

## Panel Recommends Dropping SAT To Increase Eligibility Of Latino Students

The University of California's Latino Eligibility Task Force got the attention of parents, students, and educators throughout the state last month with a recommendation on how to increase Latino eligibility at UC: Drop the requirement that high school students must take the SAT exam to get into the University.

The proposal got a surprisingly warm reception from some Regents and President Atkinson called it "a very powerful recommendation." The Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has delegated authority to propose changes to UC's basic admissions requirements; BOARS Chair Keith Widaman of UC Riverside said in September that his committee will soon begin an evaluation of several proposals to modify UC undergraduate admissions.

Only about 3.8 percent of California's Latino high school graduates are eligible for admission to UC, compared to about 12.3 percent of the state's high school graduates generally. Among Latinos, as with all students, there is a large pool of students who are referred to as "potentially eligible" — meaning those who would be eligible for UC if they had taken the SAT exam. Speaking for the Task Force, UC Berkeley Education Dean Eugene Garcia told the Regents that making such students fully eligible, by dropping the exam requirement, would increase the Latino eligibility pool by almost 60 percent.

At present, Garcia said, the SAT acts as a barrier to Latino eligibility without doing much to assure student quality. It has very little predictive value for Latino performance in college, he asserted, adding that it tests for "well-educated" students as opposed to "well-schooled" students. Well-educated students, he said, receive much of their knowledge from the perks that come with higher family income — such as access to computers — while Latino students are far more dependent on school

(Please See: SAT, page 2)

## In Response to Governor's Wishes, Regents Delay Consideration of Partners Benefits

For about 30 minutes in September, it appeared that the University of California would begin offering domestic-partner benefits to its employees. Meeting on September 18, the UC Regents Committee on Finance was presented with a choice: If it voiced no serious objection, President Atkinson would go forward, under his own authority, with a proposal on domestic-partner benefits he presented at the meeting. If the Regents did object, the President seemingly was prepared to withdraw the proposal. Despite the reservations of a couple of Regents — and an important communication from Sacramento — the committee meeting was brought to a close with the President retaining a free hand in the issue. Supporters of domestic-partner benefits left the hall thinking that they had carried the day and that such benefits would likely be instituted in the coming year.

Within half-an-hour, however, the Regents were back at the issue in an impromptu session in which Regents' Chairman Tirso del Junco requested a

Board consideration of the question in November — meaning a Regents' vote. The president thereupon announced that he would suspend any action on domestic partners pending the outcome of the Regents consideration.

What came in between the two meetings? Seemingly a decision on the part of some Regents that the University was taking an unacceptable risk by moving forward on domestic partners in September, since it had been asked not to do so by California Gov. Pete Wilson. At the earlier Finance Committee meeting, a message was delivered from the governor in which he requested that the Regents not act on the issue until their November meeting and do so then only through a vote. Delivered by Regent John Davies of San Diego — a friend of the governor and his judicial appointments secretary — this message did not come as news to the Board at the meeting, since Davies had informed the president earlier in the week of Wilson's feelings on the issue. It did, however, set up

(Please See: Domestic, Page 4)

## With Final Hurdles Cleared, Stanford and UCSF Will Merge Their Medical Centers

Nearly two years of calculating and negotiating came to a close in September as the UC Regents and Stanford Board of Trustees approved the merger of the UC San Francisco and Stanford University Medical Centers. As of November 1, Stanford and UCSF will begin consolidating most of their clinical operations under a single nonprofit corporation, UCSF-Stanford Health Care (USHC). Full integration of the facilities is expected to be completed in three years.

A major piece of the merger puzzle fell into place late in August when Stanford and UC reached agreement with California legislators on the degree to which USHC would be subject to California's open records and open meet-

ings laws. Another boost for the plan came early in September when a third independent analysis of the merger — this one performed by the California State Auditor — found that USHC would generate \$120 million more in its first four years than Stanford and UCSF would if they operated separately.

