

Notice

A publication of the
Academic Senate,
University of California
Vol. 23, No. 1, February 1999

NEWS FOR THE UC FACULTY

Faculty Salary Increases Achieve Comparison Parity, Questions for the Future Remain

Led by efforts of President Richard C. Atkinson, the UC Regents approved a 4.5 percent increase in salary and merit pay for eligible faculty on September 20, 1998. This increase caps a four-year effort to restore pay parity with faculty at the University's comparison eight institutions. Even so, the compensation levels of UC faculty remain substantially below those of faculty at the nation's top private schools, a disparity that causes continuing concern in some quarters.

During the budget crisis of the early 1990s, UC retired thousands of faculty early. In addition, the University provided no salary increases as well as

(Please See: Faculty Salary, Page 3)

Task Force Appointed for UC Merced Campus

Search for Chancellor Begins

On October 14, 1998, the Academic Council appointed a 16-member task force for the new UC Merced campus. Headed by Fred Spiess of UC San Diego, the group will provide planning advice to the Office of the President and the future Chancellor of UC Merced, which is scheduled to open its doors to students in the fall of 2005. This universitywide Task Force will help ensure shared governance between administration and faculty of the new campus and will continue until the new campus establishes its own division of the UC Academic Senate.

The Task Force will serve as the Academic Council's primary advisory board regarding the development of the UC Merced campus. Among its responsibilities are:

- Coordinating policy issues to bring to relevant Senate committees for formal consideration by the Academic Council;
- Ensuring UC faculty engagement in UC Merced developments, such as developing courses and curricula, and carrying out reviews, approvals and consultations that the Senate already does for established divisions and systemwide;
- Formulating the development of an Academic Senate for UC Merced;
- Providing academic direction for the UC Merced implementation plan being developed by the Office of the President; and

(Please See: UC Merced, Page 2)

Universitywide Academic Senate Task Force on UC Merced

Representation	Faculty	Affiliation
Task Force Chair	Fred Spiess	Oceanography, UCSD
Academic Council	Lawrence B. Coleman	Physics, UCD
Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs	Christopher Calvert	Animal Science, UCD
University Committee on Academic Personnel	Donka Minkova	English, UCLA
University Committee on Educational Policy	Peter Berck	Agricultural & Resource Economics, UCB
University Committee on Planning & Budget	William Sirignano	Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering, UCI
University Committee on Research Policy	Allen Zych	Physics, UCR
UC Berkeley	Lily Wong Fillmore	Education, UCB
UC Davis	Robert Flocchini	Biological Science, UCD
UC Irvine	Christian Werner	Geography, UCI
UC Los Angeles	Joyce Appleby	History, UCLA
UC Riverside	Justin Roberts	Biochemistry, UCR
UC San Diego	Katja Lindenberg	Chem.& Biochem., UCSD
UC San Francisco	Michael Drake	Ophthalmology, UCSF
UC Santa Barbara	Elliot Brownlee	History, UCSB
UC Santa Cruz	Wendy Brown	Women's Studies, UCSC

UC Merced

(Continued from Page 1)

- Linking to other UC Merced planning committees on issues such as student services and physical development of the campus.

“The Task Force is the first concerted activity to bring aspects which are of concern to the Academic Senate into the planning for UC Merced,” notes Spiess, Professor Emeritus of Oceanography at UC San Diego.

Other members of the Task Force include representatives who will link the group to the Academic Council, universitywide Academic Senate committees and the nine existing campuses. Among them are faculty members from a wide range of disciplines, many of whom have themselves developed successful academic ventures.

The appointment of the Task Force came as good news to those who are currently working on establishing the new campus. Carol Tomlinson-Keasey, Senior Associate to the UC President for UC Merced, is the top administrator for development of the new campus. She notes that two previous faculty committees, one in 1991 and another in 1997, provided suggestions for the academic structure of the campus. The Task Force “gives us a sounding board and breadth of experience that’s campus based to guide us,” she says.

The University of California is one of the first multi-campus university systems in the nation. As a result, over the past nine decades, the process of expanding the number of campuses within the University has been the source of significant debate and policy making, as well as great pride. That pattern continues with the creation of the UC Merced campus, which will be the first new higher education research institution to open its doors in the 21st century.

UC expansions in the first half of the century were not initiated by internal planning. In 1919, the Los Angeles community pressed for a state university campus in southern California and converted the Los Angeles Normal School into what has become UCLA. In 1943, the Regents initially resisted state legislation

(Please See: UC Merced, Page 4)

News from the Divisions

Following are a selection of news items from some of the nine UC Academic Senate Divisions. We asked the Division Chairs to identify relevant issues that would be of interest systemwide. We will be including items from the other campuses in forthcoming issues of Notice.

