffing levels, particularly in the departments, never recovered from UC's bad budget years and the early retirements that came with them. Certainly an all-important collaboration — that between faculty and staff — was weakened by the troubles of the early 1990s; a case can be made that this collaboration is in need of its own recovery. All the signs indicate a decade of incredible growth ahead for UC; such growth makes it imperative that we strengthen our faculty-staff collaboration.

The Senate's Academic Council and the staff's Council of University of California Staff Assemblies (CUCSA) took a first step toward this goal when, last year, they charged their vice chairs to lead a task force whose responsibility was to identify campus best practices, training opportunities, and resources for resolving faculty-staff conflicts. As vice chair of the Council last year, I co-chaired this group along with Kathryn Day-Huh, who was then the CUCSA vice chair. Our panel, made up of faculty and staff from each of the campuses, took to its task with enthusiasm and soon found common ground on many points. There was, for example, broad agreement among us that UC seems to have experienced an increase in incivility in recent years, one that has damaged campus cultures and important working relationships. We also found that many faculty and staff do not understand or appreciate each other's work lives or roles.

Our campuses have taken this issue seriously; we found many examples of effective programs aimed at improving the faculty-staff working environment and providing informal ways of resolving difficulties. However, we also found that many of these programs were unknown to large segments of the campuses and that simply locating information about them on campus web sites can be a challenge.

One outcome of our discussions was the creation of a Partnership Statement, similar to the Statements of Community adopted by many of our campuses. The statement has now been endorsed by the Academic Council, CUCSA and President Atkinson. It reads:

The greatness of the University of California follows from the excellence of its people — its faculty, staff and students; however, a mere collection of outstanding individuals will not advance the University. Our ability to excel in our missions depends on collaborations and collegial environments. A collegial atmosphere can only come about through strong partnerships based on mutual trust and respect. Therefore, in support of the University's missions, the faculty and staff of the University of California affirm their responsibility and commitment to creating and fostering a cooperative and professional working environment.

The Task Force members learned much from each other. As is often the case when human experience is being examined, it was the process — of communicating with one another — rather than the product of reports and statements that was most valuable. Given this, the state of faculty-staff relations would be greatly improved if each campus engaged in a similar activity. I encourage campus Senate members to get together with representatives of their campus Staff Association and engage in an open discussion of this issue. My hope is that each campus might create its own Partnership Statement. The complete Task Force report can be viewed on the web at: www.ucop.edu/senate/reports.html and will soon be transmitted to the campuses.

—Lawrence B. Coleman, Chair
Academic Council

(Please See: Irvine, Page 6)

UC in Washington

(Continued from Page 3)

their own research in Washington. Each campus program also has at least one teaching assistant in residence in Washington and from two-to-five graduate students are at the center courtesy of doctoral fellowships funded by UC's IGCC. In addition, some graduate students are given space at the center to complete doctoral research.

Berman says one of his goals is to broaden the disciplines from which the center draws its students. There is a presumption among many students that only political science majors would benefit from spending a term in Washington, D.C., but an art or anthropology major, Berman notes, could be doing work at the Smithsonian, while science students with an interest in public policy could be at the National Institutes of Health. Apart from this, Berman is also interested in establishing a national advisory board for the center and is investigating possibilities for extramural support of the center's activities. When the center is completed, there will be an alumni speaker series. All in all it's a busy time for UC's main East Coast outpost.

Notice

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

Lawrence B. Coleman, Chair
UCOP, 12th Floor, 1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94607-5200

David Krogh, Editor
(510) 987-0162
david.krogh@ucop.edu

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

Irvine Senate Change

(Continued from Page 5)

of the UCI Senate, and the first UCI Senate leader to have gone through the process of succeeding from Vice Chair to Chair. She agrees with May that the new UCI Cabinet is a clear improvement over the old Executive Committee. The Cabinet, she says, has become "much more of an advisory group" that can assist the Chair in the mode that Arnold Binder envisioned. The new committee structure, with its adjusted workloads, has been "better for the morale of the participants," she says, though she notes that some of the committees left untouched by the reorganization, such as the Committee on Academic Personnel, are still "working too hard." Doshier has some concern that the new Assembly makeup, with its smaller number of participants, will mean that Assembly members are interacting with fewer faculty, with a concomitant loss of information about Senate activities being distributed throughout the faculty.

The "internship" that divisional Vice Chairs now undertake before becoming Chairs is helpful, Doshier says, though she notes that the division may at some point want to revisit the idea of chairs once again serving two-years terms of office, rather than the single-year term that has been adopted. With a one-year term of office, she notes, it will be difficult for chairs to move their own agenda items through from start to finish. She acknowledges, however, that a two-year commitment is a lot to ask.

And what does the person who started the reorganization think of its outcome so far? Arnold Binder began a stint as Interim Dean of UCI's School of Social Ecology after he finished his term as Irvine Senate Chair. As a result, he hasn't been able to observe the workings of the new structure in a personal way. But, from a distance, he says, the new structure "seems to be very effective."

Senate Publications

(Continued from Page 1)

existent at Los Angeles, but this is changing under the Senate's communications plan. All active Senate faculty should now be receiving each issue of *Notice* via campus mail. (Any Senate faculty member who is not receiving *Notice* by mail should contact *Notice* editor David Krogh at david.krogh@ucop.edu.)

The twice-yearly chair's e-mail letters to all faculty will be an informal communication aimed at bringing faculty up to date on issues confronting the Senate and the University as a whole.

The *Statewide Senate Report* will be an electronic newsletter, written by the chair of the statewide Senate and sent to all faculty serving on statewide Senate committees in the current year, as well as those faculty who served the statewide Senate in the previous year. All current and recent members of the Universitywide Assembly will likewise be receiving the publication. Faculty who do not fall into any of these groups, but who would like to receive the *Statewide Senate Report*, may subscribe by sending an e-mail to: subscribe@ucop.edu. (No message is required in the body of these e-mails.) The *Statewide Senate Report* will provide updates on University issues to an audience assumed to have some familiarity with the Senate and the issues confronting it.

The Senate's new website will have not only more information, but will provide a means for rank-and-file faculty to present their views to the leadership of the statewide Senate. In essence, the new site is aimed at becoming a center of information and communications for the statewide Senate as a whole and for the committees that are its working units.

The statewide Senate's new communications plan and its attachments can be viewed on the web at: www.ucop.edu/senate/commun.html.