Still, the merger retained many critics even after it was approved. Some Regents and faculty noted that the UCSF Medical Center had an operating margin of about \$21 million in the fiscal year just ended, as opposed to the \$3 million that had been projected, thus providing support for the view that UCSF does not need a merger to prosper.

Labor unions have gone to court to block the action, though UC announced in September that all but 28 current employees of UCSF and Stanford would be offered jobs at USHC. Writing to the Regents on behalf of himself and seven

(Please See: UCSF, Page 3)

---

## Inside Notice: Assembly Meeting; Salary Increase Delay

---

## Letters to Notice UC Faculty and Nuclear Weapons

In 1996 UC's faculty, reversing their earlier position, supported the Administration and Regents in renewing UC's management of the nuclear weapons laboratories at Los Alamos and Livermore.

In 1995 UC's oversight committee, including Senate representation, had opposed a five-year phase-out of nuclear weapons work at Livermore, as proposed by the blue ribbon "Galvin" Committee. Making reference to UC's position, the Secretary of Energy rejected the phase-out recommendation.

The Laboratories' current budgets are similar to Cold War levels of about \$1 billion per year each. The Nonproliferation Treaty and Nuclear Test Ban now prohibit the development of new nuclear weapons, their traditional core function. Instead the labs participate in the multi-billion dollar nuclear weapons "Stewardship" program, whose official purpose is to maintain existing systems in a state of safe and reliable readiness and to support an extensive staff.

In *Newsbrief* 38, Spring 1997, of the highly respected Programme for Promoting Nuclear Non-Proliferation (Southampton University), I read the following:

... Reportedly, among the weapons [US B-2 stealth bombers] will carry is the new B61-11 "bunker buster" needle-shaped warhead, designed to penetrate fifty feet into the ground. . . . American military authorities claim that the B61-11 is an upgraded version of an existing warhead, the B53, . . . [which] weighed about 9,000 lbs. while the new weapon weighs 750 lbs. . . . Some observers also see the development of what is in essence a new weapon as violating the US' commitments under the NPT, and fear that the 'stockpile stewardship program' may be used as a cloak for the development of other new nuclear weapons . . .

And also:

There are reports that weapons scientists in the United States and in France are working on the development of a 'pure fusion bomb': a hydrogen bomb that could be ignited without the use of an atomic explosion, presumably by means of laser beams . . . [This research] has already raised concern that in the long run it might conceivably lead to the devel-

opment of a new type of weapon that would be light and cheap to manufacture. On 15 April Nobel-prize physicist Hans A. Bethe wrote to President Clinton urging him to have a stop put to this research, but there is doubt that such a move would be successful, given the political influence of the nuclear-weapon laboratories . . .

In my 10 years of personal involvement the official Senate leadership has consistently aligned itself with the questionable positions of the Administration and Regents that UC's management of the federal weapons labs is *ipso facto* a commendable "public service" that brings benefits to faculty and students.

This century has repeatedly seen individuals justifying their actions or inaction by a degrading "we did not know." The facts about UC's umbrella over the nuclear weapons labs have long been known to those who wanted to know. The present letter aims to contribute to this knowledge.

—Walter Kohn, Physics, UCSB

### Assembly To Meet This Month at UCB

The Academic Senate's Universitywide Assembly will hold its first meeting of the new academic year on Wednesday, October 29, on UC Berkeley's Clark Kerr Campus. The meeting will begin at 10 a.m. in the Theater of the Kerr Campus.

The meeting is the first of three that Assembly Chair Sandra Weiss has announced she intends to hold this year. In addition to the usual schedule of business and consultation with UC's president, each meeting will also include a period of time set aside for an Assembly discussion of policy issues confronting the University.

At the October meeting, the Assembly is expected to have a policy discussion regarding the analysis the statewide Senate currently is undertaking regarding its own governance, organization, and resources. Chair Weiss is expected to bring the Assembly up to date on the progress of its Task Force on Governance, whose

(Please See: Assembly, Page 6)

## SAT Proposal

(Continued from Page 1)

for their academic knowledge. As a result, Garcia said, "The SAT is providing preference for students who are not Latinos."