UC BERKELEY

Robert Brentano, Chair

Senate members continue their efforts to support the UC admissions policy and to engage in outreach to underserved populations. Members of the Senate’s Divisional Council, including Chair Brentano, Vice Chair Robert Spear of the Public Health Department and Stephen Small, Professor of Sociology and African American Studies, are running a Saturday School for 10th graders who might not consider attending college. The 60 high schoolers learn about the professors’ roles and the potential attractions of higher education. This program stands beside others at UC Berkeley as part of the universitywide efforts to enhance outreach efforts.

The recent five-year, \$25 million agreement between UC Berkeley and Novartis AG, a giant, Swiss-based drug and agri-business firm, fueled faculty concerns over the issue of privatization at a public university. The arrangement gives UC access to Novartis’ proprietary technology and databases on plant DNA in return for special bargaining rights for Novartis to the products produced by research. According to Chair Brentano, the Senate was not part of the decision making process, but faculty did offer suggestions for guidelines and controls. The Senate did recommend an ongoing and independent assessment of the institutional impact of the Novartis deal on all phases of campus life. As part of their normal operations, various Senate committees, including the Committee on Research,

the Committee on Academic Freedom and the Graduate Council, will concern themselves with the effects of the agreement.

UC IRVINE

James Fallon, Chair

UC Irvine faculty and administrators are also questioning the proper relationship between a public institution and private industry. They are grappling with that issue as the Irvine Company develops a million square feet of inclusionary land on campus for biotech, software and other light industry uses. The university and the developer have been meeting to discuss ways of benefiting both the private interests and the university population with, for example, strategic partnerships or joint research projects. In an attempt to reduce traditional tensions between and among faculty and administration, efforts are being made to create a transparent budget. This process would reveal the flow of money through about 100 different campus units. Such disclosure, which the administration supports, will hopefully reduce paranoia and heated debate in both faculty-to-faculty and faculty-to-administration discussions regarding both current and future activities.

UC LOS ANGELES

Vickie Mays, Chair

Members of the UC Los Angeles faculty have also focused attention on the outreach issue and have become more involved in interacting with high schools and in assisting outreach efforts generally. The two Senate committees most active in this area at the moment are those in charge of undergraduate admissions and relations to schools and of planning and budget. The latter committee is looking at what resources are available for outreach activities.

(Please See: News, Page 3)

News

(Continued from Page 2)

Also prominent in campus discussions is faculty's relationship to copyright and intellectual property rights. Each L & S undergraduate course now has a web page, which raises questions about who owns the contents of those pages. Senate Chair Mays points out that the proximity of the entertainment industry and its use of cutting edge technology involves some UC Los Angeles faculty. An ad hoc committee is now looking at these issues and ways to address them.

UC RIVERSIDE
Irwin Sherman, Chair

Chancellor Raymond L. Orbach broke with tradition in providing feedback to members of the Riverside Division regarding his five-year performance review. Normally, both the members of the review committee and their report remain highly confidential throughout this procedure. There is no opportunity for feedback to the campus other than confirmation that the review process has been successfully completed. In an attempt to bridge that gap, Chancellor Orbach took the opportunity at the November 5, 1998, meeting of his campus's Division to note some constructive criticism of his administration and his intention to respond to those portions of the report that indicated a need for more attention.

UC SANTA BARBARA
Richard Watts, Chair

While the Chancellorial review process has ended at UC Riverside, the same procedure recently got underway at UC Santa Barbara. The UC Academic Senate is assembling a five-member review committee to conduct a five-year review of Chancellor Henry T. Yang. The committee will consist of three members of the UC Santa Barbara Academic Senate and two members from other UC campuses. UC Senate Chair Aimee Dorr requests that all UC Santa

Barbara Senate members who wish to add their comments to the review do so in writing to her.

Largely through the efforts of immediate past Divisional Chair Stanley Awramik, Chancellor Yang recently appointed a campus Academic Planning Coordinating Committee to craft a long-term academic strategy for the future of UC Santa Barbara. Last summer, Chancellor Yang met regularly with heads of the Academic Senate to establish membership of the committee and its charge. The coordinating committee is now co-chaired by current Divisional Chair Richard Watts and UC Santa Barbara's Executive Vice Chancellor Ilene Nagel. Faculty members currently comprise the bulk of the committee, but Watts notes that "we are in the process of forming a number of subcommittees to take on the detailed work of establishing UCSB's direction over the next 20 years. These subcommittees will include membership by many of our administrators as well as more faculty." The Coordinating Committee looks to complete its work by the middle of the 1999-2000 academic year.

