

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY**

[see pages 2 and 3 for Representative Assembly membership list]

**NOTICE OF MEETING
Tuesday, November 27, 2007
3:30 p.m.
Center for Molecular Genetics
Conference Room**

ORDER OF BUSINESS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Minutes of Meeting of May 22, 2007	4
2-7. Announcements	
Chancellor Fox	Oral
Chair Posakony	Oral
Vice Chancellor Steven W. Relyea	Oral
Campus Emergency/Disaster Preparedness	
8. Special Orders	
Consent Calendar	
2006-07 Annual Reports to be received by title	
Research	14
Election of Two Members for Senate Council	19
Appointment of Members of Committee on Committees	22
9. Reports of Special Committees <i>[none]</i>	
10. Reports of Standing Committees	
<u>Reports with Recommendations (Action)</u>	
Faculty Research Lecturer	Oral
Graduate Council	
Proposal for a UCSD/SDSU Joint Doctoral Program in Geophysics (Earthquake Science and Applied Geophysics)	23
Proposal for Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Computational Science, Mathematics and Engineering Leading to the M.S. Degree	24
<u>Informational Reports</u>	
Admissions	
Proposal from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy	26
11. Reports of Faculties <i>[none]</i>	
12. Petitions of Students <i>[none]</i>	
13. Unfinished Business <i>[none]</i>	
14. New Business	

[Any member of the Academic Senate may attend and make motions at meetings of the Representative Assembly; however, only members of the Representative Assembly may second motions and vote.]

REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY, 2007-2008 MEMBERSHIP

Ex Officio Members:

Chair of Division	James W. Posakony
Vice Chair of Division	Daniel J. Donoghue
Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)	Donald P. Rutherford
Chair, Committee on Admissions	Hans P. Paar
Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity	James E. Rauch
Chair, Committee on Committees	J. Hampton Atkinson
Chair, Committee on Campus/Community Environment	Paul A. Libby
Chair, Committee on Educational Policy (CEP)	Kim Griest
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare	Carlos Waisman
Chair, Graduate Council	Vistasp M. Karbhari
Chair, Committee on Planning & Budget	Richard A. Firtel
Chair, Committee on Privilege & Tenure	Miller S. Puckette
Chair, Committee on Research	William S. Hodgkiss
Chancellor	Marye Anne Fox
Senior Vice Chancellor - Academic Affairs	Paul W. Drake
Vice Chancellor - Health Sciences	David A. Brenner
Vice Chancellor - Marine Science	Anthony Haymet
Vice Chancellor - Research	Arthur B. Ellis

Elected Members:

Alternates:

Divisional Representatives

		Charles L. Perrin	('08)	Francesca Torriani	('08)
		Andrew T. Scull	('08)	Virgil L. Woods	('08)
		Richard E. Attiyeh	('09)	David Goodblatt	('09)
		Joel E. Dimsdale	('09)	Paul K. L. Yu	('09)
Revelle College	(2)	Mark J. Machina	('08)	_____	('08)
		Christine Harris	('08)	_____	('08)
John Muir College	(2)	Geert Schmid-Schoenbein	('08)	David Goodblatt	('08)
		Alan J. Daly	('09)	Alain J.J. Cohen	('09)
Marshall College	(2)	P. Benson Shing	('08)	_____	('08)
		Abraham Shragge	('08)	_____	('08)
Earl Warren College	(2)	_____		_____	('09)
		Christopher Wills	('08)	_____	('09)
Roosevelt College	(2)	_____	('09)	_____	('09)
		_____	('09)	_____	('09)
Sixth College	(2)	Phel Steinmetz	('08)	Steven A. Wasserman	('08)
		_____	('09)	_____	('09)
Emeritus Faculty		Peter Farrell	('08)	Mary Corrigan	('08)
Anesthesiology	(1)	Wendy Campana	('08)	Linda Sorkin	('08)
Anthropology	(1)	Keith E. McNeal	('09)	Esra G. Ozyurek	('09)
Bioengineering	(1)	David Gough	('08)	Gabriel Silva	('08)
Biological Sciences	(2)	Timothy S. Baker	('08)	Maarten J. Chrispeels	('08)
		Nigel Crawford	('08)	Paul A. Price	('08)
Cellular/Molecular Med.	(1)	_____	('09)	_____	('09)
Chemistry/ Biochemistry	(2)	Joseph W. Watson	('08)	Arnold Rheingold	('08)
		Emmanouil Theodorakis	('09)	Gourisankar Ghosh	('09)
Cognitive Science	(1)	Jaime A. Pineda	('09)	Sarah Creel	('09)
Communication	(1)	Michael Schudson	('08)	Elizabeth Cartwright	('08)
CSE	(2)	_____		_____	
		_____		_____	
ECE	(2)	_____		_____	
		_____		_____	
Economics	(2)	Kate Antonovics	('08)	Julie Cullen	('08)
		Mark J. Machina	('08)	_____	
Ethnic Studies	(1)	_____		_____	
Family & Prev. Medicine	(1)	Steven Edland	('08)	Susanne May	('08)