Garcia noted that a number of schools, including Indiana University, have dropped the SAT requirement. Questioned by reporters, however, he and other members of the task force said they had no knowledge of whether this change had increased minority enrollment at any school.

The problem for UC in considering such a step is that the University is bound, by California's Master Plan for Higher Education, to accept only the top 12.5 percent of California's high school graduates. If the SAT requirement were dropped for all students, the UC eligibility rate would go from 12.3 to about 16.8 percent. Something would therefore have to take the SAT's place to get the eligibility rate back down to 12.5 — either another exam or perhaps a ratcheting up of high school course and GPA requirements. With respect to exams, Garcia pointed to a series of tests now under construction, the Golden State Exams, which he said are intended to test students on the subject matter taught in the state's high schools.

But would there be a bottom-line increase in Latino enrollment — or even eligibility — if the SAT were supplanted by a new test or tougher GPA requirements? No one knows. In response to questioning from reporters, Dennis Galligani, UC's Assistant Vice-President for Student Academic Services, said it's conceivable that a toughening of grade-point requirements would have a disproportionately negative effect on minority students.

BOARS Chair Widaman said in September that his group had not yet examined the issue of eliminating the SAT requirement, but that it intends to evaluate "a host of different admissions scenarios" once new figures on UC's eligibility rates are delivered by the state, probably this month. Apart from the Latino Task Force recommendations, he said, there is the constitutional amendment proposed by California Senator Teresa Hughes that would require UC to accept the top 12.5 percent of students from each California public high school; and a proposal, by UC professors Rodolfo Alvarez and Richard Flacks, which recommends that the top 6 percent of each high school class be eligible.

## *Faculty Increases Weighted Differently by Step* Salary Increases Delayed for One Month

An August budget upheaval in Sacramento has led to a one-month postponement of the salary increases that were scheduled to go into effect October 1 for University of California faculty and staff.

The faculty increases, now effective on November 1, average five-percent across all ranks. With the increase, UC faculty salaries will lag those paid to faculty at the University's "comparison-eight" institutions by an estimated 6.7 percent — down from 10.3 percent last year and seemingly moving toward parity over the long run.

The budget troubles that led to the salary delay had to do with a dispute between California Gov. Pete Wilson and state legislators over tax cuts and salary increases for state employees. Having reached a stalemate in negotiations, Wilson decided in August to immediately repay all of a \$1.3 billion debt the state owed to the Public Employees Retirement System, rather than schedule the repayment over a longer period. The result was that the Legislature had to hastily cut more than \$1.5 billion from its spending plan.

UC's share of this reduction was \$12 million, half of which is being financed by the one-month delay in the salary increases. (The other half is being covered by a reduction in deferred maintenance expenditures.) What's being delayed are the "range adjustments" or COLAs that boost salary levels for payroll titles at UC. UC's Budget Director, Larry Hershman, told the UC Regents in September that he expects the \$12 million cut to be a one-time reduction that will not affect future salary increases.

Though this year's faculty salary increases will average 5 percent across all ranks, they will differ somewhat by rank and step. To take the most extreme examples, Assistant Professor I salaries will be bumped up by 4.0 percent, while Associate Professor IV and Professor I salaries will be increased by 6.1 percent. The differential is aimed at smoothing out the percent-increase between steps across UC's faculty ranks. Currently, going from Associate Professor I to II brings with it a 5.2 percent increase in salary, but going from Associate IV to V brings a 7.0 percent increase. The idea is to move toward a uniform 5.9 percent differential between steps at the Associate level and comparable uniform differentials at the other ranks.

This method of weighting the 1997-

98 salary increases was only one of several under consideration. Last summer, the Senate's University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) supported a differential weighting toward UC's full professor ranks on grounds that, for the current year, these faculty are projected to lag their comparison-eight counterparts by 8.9 percent, while the lag at associate professor is projected at 7.2 percent and the lag at assistant professor 2.4 percent. UC's academic vice-chancellors subsequently told Provost Judson King, however, that they were recruiting heavily at the assistant professor level but not experiencing recruitment or retention problems at the full professor level and thus did not support weighting toward full professors to reduce their larger salary gap.

