

SP-1 Seen as Having Different Impacts on Professional Schools, Academic Programs

What effect has the elimination of affirmative action in admissions had on the enrollment of minority students in UC's graduate and professional programs? A statistical report issued last month by the Office of the President yielded a split picture. In general, UC's highly selective professional schools, with their rigid standardized test and GPA requirements, have witnessed substantial drops in minority enrollments, though for UC's medical schools the major change came not last fall, but in the fall of 1996. Conversely, it is difficult to discern any effect of the end of affirmative action on UC's graduate academic programs.

The UC Regents ban on the use of race or gender considerations in admissions, set forth in their resolution SP-1, took effect for the graduate and professional students who entered UC this past fall, a prohibition that was reinforced in August by a court ruling that upheld California's Proposition 209. Thus, affirmative action programs that were in effect for students who entered in fall 1996 or earlier were eliminated for students who entered in 1997. The UCOP report compares the 1997 figures on application, admission, and enrollment with those of several preceding years as a means of discerning the effect of the affirmative action ban. Of the students seeking graduate degrees who entered UC in 1997, about 76 percent (7,040) were enrolled in graduate academic programs, while 2,251 students enrolled in professional school programs in law, medicine, and business.

Effect on Law Schools

In UC's three law schools (at Berkeley, Davis, and Los Angeles), the number of black first-year students dropped by 63 percent in 1997 (from 43 black students in 1996 to 16 this past fall), while the number of Latino students declined by 34 percent (from 89 to 59). This occurred as the schools enrolled 14 percent more students in their first-year

(Please See: SP-1, Page 3)

Governor's Support Means That Tenth Campus Has Only One Obstacle in Its Way

When California Gov. Pete Wilson unveiled his 1998-99 state budget last month he took the penultimate step toward creating a tenth campus of the University of California. The governor proposed to increase state funding for the campus to \$10 million per year over the next several years, a figure that UC budget officials have said is sufficient to take care of the planning and operational expenses for the campus until such time as it welcomes its first students in the fall of 2005.

The governor's action leaves but one hurdle in the path of a tenth campus: The formidable barrier of capital funding, meaning money for its buildings and roads. At present, it is not clear how the state will come up with the \$400 million that UC has estimated the campus will need in capital funding by 2010. Currently, the state provides only \$150 million per year in capital funding for the entire University, and the governor has proposed a bond measure

that would essentially keep the University at this level of funding for the foreseeable future. Several legislators have proposed alternative bond measures that would increase UC's capital funding budget to \$250 million per year, a figure that would cover the tenth campus and more, but it's unclear what the chances are for this or any other capital funding plan.

Despite this major question mark, the University is proceeding as if the money will be there for the tenth-campus buildings when the time comes. It is proceeding, in other words, full-speed ahead on a campus in California's Central Valley that it has named UC Merced.

UCM got its first academic planning document last November from an 11-member academic committee. Following on this, an academic "transition plan" is now being devised that provides a road-map for the programmatic development

(Please See: Tenth, Page 4)

Faculty Would Get 4.5 Percent Salary Increase Governor's Budget Proposes Increases in Engineering, Computer Science Enrollments

The 1998-99 University of California budget that California Gov. Pete Wilson unveiled in January contained proposals for an increase in faculty salaries and an unusual recommendation to fund enrollment increases in two related academic areas, engineering and computer science. The governor proposed, however, to pay for the enrollment increases with money saved by eliminating a K-12 teacher-training program administered by UC.

Wilson recommended boosting UC faculty salaries next year by 4.5 percent plus merit increases, with the salary-scale increases becoming effective on October 1, 1998, rather than being delayed until November as they were

this year.

One of the most notable aspects of the budget proposal was its recommendation that the state provide UC with an additional \$6 million next year as the first installment in a program aimed at boosting undergraduate enrollments in computer science and engineering. The governor proposed that these enrollments be increased by 40 percent, meaning 800 additional students per year, over the next eight years.

