

## Council Approves Blueprint for Senate Role in 10th Campus

What role should the University of California's Academic Senate play in developing a tenth UC campus? In February, the Senate's Academic Council approved a blueprint for Senate involvement that calls for the appointment of five separate committees that would undertake a variety of roles in campus planning. These groups would operate until such time as the new campus has a functioning Senate division of its own. In a separate action, the Council decided it could not endorse, in its current form, an initial academic plan for the campus, submitted to the Office of the President last November.

The plan for Senate involvement concerns UC Merced, now taking shape in the San Joaquin Valley and scheduled to open its doors to students in the fall of 2005. Drawn up by Senate Policy Analyst John Douglass, the plan took into account both current realities and the way the Senate structured its participation the last time UC was opening new campuses, in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

The lynchpin of the plan is its call for appointment of a Tenth Campus Academic Senate Task Force that would work on some development issues itself and that, over time, would identify other issues that it would assign to existing Senate committees or new working groups. The task force, the plan says, "would serve as an advisory group to the Academic Assembly, the Academic Council, other Universitywide Committees, the President, and ultimately the new chancellor." It would develop a formal proposal, more detailed than the one the Council approved last month, for Senate work on the new campus. Depending on what its members decide, it might ultimately be concerned not only with academic planning, but with advising the president on the physical development of the campus and with establishing research linkages between existing campuses and UC Merced (UCM).

In addition to the Task Force, the plan the Council approved also called for appointment of:

(Please See: Tenth, Page 2)

## Senate Looks into Making Top 4 Percent of Students in Each High School UC-Eligible

The phrase "top 4 percent" entered public discourse in February regarding undergraduate eligibility for the University of California. It refers to an idea now being considered under which the top 4 percent of the graduating class of each California public high school would automatically be eligible for admission to UC. The chair of the UC Academic Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools — which recommends eligibility changes to the UC Regents — said that his committee thinks the idea "is a nice one, for a variety of reasons," and President Atkinson and UC's top admissions officers had only good things to say about it as well. It is not yet a formal proposal but in February the chances of it becoming one seemed good.

The rationale for the 4-percent plan has to do with fairness and with the idea that it could act as a spur for some of the state's high schools — many of them inner-city and rural — to send greater numbers of students to UC.

"It is a way of combating inequality of educational opportunities across the

state," BOARS Chair Keith Widaman of UC Riverside told reporters after briefing the Regents on the idea last month. Widaman points out that many California high schools offer few or no honors or advanced placement courses, which can confer grade-point credits of up to 5.0. A few high schools don't even offer all the required or "a to f" courses that UC mandates and many more have such a poor selection of such courses that students may have a hard time getting the ones they need. Taking students from among the top 4 percent of each high school class, he said, would help level the playing field for all students.

Beyond this, Widaman said, such a change might have an effect on the culture of high schools that currently send few students to UC. If the top 4 percent of students were notified at the end of their junior year that they were likely to be UC-eligible, the effect might be to make some students consider UC for the first time. "Raising the visibility" of UC in this way conceivably could

(Please See: Four, Page 2)

## Also Confronting Issue of Placing All Eligible Students Educating More Students Than The State Funds, UC Has an 'Overenrollment' Problem

This year, the University of California's eight general campuses are educating the equivalent of about 145,000 full-time students. UC's problem is that it is only receiving state funding for 141,000 of them. In a nutshell, this describes the University's "overenrollment," issue, which it has decided to try and take on this year by requesting an additional appropriation from the state, so that every student it admits is supported by state funding. Meanwhile, because of surging undergraduate demand, another enrollment issue has arisen for UC: It seemingly will be forced in the near

future to come up with a new means of adhering to its responsibility to find a place on one of its campuses for every UC-eligible student.

Overenrollment may sound like one of those bureaucratic terms that have little bearing on real life, but in this case the effect is very real. The additional funding UC is seeking — \$23 million for 1998-99 — means the difference between hiring, or not hiring, 170 new faculty across the eight general campuses. In addition, each student brings state support dollars that fund everything from libraries to lab equipment. Every general campus at UC is overenrolled, none by less than 300 full-time-equivalent (FTE) students, and UC Riverside by 890 such students. If UC's initial projections are correct, the system

(Please See: Overenrollment, Page 6)

---

## *Inside Notice:* Shared Governance; UC's Eligibility Pool

---

### Is the Pool the State's Top 11.1 Percent, or 20.5 Percent? Dispute over Size of UC's Eligibility Pool

Do the University of California's entrance requirements make too many, or too few students eligible for UC? A dispute on this issue, involving several state agencies, has arisen in the wake of a report on the proportion of state high school students who qualify for UC.