### NEWS IN BRIEF

#### TENTH CAMPUS MOVING AHEAD

With each passing month it appears more likely that UC will be building a 10th campus in California's Central Valley. The California Legislature recently approved \$4.9 million for planning and development of the campus and in September the UC Regents authorized UC's continuation of such work. With the board's action, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, which evaluates new campus plans for the state, will begin its review of UC's plans for the new campus. Academic planning for it began last year under the direction of a faculty advisory committee chaired by Daniel Simmons, a professor of law at UC Davis and former chair of the Senate's Academic Council.

In 1995, the Regents chose the "Lake Yosemite" site near Merced as the location for UC's tenth campus. UC's position has always been, however, that the campus would only be built if the state could provide sufficient funding for it while continuing to support the existing campuses at their current levels. Momentum for the campus increased during the past year with the support given to it by California Assembly Speaker Cruz Bustamante of Fresno.

#### DOE CONTRACTS SIGNED

After more than a year of on-again, off-again negotiations, the University of California and the Department of En-

(Please See: News, Page 5)

## UCSF Merger

(Continued from Page 1)

other faculty members, UCSF Professor of Medicine Warren Gold said last month that the merger has never been properly evaluated and that UCSF faculty have never been informed — much less involved — in any meaningful way regarding the plan.

Despite such criticisms, the votes the Regents took on the issue were not close. At root, the board seemed to feel that, whatever UCSF's current financial status, its long-term fiscal health can be best assured by a union with Stanford and that academic quality will follow from institutional commitment and a healthy bottom-line.

What will this action mean in practice? The academic departments in the Stanford and UCSF Schools of Medicine will remain completely separate entities, hiring, evaluating, and promoting faculty on their own. What's changing is that the hospitals and clinical practices of the two institutions are being transferred to a single entity that will then run them.

In the short-run, this action is supposed to generate additional revenue from the economies of scale that come with increased purchasing power and consolidation of operations. In the near-term, there will probably be some pressure to consolidate the operations of high-cost medical specialties, such as organ transplantation. Many observers feel, however, that the real clinical realignment of Stanford and UCSF will come only in the long run.

"The impact will come if and when we get to that point when clinical services are rationalized by the new entity so that services are provided only at one site or the other," says Larry Shapiro, Chair of the Department of Pediatrics at UCSF. If a decision were made to locate a given service or a piece of equipment at the former Stanford facilities, he says, UCSF faculty either would not participate in the work or would have to travel to Palo Alto to do so. Such a structure, he acknowledges, could lead to infighting as faculty from each institution strive to increase the clinical activity that facilitates research and teaching.

"This whole undertaking is going to require a shift in thinking or culture among the two institutions," he says. "It means we have to stop thinking of Stanford as a competitor and look at it more as a sister department."

# Domestic Partners: Regents May Vote on Issue in November

(Continued from Page 1)

a critical public decision for the Regents: Accede to the governor's wishes or not? At first the answer was no; then came the turn-about.

Any California governor has great power over the University of California but in September UC found itself in a particularly vulnerable position with respect to Gov. Wilson. In the legislative session that ended in September, both houses of the California legislature passed Assembly Bill 1415, which would guarantee UC — for the first time ever — a stable proportion of state funding. The bill is of such importance that UC Budget Director Larry Hershman told the Regents last month that it was "the most significant piece of legislation I have seen in the 30 years I have been with the University." The fate of the bill is uncertain, however, as it currently sits on Gov. Wilson's desk, awaiting his signature or veto. It was with this as background that the Regents considered the domestic partners proposal.

Where the issue goes now is unknown. It appears that Wilson, an ex-officio Regent, wants to be present for the November discussion of domestic partners, but in the days after the September board meeting his press spokesman said he had not yet formulated a position on the issue. Even if the Regents voted for domestic-partner benefits in November, their November 20 meeting date would leave little of the month's 1998 "open-enrollment" period left.