The idea for increasing the enrollments came originally from high-tech business leaders in California, who complained to Wilson that the University is not turning out nearly enough computer scientists and engineers to meet the state's needs. Wilson thus asked UC to prepare a proposal on the issue, which it did through President Atkinson's Advisory Council on Engineering. UC's recommendation for

Inside Notice: UCRP Valuation; Assembly Meeting

(Please See: Governor's Page 6)

Changes in 403(b) Contribution Limits, Survivor Regulations

UCRP Healthy, But When Will Employees Contribute to It Again?

The UC retirement system is healthy, but down the road UC and its employees will once again have to start contributing to it in order to keep it that way. After hearing this report, the Regents went on to approve several changes in the voluntary retirement savings programs the University administers.

The Regents were told that the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP), in surplus since 1987, had its surplus grow over the past year, thanks to a 25.8 percent return on the market value of the plan's assets in 1996-97. On July 1, 1996, the market value of the assets stood at \$23.7 billion but by July 1, 1997 it had grown to \$29.1 billion. The plan's actuarial value of assets exceeded its accrued liability by some \$3.59 billion by last July.

Despite these numbers, one of the subjects before the Regents was the date by which UC and its employees will have to resume making contributions to UCRP. It has been so long since such contributions have been required that it may be easy to forget that the plan has only three sources of funding: Employer contributions, employee contributions, and the investment earnings on the plan's assets. Employer and employee contributions were suspended in November of 1990, given the surplus funding that the plan had accrued by that time. Beginning then, employee contributions were "redirected" into the employees' own defined-contribution plan (DCP) accounts. The change amounted to a boost in employee compensation, since employees now get pension accumulations in UCRP plus money accumulating in their DCP accounts.

In the intervening years, the plan has continued to take on liability in the form of added years of worker service, but the stellar increase in investment earnings during this period has allowed UCRP to retain its surplus funding through investment performance alone.

All parties are agreed that the plan cannot be funded in this way in perpetuity. The question has been when employer and employee contributions will once again be required. Wayne Kennedy, UC's senior vice-president for business and finance, told the Regents that a group is now being brought together that will seek to provide

answers to this question.

In other retirement news, the Regents approved a UCOP recommendation that will allow the spouses of deceased UC employees to leave the 403(b) accumulations of those employees in UC's 403(b) plan indefinitely. Previously, surviving spouses had nine months to move the accumulations out of the plan through any of several means. A plan participant must have died on or after January 1, 1998 for his or her spouse to take advantage of the change.

In another action, the Regents approved a recommendation that will remove a restriction on the maximum amount that UC employees can

contribute to UC's Defined-Contribution Plan After-Tax Account. Previously, this plan allowed participants to contribute the lesser of either 10 percent of gross University salary or the limits prescribed in Internal Revenue Code Section 415 — the lesser of \$30,000 or 25 percent of the participant's compensation. As of last month, only the latter limit will apply to UC employees.

Finally, the maximum annual contribution that many UC employees have been able to make to UC's tax-deferred 403(b) plan has been \$9,500. As a result of 1998 cost-of-living adjustments, that maximum has now been raised to \$10,000.

Letters to Notice

Respecting The Law on Affirmative Action

To the Editor:

Professor M.J. Glennon, a law professor at UC Davis, in the November, 1997 issue of *Notice* questions the statement from the UC Affirmative Action and Diversity Committee which appeared as a letter in the June, 1997, issue. Professor Glennon professes ignorance of "certain unidentified 'federal guidelines'" and thinks us disrespectful of the law because we advised the university community that faculty hiring practices are still to be guided by affirmative action plans.

Federal regulations, with which the University of California as a federal contractor must remain in compliance, do indeed still require an affirmative action program for faculty hiring. Both SP-2 and Proposition 209 specifically recognize this. As SP-2 says, "Nothing in Section 1 shall prohibit any action which is strictly necessary to establish or maintain eligibility for any federal or state program, where ineligibility would result in a loss of federal or state funds to the University." 41 Code of Federal Regulations, Chapter 60, Section 2 requires a program for the hiring of women and minorities which must include 1) identifying areas of underutilization; 2) establishing

placement goals (not quotas) based on the areas identified and timetables for meeting the goals; 3) collecting employment data and identifying problem areas; 4) developing strategies to resolve problems. Thus our campuses should still be compiling and carrying out Affirmative Action Plans with respect to faculty hiring.