The requirement underlying this discussion, set forth in California's Master Plan for Higher Education, is that UC draw its freshmen from among the top 12.5 percent of the graduates of California's public high schools. The two main questions are: To what extent is UC deviating from this requirement now; and should it come up with a new definition of the top 12.5 percent of California's high school graduates?

In November, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) released a report on the proportion of the state's public high school graduates who actually are eligible for UC, a number that turned out to be 11.1 percent. This seemingly handed the UC Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), which determines UC eligibility standards, a mandate to get the proportion up to 12.5 percent. But the report also prompted the view that UC is drawing from too *large* a pool, thus hurting California State University.

The reason for this assertion is that some 9.4 percent of the state's high school graduates fall into a category called "potentially eligible," meaning students who would be eligible for UC if they merely took the SAT I and II exams. It would not matter how such students *scored* on the exams, as they are eligible on the basis of their high school GPAs alone. But UC requires that they must take the exams in order to be eligible — or "fully eligible" — for admission.

Added together, the "fully eligible" and "potentially eligible" pools comprise 20.5 percent of California's high school graduates. The question now being debated is whether UC is drawing its students from this larger pool or from the 11.1 percent of students who are fully eligible. The state's Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) is among those saying the larger pool is the one actually being used. In excluding students on the basis of not having taken the SAT exams, the LAO wrote recently, "UC significantly understates the size of the pool from which it draws freshmen. It is much more accurate to say that UC is drawing from the top 20.5 percent of

high school graduates." UC officials have argued, conversely, that the relevant criterion is not who might be eligible, but who actually is.

If the LAO view prevailed, it would have great practical ramifications for UC and for the Cal State system. UC would have to significantly toughen its entrance requirements to reduce the 20.5 percent pool to 12.5 percent and Cal State would be a major recipient of the students that would then be excluded from UC. (If the LAO is correct, almost 40 percent of UC's eligibility pool (the potentially eligible) should rightly be eligible only for CSU, which draws from among the top third of the state's high school graduates.)

This issue also is connected to the 4-percent eligibility proposal now being considered. If the 11.1 percent eligibility figure is correct, then UC needs to raise it. It turns out that implementing the 4-percent proposal would do that, to the tune of increasing eligibility by about 1.3 percent, thus bringing UC very close to the 12.5 requirement. Adding to this mix, BOARS is considering requiring that all entering students not only take the SAT exams, but achieve some specified score on them to be eligible for UC. With this, the "potentially eligible" category would disappear.

### Tenth Campus: Plan for Senate Role OK'd

(Continued from Page 1)

- An advisory committee for selection of a chancellor.
- A subcommittee of the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) that would review the appointments of all new UCM faculty until such time as the campus' own Senate division could carry out this work.
- A committee that would guide the development of an Academic Senate division at UCM.
- An academic development committee that would do three things: Assist in the recruitment of the founding faculty; establish committees that would aid deans and new faculty in setting up school or college degree programs; and approve undergraduate degrees while developing graduate degrees for approval by the Senate's Graduate Affairs committee.

In other tenth-campus business, the Academic Council decided that it could not support the recommendations con-

### Four Percent: Senate Analyzing Proposal

(Continued from Page 1)

provide schools with an incentive to send more than the top 4 percent of their classes to UC.

Simulations run by the Office of the President indicate that the plan would have little impact on racial proportions at UC, since any increases in numbers of black, urban students would be matched by increases in white, rural students. About two-thirds of the students in the top 4 percent of their classes already are UC-eligible. Given this, an estimated 3,600 additional students — the remaining third of the top 4 percent — would become eligible with the change.

The 4-percent plan is only one of several ideas that have been proposed for making a given proportion of each graduating class in California eligible for UC. Another proposal suggests a 6 percent figure and State Sen. Teresa Hughes has introduced a constitutional amendment that could completely populate UC in this way by making the top 12.5 percent of each high school's class eligible. The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has been looking at each of these proposals, but thus far seems most favorable to the 4-percent plan. With respect to the

(Continued on next page)

tained in a preliminary academic plan for the campus, submitted to UCOP last November by an 11-member administrative committee composed mostly of UC faculty. The Council deliberated on the plan after receiving input regarding it from statewide Senate committees and from campus divisions.