The proposal that the president brought to the board in September had two parts. First, an extension of medical, dental, and vision-care benefits for "same-sex" domestic partners of UC employees. Second, new guidelines for student family housing that would give chancellors discretion to include students with domestic partners in such housing. The cost of the health-care benefits was estimated to range from \$1.9 million to \$5.6 million per year — depending on how many employees sign up — against a total UC health-care benefits cost of about \$400 million per year. As a prerequisite for getting such benefits, employees and their partners are likely to have to file with UC an affidavit declaring that both parties are unmarried to any other person, that they are financially responsible for each other, and that they have shared a common residence for at least 12 months.

The Regents' September consideration of this proposal was an outgrowth

of an extended discussion they had regarding domestic partners in July. That discussion, in turn, was prompted by an earlier plea from last year's Academic Council Chair, Duncan Mellichamp, that the board take the issue up. Most observers seem to agree that the Regents finished the July meeting more positively disposed to domestic partner benefits than they began it, thanks in part to a moving series of presentations from gay and lesbian UC faculty and staff on

what the lack of domestic-partner benefits has meant to them. (See accompanying story below.) At the September discussion, current Academic Council Chair Sandra Weiss made a plea with the board "not to allow external factors to interfere" with approval of domestic-partner benefits. Her sentiments were echoed by several Regents, including Ward Connerly, but in the end the Regents decided to delay consideration of the issue.

## Unrecognized Partners: Three UC Stories

*What follows are adaptations of remarks made to the UC Regents in July regarding domestic-partner benefits.*

My name is Dr. Rose Maly. I have been Assistant Professor of Family Medicine at the UCLA School of Medicine since July of 1994. Within three weeks of beginning work in this position, my life partner of 11 years, Sally Ann Armstrong, was diagnosed with breast cancer that had spread to her liver. After waging many tremendous battles with grace and dignity, Sally died at home with me beside her last August 7th. I do not have the words to tell you how much I loved her, how horrifying it was to watch her go through that hell, and how terribly, terribly much I miss her.

Let me tell you how the University of California's current policy on domestic partner benefits contributed to this agony. After a bone marrow transplant she underwent, Sally was completely exhausted, having nearly died of septic shock and heart and kidney failure. But because of the critical need to maintain her health insurance, she was forced to go back to work well before she was ready. She spent what was to be the last good eight months of her life commuting in L.A. traffic and working in a highly stressful job, for the sole reason of keeping her health insurance. Had we been a heterosexual couple, health insurance would have been available to her through my employment at UCLA, and Sally would have been able to spend those last good months of her life doing the things she really liked and wanted to accomplish.

\* \* \*

My name is Terry Colbert. I moved to San Francisco in March of 1996 to start work in the Office of Research

Affairs at UCSF, Laurel Heights. My partner, James Mason, a librarian by profession, stayed in the Midwest long enough to sell our house and rejoined me here in the city in June of '96. Jim and I have been partners for 20 years, first in Illinois, then in Kansas, and now in California. Our commitment to each other is as deep and abiding as any heterosexual marriage. As it was on the strength of Jim's job offer at Kansas State University that we left Illinois, so it was on the strength of my job offer at UCSF that we left Kansas.

When we made the move to Kansas, I went through a long search — a total of 25 interviews — before finding a job of my own. The position I finally found there has led to San Francisco, and now it is Jim's turn to search. He has taken a part-time position at San Francisco Public Library, but a part-time job does not carry medical benefits. If we were a married heterosexual couple, Jim would have the security of UCSF medical benefits as my spouse until he could find full-time work. The fact that as an employee of the University of California I cannot offer my life-partner the same security that the University routinely extends to heterosexual spouses is illustrative of the injustice that the Board of Regents is asked to correct by providing domestic partner benefits.