Faculty Salary

(Continued from Page 1)

cut salaries in a particular year because funds available for salary increases were lower than they should have been. Average UC faculty salaries fell behind those of faculty at the four private and four public universities used for comparison in establishing UC salary rates.

Four years ago, UC negotiated a compact with California Governor Pete Wilson that would establish fiscal stability and allow for growth through a combination of state general funds and student fee revenues. In return, UC was expected to maintain quality, to provide access for all eligible students under the Master Plan and to continue progress on a number of outcome issues (e.g., shorter time to degree, increased teaching). For President Atkinson

and other UC officials, raising faculty salaries topped the list of goals to achieve in the more predictable environment the compact created.

Even with this achievement, UC faculty salaries are lower than those of faculty at our four private comparison institutions. Robert Anderson, Chair of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), attributes this disparity to the stock market's upward climb over the past few years. The privates' endowments have grown commensurately, which gives them more salary freedom. Public universities like UC have also benefited from the robust economy, but not to the same degree.

The salary disparity remains an issue, because UC competes for faculty with the top private institutions, as well as the top public institutions. UCFW has a group working on the topic. "If we're going to remain a premier institution of higher education, we can't do it if our salaries don't match the privates," says Anderson. "We need to develop a new methodology or a new strategy in order to remain competitive."

Are competitive salaries necessary and sufficient to attract and retain the best faculty? Many argue they are not. Faculty seek environments in which their teaching, research, and creative activity can thrive. A competitive salary cannot long counterbalance an unsupportive

While more money has been made available for faculty salaries, other important areas of the university are unfortunately still feeling the effects of the early 1990s budget crunch. Howard Haber, a former member of the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) and former Chair of the UCSC Committee on Research, recalls a UCORP survey completed in 1996 of 2400 UC faculty. The survey identified shortcomings in both physical infrastructure, such as storage areas and computers, and social infrastructure, including secretaries,

(Please See: Faculty Salary, Page 6)

UC Davis Academic Senate Chair Bryan Miller Dies

Professor R. Bryan Miller, 58, Chair of the Academic Senate and Professor of Chemistry at the University of California, Davis, collapsed and died on October 29, 1998, at the Los Angeles International Airport. Professor Miller was most recently pursuing research in environmental chemistry and remediation processes and the design of compounds with enhanced anti-cancer properties. A faculty member at UC Davis since 1968, Professor Miller was also a visiting scientist at the National Science Foundation.

As Chair of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate since 1997, Miller devoted himself to several issues, including admissions policies, outreach to under-represented communities, expansion at the new UC Merced campus and improved articulation for transferring CSU and community college campuses.

“Professor Miller was an outstanding intellectual and motivational force within the Academic Senate,” said Sandra Weiss, immediate past Chair of the UC Academic Senate. She especially noted Miller’s central role in creating a model for assessing academic accountability within the University.

Miller spent his last day engaged at the Assembly of the Academic Senate meeting at UC Los Angeles. Others in the UC Davis delegation recall his characteristic thorough preparation and well-informed contribution to the day’s discussion, as well as his low-key humor in transit. When all six of the UC Davis delegation crowded into a mid-size car for the rush hour ride back to the airport, Miller noted wryly that “this is one of the goals of these Senate meetings, to bring us all closer together.”

Miller’s collapse came suddenly as the group awaited their return flight. In spite of receiving almost immediate aid from trained personnel, he never regained consciousness. “We will miss Bryan’s presence on the Council enormously,” added current UC Academic Senate Chair Aimee Dorr. “His insights, good values, preparation, knowledge, collegiality and warmth were ever present and much valued. I’m glad I had the chance to work with him for the last year.”

UC Merced

(Continued from Page 2)

to absorb Santa Barbara State College into the UC system but finally agreed to the addition.

Planning and creating new campuses for UC developed as a post World War II phenomenon, driven by large increases in enrollment demand and political pressure to expand University programs in under-served and growing areas of the state. Since the 1940s, the Academic Senate has developed a series of studies and recommendations related to the process of establishing new campuses of the University. These provide precedents and potential models for Academic Senate involvement in the efforts to create UC Merced.