A detailed analysis of the plan was provided by the Senate's University Committee on Planning and Budget, which questioned the plan's call for an interdisciplinary curriculum at the undergraduate level. UCPB also questioned what it believes is an underlying premise of the plan: That the campus could be on the one hand a world-class research university and on the other a "regional university serving the Valley and fueling regional and local economies."

In determining that it could not endorse the plan in its current form, the Council recommend that the tenth-campus task force be asked to deliberate on revisions to it.

(Continued from previous page)

Hughes proposal, Widaman noted that UC's simulations project it would increase racial diversity at the University, but at the cost of bringing about "a dramatic decline in the academic quality of entering students." Moreover, he says, there is now anecdotal evidence from the University of Texas — which admits the top 10 percent of each high school class — that introducing such a system results in students being counseled to take the least difficult set of courses as a means of boosting their grade-point averages.

If the 4-percent plan were implemented, it would be BOARS, rather than California's high schools, that would be defining the top 4 percent of each school. Nevertheless, given that a third of the top 4 percent of California's students are not currently UC eligible, the plan does raise the issue of a lower set of standards for some of the students it would make eligible. This, in turn, raises the question of whether the proposal would engender a two-tiered UC admissions process in which "4-percent students" would be stigmatized as a less-qualified group.

Widaman says, however, that there are two factors that stand to at least mitigate this outcome. First, many of the students made eligible would presumably come from the schools that offer fewer honors and AP courses. Allowing, say, a lower GPA for these students would not necessarily mean admitting less prepared students; it would simply mean that students whose GPAs are unfairly low would be eligible. Second, it may be that many of these students fall into the group known as "potentially eligible" for UC — that is, they would be eligible if they merely took the proper SAT exams (see story, page 2). Beyond this, UC admissions officers point out that, in the 1950s and early 1960s, UC had not one, but several routes to eligibility, one of which included being in the top 10 percent of a high school class. The view then was that any given route was "different than," but not "less than" the others.

BOARS will be working with the administration over the next several months to try to answer a good many questions that exist not only about the 4-percent plan, but about the interrelated set of admissions issues facing the University. The committee's hope, however, is to formulate a proposal this spring that would subsequently come to the Senate's Universitywide Assembly and then to the UC Regents.

## *Notes from the Chair: Shared Governance*

One of the questions I am asked most frequently is whether shared governance is alive and well at the University of California. There is no simple answer to this question, as the vitality of shared governance will always depend upon the attitudes and styles of the individuals who are taking part in University governance. When the Academic Senate was established in 1868, there was a clear recognition by the Regents that faculty involvement in the management of the University was central to the development of UC's quality. Shared governance advanced further with the 1899 appointment of a UC President, Benjamin Wheeler, who believed that faculty must be not only responsible for all educational policy, but self-governing with respect to teaching and research. Then, in 1920, the Regents delegated, through their Standing Orders, several direct and indirect powers to the Senate. It was given authority to determine conditions of admission to UC, to authorize and supervise all courses and curricula, to set graduation requirements, and to advise the administration on libraries and the budget. Simultaneously, the Board accepted (and codified) Wheeler's idea that to fulfill these responsibilities the Senate needed to be self-governing.

History suggests that some of the strongest regental boards, presidents and chancellors have been those who embraced the Senate most substantially as partners in University governance. There clearly have been variations in this regard over time, however, and today the vitality of shared governance differs greatly from one UC campus to the next. Faculty on some campuses report that their collaboration with administration is working beautifully while the faculty view on other campuses is that shared governance is neither valued nor fully utilized by administration.

And what of the stance of our Regents on this issue? Does our current Board continue to support UC's tradition of shared governance? This question was raised repeatedly following the Board's 1995 decisions on affirmative action. As an outgrowth of these events, the Universitywide Senate established a Task Force on Governance, which in turn convened a panel charged with looking at shared governance. This group, chaired by Duncan Mellichamp, has now submitted its report. Among its recommendations are calls for reinvigorating the role of faculty in UC decision-making processes and for improving the Senate's mechanisms for providing advice and consultation. It suggests there would be value in establishing long-range educational policy groups composed of Regents, administrators, and Senate members; and it calls for regular meetings between chairs of regental committees (for example, Educational Policy) and their counterparts in Senate committees. The panel conceptualized the Senate's delegated responsibilities as falling into three areas in relation to the administration — primary, shared, and advisory — and it urged the Senate to bring about a better understanding of its responsibilities and to strengthen the role of its committees.