\* \* \*

My name is Scott Hodges, I am a UC Berkeley alumnus and an Assistant Professor at UC Santa Barbara. My partner of 14 years, Douglas Bush, is also a UC Berkeley alumnus and is currently an Associate Professor at Rutgers University. A common problem for academics is finding two positions, one for oneself and another for

(Please See: Domestic, Page 6)

## News in Brief

(Continued from Page 3)

ergy signed a new set of contracts at the end of September for UC's continued management of the DOE laboratories at Berkeley, Livermore, and Los Alamos, New Mexico. The agreement means that UC will be managing the labs until at least September 2002. The enormous DOE labs employ a combined workforce of more than 17,000 UC employees and operate on federally funded budgets totaling about \$2.4 billion annually.

The new contracts represent a continuation of the "performance-based" management concept put into place in the 1992 round of contract negotiations. Should UC live up to its expectations regarding scientific and management quality, it will receive about \$14 million per year in lab management fees under the new contracts. This money is then put back into discretionary laboratory research, a small portion of which is controlled by UC, with the remainder controlled by the labs themselves. UC officially operates the labs on a "no-gain, no-loss" basis, neither profiting from nor paying for its management.

For the UC faculty, the University's management of the labs no longer seems to be the incendiary issue it once was. Though a number of Senate divisions held 1996 votes related to the new contracts, only Santa Barbara had a majority of faculty voting against UC's continued management of the facilities — a decided turn-around from 1990 when nearly every division voted to sever ties with the labs. Nevertheless, the Senate will be evaluating some issues with respect to the new lab contracts. The "Coleman" committee of the statewide Senate recommended that when the new contracts were signed, the Senate should compare them to the 1992 contracts to see if Senate input had made any difference in a number of areas of concern to the Senate. This process of comparison will now get underway.

### PRIMER ON INDIRECT COSTS

Faculty who have found themselves confused by the complex subject of indirect costs at UC now have a place they can turn. The statewide Senate's University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) has prepared a background report on the issue, *Indirect Cost Recovery/Overhead Distribution*, which can be viewed through the statewide Senate's website under "Documents of Interest" at: <http://www.ucop.edu/senate>.

## Notes from the Chair: A Valuable Debate

Is the concept of "One University" threatened at the University of California? Last year's transfer of budgeting decisions from the President's Office to the campuses raised fears that each campus would now be able to act in isolation of the others, showing minimal concern for any university-wide goals. But it's not as if significant differences within the University are appearing for the first time with this budgeting change. We have been rich with counterpoint for years: established campuses versus developing campuses, scholars versus practitioners, academic departments versus extension, administration versus faculty, the campuses versus the president's office, traditionalists versus reformers, and so on.

I have no doubt that there is less unanimity, greater heterogeneity, and as a result, more dynamic tension within UC than I have seen in my 27 years here. But I am not convinced that this is detrimental, or that it threatens our capacity to be a powerful and coherent institution. What is really new, it seems to me, is that lately we have begun to confuse open debate and differences of opinion with resistance, inefficiency, or a need to be in control. Initiative and innovation have recently been mistaken for a turf-building that is harmful to parts of a campus or the University as a whole. Why are we now defining our differences as a liability? Probably because the 1990s have been so harsh on resources. Under such conditions, there is pressure to do one of two things: 1) decrease incentives for initiative so that resources can be spread modestly, though inadequately, over the full range of institutional needs, or 2) channel resources in ways that privilege some parts of the University at the expense of others.

Both of these approaches can be destructive and eventually erode the sense of being "One University." In the first scenario, UC's current stellar achievers may be held back until their commitment to the University as a whole wanes. The concept of "One University" should not mean there is no room for the unusual or the untried. If we force accommodation to a rigid mold of comparability, we run the risk of squelching some of our most effective entrepreneurs, whether they be scholars, administrators or entire campuses within our system. But, in the second scenario, those who are not yet flourishing are neglected, with the result that their support for the whole is undermined. It is inevitable that some of today's nascent scholars, fields, and even campuses will be at the forefront of tomorrow's academic world. We run a risk in trying to preserve what is great now at the expense of what could be great tomorrow.

I am not naive enough to believe that there is some easy solution to this dilemma. But to my mind, the best answers will come from an active debate. The myriad of strongly articulated opinions within the University forces us to examine our options and critique our own rigidly held perspectives. Debate among all of our factions fuels the fires of our creativity.