In 1958, for example, a conference on “The University of California: Retrospect and Prospect” focused considerable attention on the development of new campuses. Among other recommendations, the attendees called for special Senate committees composed of faculty from existing campuses to formulate initial plans for the academic structure of the new campuses and to recruit faculty. They also encouraged experimental educational programs and supported associations between faculty members of smaller and new campuses with institutes, bureaus and other organized programs of research on larger campuses.

Out of the same conference came a three-step process for establishing an Academic Senate division on a new campus. This process started with the appointment of a Chancellor or Chief Campus Administrator, followed by the creation of a Staffing Committee from the Academic Senate. This group, analogous to the recently appointed Task Force, would review and recommend academic appointments and establish other necessary committees such as those dealing with Educational Policy, Courses and Library. Finally, the Staffing Committee would disband when the new faculty body reached the point where it could fill essential Senate committees with tenured personnel.

The youngest UC campuses, Irvine, San Diego, and Santa Cruz were established in the early 1960s. San Diego

already had an academic program linked to the Scripps Institute of Oceanography and a School of Science and Engineering, but Santa Cruz and Irvine were built more from the bottom up. The transition committees for the three campuses examined academic and physical plans, reviewed faculty hires and approved courses prior to the establishment of an Academic Senate Division. Working with the Chancellors chosen for these new campuses, the committees are credited with creating a framework for quality academic programs and the resulting high national rankings of these UC campuses.

The involvement of the universitywide Senate offered two other important advantages. One was the assurance that the academic planning, faculty hiring and new program development harmonized with required Senate review and approval processes. Secondly, it generated broader support from the entire university community for developing the new campuses, involved talented senior faculty into the academic planning, and forged links with established programs and institutes.

Task Force Chair Speiss exemplifies these points. After studying physics at UC Berkeley, he joined the research staff at Scripps Institute of Oceanography in 1952. He continued to serve on the faculty in the late 1950s and early 1960s as Scripps transformed into UCSD. Thereafter, he has been a vigorous UCSD faculty member, administrator, and divisional and systemwide Senate leader.

Speiss points out that the development of UC Merced doesn’t exactly match that of the three newest campuses. UCSD and UCSC were built up around existing institutions. “UCI offers the closest parallel,” he says, “because there wasn’t much there at the time but open land.”

The funding climate during the 1950s/1960s was hospitable to UC growth. The State of California had the money to start three major campuses in as many years. Currently, the tighter financial situation has stretched out the development of UC Merced over the past decade. During this time, the President and Board of Regents have been vigorous in their efforts to provide for the needs of UC’s nine existing campuses and for UC’s incipient campus.

(Please See: UC Merced. Page 6)

Notes from the Chair: Governance in Action

UC freshman admissions policy will soon change. Why? Primarily because UC freshmen are now coming from among the top 11.1% of graduating California public high school seniors rather than the top 12.5% mandated by the California Master Plan for Higher Education. Proposed policy changes would expand what UC calls its eligibility pool, while maximizing excellence and access. In addition, they would give appropriate weight to different types of required tests and advanced courses, make meaningful use of scores from all required tests, and expand required high school preparation for UC to include visual and performing arts courses.

The proposed changes will be familiar to most of you reading these *Notes from the Chair*. Less familiar will be the governance system by which the changes come about. As Chair, I am having ample opportunity to observe how this system works. I'd like to share some of my reflections on it.

Our governance system is complex, fitted to a complex organization in which power is widely shared. For admissions policy, some parts of the governance process are particularly challenging. The nature of the UC undergraduate student body is of vital interest within UC and in the wider public and political arenas in which UC operates. When a complex system addresses a vital interest, also full of complexity, sustained work and goodwill are required of all participants if the process is to result in a successful conclusion.

According to the Standing Orders of the Regents, the Academic Senate is responsible for establishing the conditions for admission, subject to Regental approval. The Senate's governance system assigns responsibility for admissions policy to a Universitywide committee: the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). Led by Chair Keith Widaman (UC Riverside), BOARS worked for more than a year to craft a final proposal that adroitly balances varying interests and promises to achieve the intended goals. The succeeding Senate steps are review and approval by the systemwide Senate's Academic Council and then by the systemwide Assembly of the Academic Senate.

BOARS, the Academic Council, and the Assembly are comprised of faculty from each campus; campuses are equally represented on BOARS and the Council and proportionally represented on the Assembly. Senate bylaws clearly assign policy development work to BOARS and final approval to the Assembly. Moreover, what the Assembly approves applies to all UC campuses. Informal consultation is a challenging, yet crucial, aspect of what is otherwise a well defined governance process. Although BOARS is a faculty committee, it involves few people compared to the number who must ultimately approve BOARS' recommendations. For BOARS' policy proposals to prevail, there must be early, continuing, and meaningful consultation with campus faculty and faculty representatives to the Council and Assembly.