History	(2)	Judith M. Hughes ('08)	Michael Provence ('08)
		Luis A. Alvarez ('09)	Hasan Kayali ('09)
IR&PS	(1)	Richard E. Feinberg ('09)	Ulrike Schaede ('09)
Linguistics	(1)	Rachel I. Mayberry ('09)	Roger P. Levy ('09)
Literature	(2)	Robert Cancel ('08)	Lisa M. Lowe ('08)
Mathematics	(2)	James R. Bunch ('09)	Cristian Popescu ('09)
		John D. Eggers ('08)	David A. Meyer ('08)
MAE	(2)	Steven Buckley ('08)	Juan Lasheras ('08)
Medicine	(2)	Joshua Fierer ('09)	
		Renate Pilz ('08)	Daniel T. O'Connor ('08)
Music	(1)		
Neurosciences	(2)	Eliezer Masliah ('08)	Anders Dale ('08)
		Binhai Zheng ('09)	
Ophthalmology	(1)		
Orthopaedics	(1)	Douglas J. Chang ('08)	Reid Abrams ('08)
Pathology	(2)	Michael J. Kelner ('08)	Nigel A. Calcutt ('08)
Pediatrics	(2)		
Pharmacology	(1)	Morton Printz ('08)	Aikaterina Akasoglou ('08)
Pharmacy & Pharm Sci	(1)	Tadeusz Molinski ('09)	Philip Bourne ('09)
Philosophy	(1)	Gila Sher ('09)	Michael Hardimon ('09)
Physics	(2)	John Goodkind ('09)	Kim Griest ('09)
		Frank Hsia-San Shu ('08)	Michael L. Norman ('08)
Political Science	(2)	Gerald Mackie ('08)	Scott Desposato ('08)
		Thaddeus Kousser ('09)	Zoltan L. Hajnal ('09)
Psychiatry	(2)		
		J. Vincent Filoteo ('08)	Thomas Rutledge ('08)
Psychology	(1)	Vladimir J. Konecni (F) ('08)	Sandra Brown (F) ('08)
Radiology	(2)		
Reproductive Medicine	(1)		
SIO	(5)	Douglas H. Bartlett ('08)	T. Guy Masters ('08)
		David M. Checkley ('08)	Paterno R. Castillo ('08)
		LeRoy M. Dorman ('09)	Dean H. Roemmich ('09)
		Joel R. Norris ('09)	David R. Hilton ('09)
		George Sugihara ('09)	Bradley S. Moore ('09)
Sociology	(1)	Rebecca Klatch ('08)	David P. Phillips ('08)
Structural Engineering	(1)		
Surgery	(2)		
Theatre and Dance	(2)	James Carmody ('08)	Liam P. Clancy ('08)
Visual Arts	(2)	Fred Lonidier ('08)	Kuiyi Shen ('08)
		Lev Manovich ('08)	Charles (Jordan)Crandall ('08)

Advisors:

Research - GC	(3)		
- SIO		Bruce Cornuelle ('09)	Bianca Brahamsha ('09)
- HS			
Undergraduate Students	(2)		
Graduate Students	(2)	Charles Saenz ('08)	