Finding the right balance between what is good for the whole and what is best for each of our component parts is perhaps the biggest challenge we face. This balance is central to the ultimate "rightness" of our approaches in such matters as development of a tenth campus, planning for the future of our library system, managing effective health science centers, and determining the policies for differential fees. Are we up to the challenge? The answer depends upon: 1) whether we are each willing to put in the time to bring our particular wisdom to the table for discussion, and 2) how effectively we can detach ourselves from the status quo, however invested we may be in it personally, in order to allow for the synergy that can come with the free flow of divergent views. These conditions are the foundation for preserving the reality of "One University." No one faction can possibly determine the right directions for this great University and no particular path to getting there will be appropriate for all of us.

—Sandra Weiss  
Chair, Academic Council

## Domestic Stories

(Continued from Page 4)

one's partner. Often, couples are faced with one member having to give up a faculty position to maintain the relationship. As difficult as this decision is for married couples it is even more difficult for my partner and me because one of us faces the prospect of losing health and retirement benefits. Because UC does not offer domestic partnership benefits I cannot provide for my partner in the manner that other UC employees can. Although it is possible to purchase these benefits, the cost is high. It would be well over 15 percent of my net salary.

Domestic Partnership benefits would be important to me and I also feel that they would benefit the University for many reasons. As someone who has recently been hired at UC, I am keenly aware that the University is often in competition with a number of top public and private universities for new hires. Moreover, as increasing numbers of top universities offer these benefits not having them at UC will be a significant disadvantage in attracting and retaining faculty. I have no doubt that endorsing this proposal would benefit the university but I also feel that it is the fair and principled action to take.

### Notice

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

Sandra 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>

## Assembly: Meeting in Berkeley October 29

(Continued from Page 2)

three panels are overseeing this analysis, and to seek input from Assembly members regarding the organization and effectiveness of the Senate. In addition, Weiss expects to provide Assembly members with a briefing on the contracts UC signed last month for continued management of the Department of Energy laboratories at Livermore, Berkeley, and Los Alamos, New Mexico.

In business items, the Assembly is expected to take up the issue, raised in last year's Assembly, of the date at which UC campuses count student enrollment in courses. This past May, Assembly Representative Quirino Paris of UC Davis charged that UC is misrepresenting its course enrollments by taking student head-counts in the first few weeks of each term, rather than at the term's end when a proportion of students have generally dropped out of courses. The result, he said, is that UC has an unused teaching capacity of about 15 percent.

The Assembly referred the issue to two statewide Senate committees, which split the Paris inquiry into two questions. One was whether UC needs a systemwide policy governing add/drop

dates for courses. The lead committee in this issue, Educational Policy, has concluded it does and will present to the Assembly in October a preliminary draft of the legislation on add/drop dates. Based on the input the committee receives from the Assembly, it will proceed to draft final legislation on the issue.

The other add/drop issue was whether UC is misrepresenting its course enrollments by taking its census when it does. Having looked at the issue, the University Committee on Planning and Budget concluded this is not the case. Such "unused capacity" that comes with being budgeted for the number of students who enroll in classes — as opposed to those who finish them — is a marginal increment that is required if UC is to allow students to drop classes. Were UC to be budgeted for the number of students who finish classes it would not have the capacity to allow for the initial larger enrollments. Budgeted in this way, it would either have to reduce its course capacity or deny students the right to drop classes, the committee concluded.

## Voluntary Contribution Plan Update

### UC Voluntary Contribution Fund Performance As of August 31, 1997

Fund	Rate of Return, Last 12 Months	Rate of Return, Last 1 Month	Unit Price
Equity	31.60%	-5.48%	\$194.4
Bond	24.25%	-3.39%	\$94.6
Savings	6.22%	0.51%	N/A
ICC	7.60%	0.63%	N/A
Money Market	5.59%	0.47%	N/A
Multi-Asset	18.11%	-2.53%	\$21.8