We would also like to cite President Richard Atkinson's Nov. 6, 1996, response to the passage of Proposition 209. He said, in his fifth point, that "the University continues to seek a diverse pool of applicants for jobs and contracts, consistent with Federal law, the Regents' resolution on hiring and contracting, and Proposition 209."

The question is, indeed, whether the faculty and the administration of the University will respect the law. Until Federal law changes, we still have the obligation and the means to "best fulfill our responsibilities as a public university in the nation's most ethnically and culturally diverse state," again quoting from President Atkinson's Nov. 6, 1996, letter to the University community.

—Karen Leonard, 1996-97 Chair
Aida Hurtado, 1997-98 Chair,
University Committee on
Affirmative Action and Diversity

SP-1: Affecting Professional Schools, But Not Academic Programs

(Continued from Page 1)

classes; Asian-American enrollments grew by 32 percent and white enrollments by 27 percent.

Interpretations of the Change

The statistics compiled by UCOP may shed some light on the means by which this occurred. Applications to UC's law schools have been dropping for several years. Between 1996 and 1997, they dropped by about 13 percent. In this same interval, however, black applications to UC's law schools dropped by about 31 percent and Latino applications by about 28 percent. Several interpretations of this change are possible. One — sometimes voiced by those who oppose affirmative action — is that those minority students who were not competitive without affirmative action in place believed themselves less likely to be admitted to schools like Berkeley, Davis and UCLA and hence applied in lesser numbers to them. Another explanation — sometimes voiced by those who support affirmative action — is that the drop-off in applications can be explained in part by the “chilly climate” effect, meaning that with UC's ban on affirmative action in admissions, minority students felt less welcome at UC.

It is in admissions decisions — as opposed to applications sent in — that the direct effects of an affirmative action ban should be apparent and this seems to be the case with law schools. Black applications to UC's law schools may have been down by 31 percent last year, but black *admissions* to them were down by about 72 percent, while for Latinos there was a 28 percent drop in applications and a 35 percent drop in admissions.

The third step in the enrollment process then involves a selection made by students: Who among those granted admission actually decides to come? Here it is hard to see any effect of the Regents' action. In 1995 — measuring, in this case, students who made a decision before the Regents' vote — about 24 percent of those black students who were offered admission to one of UC's law schools actually enrolled; for 1997 that figure was about 27 percent. For Latinos, the 1995 “take rate” was about 36 percent, while for 1997 it was about 35 percent.

Business School MBA Programs

UC's five business schools increased

their MBA enrollment by about 2 percent from fall 1996 to fall 1997. During this period, Latino new-student enrollment dropped by 54 percent (from 54 to 25 students) and black enrollment by 26 percent (from 27 to 20 students). Meanwhile, white enrollment increased by 5 percent (from 373 to 390 students) and Asian enrollment increased by 9 percent (from 140 to 153 students).

Medical Schools

UC's five medical schools have held their first-year classes constant for many years, with 569 students enrolled each year. The enrollment of all underrepresented students dropped by 3 percent from 1996 to 1997, but this decline is far less steep than that experienced between 1995 and 1996, when minority enrollments decreased by 24 percent. Black first-year enrollments edged up by 4 percent in 1997, from 26 to 27 students, while Mexican-American/Chicano enrollments declined by 5 percent, from 41 to 39 students. By comparison, between 1995 and 1996, black enrollments dropped by 28 percent and Mexican-American/Chicano enrollments by 24 percent. Why did such a big change in minority enrollments at UC's medical schools come a year before the enforcement of the ban on affirmative action?