**MINUTES
REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
ACADEMIC SENATE
SAN DIEGO
May 22, 2007**

Chair Powell called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. A quorum was present (see attached attendance sheet), as were other Academic Senate members and guests. He welcomed members and guests to the last meeting of the academic year and reviewed the rules governing privilege of the floor and voting of the Representative Assembly.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF APRIL 24, 2007

The minutes of the Representative Assembly meeting of April 24, 2007 were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR

Chancellor Fox conveyed her appreciation to Assembly members for their dedicated service and excellent contributions to the University's mission. She noted that progress was being made in the recruitments for the new Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (VCSA). She invited all to attend the open forum that will be held to meet the three candidates for the position of VCSA. She encouraged members to attend many of the events scheduled on campus including the ground breaking ceremony for the new Music building, the open faculty forum with UC President Dynes, and any of the twelve commencement ceremonies.

Reporting on The Regents meeting in May, Chancellor Fox said she was pleased that plans to expand the campus' student housing and to improve health care for the community with the expansion of beds at UCSD Thornton Medical Center have been approved and have community support. Regarding UC retirement plans and eligibility of faculty affiliated with the Howard Hughes Medicine Institute (HHMI) and the Ludwig Institute for Cancer Research (LICR), Chancellor Fox said concern was stated and The Regents have the matter under consideration.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR OF THE DIVISION

Chair Powell announced that UC President Dynes will be on campus on May 25, 2007. He is visiting with faculty in an open forum on each campus as part of a long-range planning process. He also encouraged faculty to attend the upcoming Academic Senate Distinguished Teaching Award ceremony on June 1. The Chancellor has asked the Academic Senate for input on nominations for honors and awards at the national level. The Academic Senate is happy to support this initiative and looks forward to having faculty from a broad range of disciplines help in identifying prospective nominees.

Chair Powell updated the Assembly on Regents' Item RE-89 – Adoption of Policy Restricting University Acceptance of Funding from the Tobacco Industry – and noted how different campuses are managing the issue. He noted that the systemwide Academic Council at its April 25 meeting voted to recommend to the systemwide Academic Assembly that the Assembly oppose RE-89. The Academic Assembly voted to oppose the adoption of RE-89 with a vote of 43 in favor and 4 not in favor, with 3 abstentions, at its May 9 meeting.

With regards to the Representative Assembly, a special meeting was scheduled for May 10 in response to a valid petition. The meeting was not called to order due to lack of a quorum. RE-89 was on The Regents' May 17 agenda, but consideration of this item was postponed until the July Regents' meeting.

Chair Powell reported that faculty received an email announcement regarding the Report of the Senate-Administration Task Force on Multidisciplinary Joint Appointments. The Senate was surprised to see this report circulated before receiving a request and opportunity to review it. Given the lateness in the academic year, the

Senate's review process will commence in Fall Quarter. He reminded the Assembly that under the system of shared governance appropriate consideration of administrative initiatives is the responsibility of the Senate and its committees and until the Senate has responded, the matter is not appropriate for general dissemination.

Chair Powell conveyed his special thanks to Vice Chair James Posakony for his counsel throughout the year, and wished him and incoming Vice Chair Daniel Donoghue the very best. Chair Powell expressed his gratitude to his Senate colleagues for their selfless dedication to shared governance of this campus and to the University of California. Through the many hours devoted to the Senate through its committees, the faculty continue to keep UCSD, and UC, the premiere public institution of higher academic learning. He described his experience as Chair as very gratifying and said that, in terms of the Senate and shared governance, UCSD has a robust, organized voice of faculty governance and is a model campus.

Chair Powell conveyed his thanks to Chancellor Fox, Senior Vice Chancellor Chandler, and Vice Chancellors (VC) Brenner, Ellis, Haymet, Relyea, Watson, and Interim VC Matthews, and Dean Barrett for all their hard work and for sharing a particularly collegial and constructive relationship with the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate. He wished VC Watson well in his retirement and thanked him for 40 years of dedicated service and wished SVC Chandler well in her new position at the Salk Institute.