These are only a few of the recommendations in the report, which now is being circulated to campuses for comment. It is my hope that it will stimulate a frank dialogue that will bring the concept of shared governance into sharper relief for us all.

If we look around the University, we are sure to find spots where shared governance has lost its credibility, its potency and its usefulness. But overall, I am convinced that the principles and practices underlying shared governance are alive and well. Consider the statement of President Atkinson at the September Regent's meeting last year, when he affirmed the support he and the Regents have for this principle: "Our system of shared authority and responsibility among Regents, administration, and faculty is the single most important reason for the University of California's greatness, and it is just as essential to our success today as it has been for more than three-quarters of a century. I would not be President of this University if I did not believe the Regents join me in that conviction." As I sit with the Board of Regents as your faculty representative, I am provided with ongoing evidence that the Regents do indeed embrace that conviction.

—Sandra J. Weiss,  
Chair, Academic Council

# Overenrollment: Seeking State Funding for Every Student UC Has

(Continued from Page 1)

as a whole will be overenrolled by about 3,200 students next year, but this estimate may be on the low side, given that undergraduate applications for 1998-99 are up by 8 percent.

What the University has done in connection with this situation is write to the Department of Finance to ask that the state fund all the students UC will have next year through the requested \$23 million budget augmentation. The critical period for a decision on this request will come after the spring fiscal exercise known as the "May Revise," when state income and expenses are measured against one another.

An important factor in this issue, however, is that this is not a matter of the state reneging on an obligation to fund students at UC. Indeed, the term "overenrollment" is as apt here as "underfunding." For the past four years, UC has been operating under a "compact" with the state whose provisions have included an agreement as to how many additional students the state would fund each year. The compact called for one-percent growth, on average, over the course of the four years,

but all of UC's campuses have exceeded this figure. UC underestimated demand, in other words, and campuses have not limited their growth in accordance with the funding increases they knew they would receive. The University's view, however, is that all parties acted in good faith on this issue; UC has been doing what it can to accommodate all UC-eligible California high school graduates who wish to come to the University, and the state would be doing a service by providing funds for them.

Underlying this argument is the fact that, while individual UC campuses may be selective about which UC-eligible students they take, the system as a whole doesn't have this luxury. It is bound by California's Master Plan for Higher Education to accept, on one of its campuses, all California high school graduates who meet UC's minimum eligibility requirements. Beginning next fall, however, UC may have to come up with a new means of adhering to this requirement.

For years, the University had a straightforward method of complying with the Master Plan: Students who were not accepted by the UC campus of their choice were put into a "referral pool,"

and told that they might wish to apply to a campus that was able to accept all UC-eligible students — for several years now, UC Santa Cruz and UC Riverside. Impacted by rapidly growing application pools, however, UCR and UCSC have both decided that, as of this coming fall, they can no longer accept referral-pool students. UCSC will become selective about student applicants for its fall 1999 class, according to Michael Thompson, the campus' vice-chancellor for enrollment management; and UCR is investigating this possibility for 1999 as well, according to its vice-chancellor for enrollment, James Sandoval.

This raises the question of how UC will adhere to its obligation to enroll all UC-eligible students somewhere. It may offer students who have not been accepted at a given campus the opportunity to enroll in winter or spring quarter, but the question is *where* these students will be offered a spot, since UCR and UCSC will no longer be accepting referral pool students. This issue is now being considered by UC's Council of Chancellors, with one option before them being a distribution of referral students across the system.

## 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 January 31, 1998

Fund	Rate of Return, Last 12 Months	Rate of Return, Last 1 Month	Unit Price
Equity	18.72%	0.10%	\$204.7
Bond	22.39%	1.65%	\$105.2
Savings	6.21%	0.52%	N/A
ICC	7.59%	0.61%	N/A
Money Market	5.66%	0.47%	N/A
Multi-Asset	13.78%	0.61%	\$22.9