“We had already adjusted for this [change in policies] taking place,” says Michael Drake, the associate dean for admissions at the UC San Francisco School of Medicine. “By this year, there were very few changes to be made.” Drake says he began seeing a shift in the attitudes of his admissions committee members with respect to affirmative action as early as the fall 1995 admissions cycle. The big drop for the campus in minority enrollment, however, came between 1995 and 1996, when minority registrants dropped by 31 percent; by contrast enrollments among these students dropped by only 10 percent this past year. Drake says that though the admissions process formally allowed consideration of race up through 1996, UCSF — and, he suspects, other UC campuses — had, in effect, largely discounted race as a factor by that year, in response to the public controversy over the issue.

Aggregated figures for medical school enrollments across the UC system mask significant differences by campus.

For example, the number of underrepresented minority students enrolled at the UC San Diego School of Medicine went from 13 to 12 to 2 over the past three years, but at UC Davis the progression was 7 to 2 to 11.

Another notable fact about medical school enrollments is that while admissions of all underrepresented minority students dropped by 23 percent between 1996 and 1997, enrollments of these students dropped by only 3 percent in the same period. This occurred because UC increased its take-rate of these students: From 38 percent of admits last year to 48 percent of admits this year.

Graduate Academic Programs

New enrollment in UC's graduate academic programs increased by 1 percent from fall 1996 to fall 1997. The number of black students enrolled increased by 2 percent during this period (from 213 to 218) while Asian, Latino, and white enrollments all declined — by 9 percent, 9 percent and 2 percent, respectively, with the Latino numbers dropping from 508 to 464. The increase in the number of UC's graduate students can largely be accounted for by a growth in the number of new international students, whose numbers increased by 15 percent from a year earlier. In counting graduate students by ethnic group, one confounding factor is that a growing number of them decline to state their race (491 this year, up from 393 in 1996).

The number of U.S. students applying to UC graduate programs declined by about 4 percent between 1995 and 1997. By race, about 6 percent fewer whites applied in 1997 than in 1995, 2 percent fewer Asians and 8 percent fewer blacks. Black applications increased by 1 percent, however, between 1996 and 1997. Latino applications held steady from 1995 to 1996 and increased by 2 percent between 1996 and 1997.

Looking at admissions data, no clear pattern emerges by race between 1995 and 1997. Over these three years, the number of black students admitted was 424, 366, and 381, while for Latino students, the figures were 873, 923, and 895.

A version of the UCOP report on graduate and professional admissions is available on the world wide web at: <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/datamgmt/graddata>

Tenth Campus: Rationale Is That The Valley is 'Underserved'

(Continued from Page 1)

of the campus. Physical planning is going forward as well, as UCOP administrators now are involved in conceptual discussions with officials from the City and County of Merced and with representatives of two trusts, one of which is donating land for the campus proper, and the other of which holds a large adjacent parcel of land that is likely to be developed in connection with the campus. Meanwhile, UC's Academic Senate has the task in front of it of defining what role it should play in shaping the new campus (see story at right).

For most faculty and administrators, the primary question that tenth-campus planning has raised is: Will the funding for it come at the expense of the existing campuses? For as long as the University has been considering adding a tenth campus, UC officials have stated unequivocally that it will only be built so long as the state continues to fund the existing campuses at a level that will maintain their quality. This is, however, a matter that is beyond the University's control to a certain degree. If a governor proposes not to fund, say, enrollment increases on the existing campuses at their past levels, but recommends full funding for the tenth campus, it is not clear that the new campus funding has *caused* the existing campus reductions and, even if this were explicit, what recourse would the University have? Against this, long-time observers of the University have noted that concerns about existing campuses being harmed have been voiced every time the University has expanded, but that, after the expansions have taken place, all the campuses of the University have fared reasonably well.

Why Build a Tenth Campus?

Why is the University building a 10th campus? In the late 1980s, when UC first put forth the idea of adding not one, but three new campuses, the driving force behind the proposal was to take care of excess enrollment demand. This reasoning remains part of the rationale for UC Merced, but it is no longer the chief motivating force for it.