While the Academic Senate has its own internal governance system, we also participate in a system of shared governance. For admissions policy, UC administrators have a consultative role with the Senate as it develops recommendations. Two UC Student Academic Services administrators work closely with BOARS, and their senior staff provide essential analytic support. The UC President and Provost both consult with BOARS, the Academic Council, and the Assembly. Balance of power is the governance challenge here. The Senate must be strong enough to engage in meaningful consultation. Equally important, the substantial resources, stature, and continuity of the Office of the President must be used to promote the development of feasible, mutually acceptable policy recommendations, not simply those the administration prefers.

Undergraduate admissions policy is one of the few areas, if not the only area, in which shared governance brings Academic Senate recommendations directly to the Board of Regents, who must approve them. These governance processes are difficult to manage well, not only because admission policy is infrequently changed but also because this policy interests many people. This interest can cause public discussion of Senate recommendations before the Regents have had appropriate opportunity to consider them. Moreover, because there are few mechanisms for extensive Senate-Regental interaction during policy development, shared understandings are not necessarily well developed by the time the recommendations are brought to the Regents. If there are substantial differences of opinion at this point, they may be particularly hard to work out because so much of the policy development work has already been done in the Senate's internal governance processes and the Senate-administration shared governance processes.

We should soon know exactly how UC freshman admissions policy will change. If our entire governance system has worked well, the main participants in the decision making process will be satisfied with the changes and confident they will achieve the intended goals.

Aimée Dorr
Chair, Academic Council

Faculty Salary

(Continued from Page 3)

computer training, grant preparation, library facilities and demands on faculty time. Haber hasn't seen much yet in terms of a comprehensive response to these issues.

These same questions about how to attract and retain the best people for the University of California were asked this year for chancellors, as well as faculty. As of July, 1997, UC chancellors' salaries were on average over 25% behind the salaries of the top administrators at the comparison eight institutions and at a larger group of 26 comparable public and private institutions. Chancellors had had only one salary increase in the last eight years. The Board of Regents agreed to a two-year program to bring chancellorial salaries up toward the average of the comparison groups.

Not everyone agrees with the amount of money that the Chancellors receive, even if their

pay lags behind the market. UC Berkeley Division Chair Robert Brentano cautions against thinking that the salaries of UC top academic administrators should correlate to those of corporate chief executive officers. If pay becomes the motivator for attracting and retaining top administrators, he warns, UC "will get both the kind of corporate-model Chancellors and Presidents and the reputation that we would deserve."

What lies ahead? The comparison methodology is an accepted and vital tool in establishing compensation levels attractive to the caliber of faculty, and now chancellors, essential to UC's success. What more or different to do to compete successfully for the people we want is under discussion in several quarters. How these discussions will resolve themselves is unclear, but the place of the comparison methodology is not.

UC Merced

(Continued from Page 4)

With another seven years until the target first day of classes at UC Merced, the California economy could continue to influence the pace of development.

The official search for UC Merced's first Chancellor began in November with an announcement from UC President Richard C. Atkinson. As the Academic Senate's Task Force begins laying out an academic plan for the campus in the interim, they face a tricky task. Spiess notes that they want to do their work without tying the hands of the Chancellor and the faculty of the new campus. "We want to keep the excitement alive without making it too difficult for those who'll actually be doing the work," he says.

Task Force member Wendy Brown recalls that the strong vision that initially shaped her campus offers a cautionary note. "It took a long time for the faculty at UCSC to develop their own capacity to lead and discern what would be the best way to move forward and change with the times," she says.

In spite of this caveat, Brown looks forward to helping shape the new campus, located near her childhood home in Modesto. "This is a time to imagine new possibilities," she says, "and that's very exciting."

Notice

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

Aimée Dorr, Chair

UCOP, 12th Floor, 1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

(510) 987-0711

Email: "Aimee Dorr" dorr@gseis.ucla.edu

David Krogh, Editor (on leave)

Shimon-Craig Van Collie, Writer

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, 1999

Fund	Rate of Return, Last 12 Months	Rate of Return, Last 1 Month	Unit Price
Equity	19.01%	4.04%	\$243.4
Bond	10.68%	0.72%	\$114.5
Savings	6.14%	0.51%	N/A
ICC	7.36%	0.61%	N/A
Money Market	5.61%	0.45%	N/A
Multi-Asset	11.55%	1.82%	\$25.5