Enrollment projections are subject to uncertainty and change, but UC's best current estimate is that by 2005 it will be enrolling about 162,000 full-time-equivalent students. By contrast, the capacity of all UC's existing campuses then is expected to be something in excess of 181,000. A large cohort of students

will come of college age in the five years after 2005, such that by 2010, according to state Department of Finance projections, UC could expect to have an enrollment demand of about 201,000 students — some 20,000 students in excess of the capacity of the existing campuses. Plans call for UCM to open in the fall of 2005 with a contingent of 1,000 students and to grow to 5,000 students by 2010, in theory taking care of about a quarter of the excess demand for a UC

Senate Defining Its Role in Shaping UCM

What role should UC's Academic Senate play in the development of a new UC campus? Given the increasing likelihood that UC will be building a campus in California's San Joaquin Valley, UC's statewide Academic Senate is formulating a position on this issue, with important discussions of the question scheduled for this month's meetings of the Academic Council and Universitywide Assembly.

In order to define its role, the Senate is looking into history as well as current circumstances. John Douglass, a policy analyst with the Academic Council, has researched the last round of UC campus building — in the late 1950s and early 1960s in connection with Santa Cruz, Irvine, and San Diego — and has prepared a briefing paper for the Council on the subject.

The UC Senate's previous organizational approach, Douglass says, was to establish a committee for each new campus, with each committee having on it representatives from all the existing Senate divisions. Chancellors for the campuses were hired prior to the completion of campus site selection, a sequence of events that allowed them to oversee the earliest stages of campus academic planning.

Once the chancellors were selected, the Senate committees carried out three primary tasks, Douglass says. First, they helped review the academic plans that were drawn up by the chancellors and founding faculty. Second, they reviewed all the initial faculty appointments proposed for the campuses. And third, they devised plans for the formation of the Academic Senate divisions on each campus. More generally, they were responsible for involving the Senate at a working level in the development of the new campuses by, for example, creating links with existing academic programs.

education in that year. In the longer run, however, UCM stands to be proportionately more important in this respect, since, along with Riverside, it is likely to be the only campus capable of further growth.

UCM, then, will not solve UC's projected enrollment problem, but over time the University abandoned the idea that it would deal with enrollment by building new campuses. With this change, the argument for a tenth campus became an argument for a tenth campus in a specific region — the San Joaquin Valley. Today, the primary rationale for UC Merced is that the Valley is "underserved" by the University of California. As the academic planning document for UC Merced puts it, "The San Joaquin Valley is the only California region of substantial population growth and statewide economic significance that is not directly benefited by the location of a University of California campus."

This lack of a UC campus in the Central Valley may have an effect on the proportion of Valley students who attend UC. In 1995, about 7.6 percent of all recent California high school graduates went on to attend the University of California, but only about 3.1 percent of Central Valley students enrolled at UC. Does the existence of a UC campus in the Valley stand to make a difference in this situation? Perhaps. The Office of the President has concluded that both eligibility and participation rates for UC are significantly higher than statewide averages in regions that surround UC campuses.

Beyond this, there are collateral benefits to a campus: Local employment, an educational infrastructure (libraries, museums) and, most important, the regional economic development that can go hand-in-hand with a research institution. As a practical matter, all these factors have served as an underpinning for the most important motivating force behind a tenth campus, which is political support for it in Sacramento.

What Kind of Campus?

UC Merced will be built on 2,000 acres of rolling pasture land located about five miles north of the city of Merced, which in turn is about an hour's drive north of Fresno. The campus borders have yet to be exactly defined, as they are being carved out of a 2,500 acre parcel of land, owned by the Virginia Smith Trust of Merced, that the University has an option to select acreage

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

from. In 1995, the UC Regents selected the Merced site from among some 85 Central Valley sites that were originally in the running.

Academic Plan Submitted

Though it's too early to say what kind of academic structure the campus will have, a detailed academic proposal for it has been put forward by a UCOP panel called the Tenth Campus Academic Planning Committee, formed in the fall of 1996 under the leadership of Daniel Simmons, now a professor of law at UC Davis but at the time an administrator in the Office of the President. The central premise of the Simmons committee was that the quality of UC campuses — including their educational quality — hinges on their research prowess. Given this, the panel believed that the primary challenge for UC Merced is how to achieve research stature as quickly as possible. The answer the committee devised was to attract quality faculty by organizing the founding faculty around a set of cross-disciplinary research interests that are rooted in what is special about California's Central Valley. The committee points out that the Valley is rich in ethnic diversity, is in close proximity to an array of diverse ecosystems, and is the most productive agricultural area in the nation, to name just a few of its special characteristics.

In and of themselves, these characteristics might serve to attract individual faculty, but to achieve a critical mass of faculty quickly in several research areas, the committee recommended an unusual recruiting plan for UCM.

The campus would be divided into three large "divisions," that would be akin to conventional schools: One in Social Science and Public Policy, another in Science and Technology, and a third in Arts and Cultures. The founding faculty for these divisions would then be recruited on the basis of cross-disciplinary Valley-related research interests. For example, the Division of Social Science and Public Policy might recruit economists, urban planners, and public-policy experts whose research interest is environmental management in the context of urban/rural conflicts. Divisions might be subdivided into some combination of traditional and non-traditional departments, but the recruiting principle would be to pick faculty by cross-disciplinary research clusters.

Notes from the Chair: Graduate Education

Does the University concentrate too much on graduate education, to the detriment of its undergraduate curriculum? This sentiment, which for years has had some support among policy makers and the public, is now being linked to undergraduate enrollment pressures that will be generated by the surge of entering freshmen expected in the next millennium. These pressures could buffet the UC in directions that will not serve society well.

The privately funded California Citizen's Commission on Higher Education is advancing the graduate-versus-undergraduate theme in a set of recommendations it is preparing to make to state government and other parties regarding state support for higher education. While acknowledging the importance of graduate education and research at the University, the Commission has thus far expressed sympathy for a new approach to state funding, one that would disaggregate costs for undergraduate education, graduate education, and research. This would allow state appropriations to reflect more clearly the actual expenditures for each activity; more importantly, it would make possible separate funding for them.

The University currently receives funding for each full-time-equivalent student, regardless of undergraduate or graduate status. The Commission estimates that the state's appropriation for undergraduates would be about \$3,700 per FTE, in contrast to \$10,464 per graduate student. By "unbundling" these costs, the Commission believes the state would increase its ability to target funding for teaching, especially for undergraduates. In addition, the Commission proposes that UC share more responsibility for costs by increasing its productivity — by doing "more and better with fewer resources."

In the worst case scenario, the Commission's proposed approach to funding could leave the University without state support for the costs of graduate education and research or could dramatically reduce support for graduate education, depending upon judgments made by the legislature and Governor regarding the state's shrinking pool of discretionary funds.

The recommendations of the Citizen's Commission come at a time when there is a critical need for state-funded graduate support. UC's graduate academic and professional programs will yield society's next generation of leaders. Over the last 10 years, the costs of graduate student support have been shouldered increasingly by the students themselves. Cost-of-living expenses have not been matched by stipend or fellowship increases and RA and TA opportunities have dwindled. Faculty share this burden as we spread our research and training grant monies to help support all levels of education.

More fundamentally, the idea that UC has overemphasized graduate education is simply not supported by the facts. Recent analyses by the Office of the President show that the average proportion of graduate students on our general campuses is 18 percent. Proportions are higher at UCB (27 percent) and UCLA (24.6 percent), but on our other campuses graduate student proportions range from 10 to 14 percent. And the data highlight a few troubling comparisons. The public research Universities (e.g. Michigan) average 30 percent graduate enrollment and the privates (e.g. Stanford, Harvard) average 52.8 percent. Meanwhile, the average graduate enrollment at the California State University is 11.3 percent, with many of its campuses being above our own in percent of graduate enrollments. In 1960, 29.4 percent of our students were enrolled at the graduate level, meaning our graduate proportion has declined by more than 11 percentage points since that time. Given this, it's hard to escape the conclusion that we have moved substantially toward targeting the needs of undergraduates in the intervening years.

Undergraduate education is a valued part of what we do but it can't be the force that drives our University. Perhaps we should be asking whether we are committing *enough* resources to our graduate mission. Are we adequately fulfilling our responsibility to advance society's knowledge base and prepare its leaders? Or, when the next generation of faculty looks back, will they see that our commitment to graduate education has diminished even more?

—Sandra J. Weiss,
Chair, Academic Council

Universitywide Assembly Meets on Feb. 24 Governor's Budget

Admissions, plans for a tenth UC campus, and the structure and functioning of the Senate's Universitywide Assembly will be the major topics on the agenda when the Assembly meets on Tuesday, February 24 at UC Irvine. The meeting, the second of three that will be held this year, will begin at 10 a.m. and will run until 4 p.m., one hour longer than usual. President Atkinson is expected to address the Assembly soon after it convenes.

Sandra Weiss, chair of the Assembly, said she has put admissions and the tenth campus on the agenda because the Senate soon may be called on to make decisions regarding both issues.

In admissions, the Senate has responsibility to set eligibility standards for entering undergraduates. The Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) currently is trying to ensure that the eligibility standards are set such that UC admits the proportion of California high school graduates called for by the state's Master Plan for Higher Education. Beyond this issue, BOARS is reviewing several proposals that seek to fundamentally reshape UC admissions by, for example, requiring that a fixed

percentage of the graduating class in each California public high school automatically be eligible for UC. Weiss said she has asked BOARS Chair Keith Widaman of UC Riverside to brief the Assembly on these issues and to solicit the views of Assembly members on them.

The tenth campus currently is the subject of much Senate activity because planning for the campus has progressed enough that the Senate needs to begin actively shaping it. (See story, page 4.)

The third major item on the Assembly's agenda is a discussion of the structure and responsibilities of the Assembly itself. The statewide Senate currently is involved in a major analysis of its organization and operations. As part of this analysis, it wants to solicit the views of Assembly representatives regarding the effectiveness of the Assembly. In anticipation of a discussion of this at Irvine, Assembly Chair Weiss sent out an e-mail questionnaire regarding the Assembly early in February to the Assembly representatives. She intends to share a statistical compilation of the questionnaire responses with the Assembly members at the Irvine meeting.

(Continued from Page 1)

a given number of students, formed in consultation with business CEOs, then resulted in the dollar figure that Wilson proposed.

"It's an excellent step in the right direction," says Alan Laub, the dean of engineering at UC Davis, though he suggests that, for UC to meet the needs of California, the governor's proposal needs to be joined to a similar effort funded by the private sector. "The University has artificially low engineering enrollments," Laub says, noting that engineering faculty constitute about 10 percent of UC's faculty FTE, whereas in many large, comparable institutions the proportion is likely to be about 20 percent.

The news regarding the engineering proposal was tempered by the fact that Wilson recommended funding both it and two unrelated initiatives with money that would be saved by eliminating a program called the California Subject Matter Projects, which provides professional development training for K-12 teachers in a number of academic areas. The program was funded out of Proposition 98 money until 1996-97, when its budget was transferred to UC.

Notice

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

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

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

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

Voluntary Contribution Plan Update

UC Voluntary Contribution Fund Performance
As of December 31, 1997

| Fund | Rate of Return, Last 12 Months | Rate of Return, Last 1 Month | Unit Price |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|
| Equity | 24.03% | 1.37% | \$204.5 |
| Bond | 20.45% | 1.49% | \$103.5 |
| Savings | 6.21% | 0.51% | N/A |
| ICC | 7.60% | 0.63% | N/A |
| Money Market | 5.63% | 0.48% | N/A |
| Multi-Asset | 15.14% | 1.02% | \$22.9 |