Chair Powell thanked all the Academic Senate staff members, Diane Hamann, Gaye Hill, Trevor Buchanan, Missie Jacobs, Michelle Null, Miky Ramirez, Darlene Salmon, Ellen Sherwood, and Mary Woolridge, for their exemplary support and continuity for the Senate's work, which could not be done without them.

Chair Powell asked for and received unanimous consent to reorder the agenda to have Professor Laurence Armi present the update on the activities of the Committee on Library after Vice Chair Posakony's announcements due to a conflict with Professor Armi's teaching commitment.

Results of the May 11, 2007 Election – James W. Posakony, Vice Chair of the Division

Vice Chair Posakony announced the results of the May 11, 2007 election for 2007-2008 Academic Senate Officers and members of the Committee on Committees as follows:

Vice Chair (Chair Designate) for a two-year term, effective September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2009 [the first year will be served as Vice Chair (Chair Designate) and second as Chair of the Division]:

Daniel J. Donoghue (Chemistry and Biochemistry)

Divisional Representatives to the Assembly of the Academic Senate (systemwide) for a two-year term effective September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2009:

Richard E. Attiyeh (Economics)
Joel E. Dimsdale (Psychiatry)

Alternate Divisional Representatives to the Assembly of the Academic Senate:

David Goodblatt (History)
Paul K.L. Yu (Electrical and Computer Engineering)

Committee on Committees At-Large member for a three-year term, effective September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2010:

Cecil W. Lytle (Music)

Committee on Committees member from an Engineering Department for a three-year term, effective September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2010:

Jan B. Talbot (Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering)

Committee on Committees member from a Health Sciences Department for a three-year term, effective September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2010:

Henry C. Powell (Pathology)

Committee on Committees member from a Sciences Department for a three-year term, effective September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2010:

Ruth J. Williams (Mathematics)

Committee on Committees member from a Social Sciences Department for a three-year term, effective September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2010:

Peter A. Gourevitch (IR/PS / Political Science)

Vice Chair Posakony congratulated and thanked all nominees for their willingness to stand for election. The number of valid ballots cast in this election was 509, which represents a 29.2% turnout of the current Senate membership.

In recognition of Chair Powell's extensive dedicated service to the University and to shared governance, Vice Chair Posakony expressed his appreciation and sincere thanks to Chair Powell by presenting him with four small gifts to ease his transition: a pack of cigarettes, a shovel, a bottle of wine, and a beach chair.

Committee on Library

Update on Committee Activities and Issues

Professor Laurence Armi, Chair of the Committee on Library (COL), reported on the Scholarly Communication Luncheon Series sponsored by the UCSD Libraries and the Committees on Library and Academic Personnel to raise awareness of the problems with the current system of scholarly communication and develop support among faculty for change. COL is of the opinion that the most important issue facing the University at this time is the issue of open access. Open access is a desirable goal for UC with broad impact for scholarly publications in the face of increasingly higher subscription costs. Professor Armi briefed the Assembly on the economic impact of page charges and library subscriptions, and outlined various options for copyright release and management being proposed in the UC Open Access Policy. Chair Armi encouraged faculty to be diligent in their considerations of this issue. There being no questions, Professor Armi thanked the Assembly for the opportunity to report.

Update on Calit2 Activities

Chair Powell introduced and welcomed Ramesh R. Rao, Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering and UCSD Division Director of the California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (Calit2). Professor Rao thanked the Assembly for the invitation and the opportunity to present an update on Calit2's activities and honors. He reported that the Richard C. Atkinson Hall, home to UCSD Calit2, recently received top honors from the San Diego Architectural Foundation's "Orchid and Onion Awards" for creative use of materials and dramatic arrangement of windows. Professor Rao said that the Building Advisory Committee had a salient role in influencing the architects to put forth a design consistent with Calit2's open interdisciplinary mission. He briefly reported on Calit2's successful operational activities and latest collaborative efforts and research projects

that include, but are not limited to, Responding to Crises and Unexpected Events (RESCUE) and the three-year joint project of Calit2 and the UCSD School of Medicine's Wireless Internet Information System for Medical Response in Disaster (WIISARD). Both projects bring together broad-based participation from academia, industry, the military, and emergency responders from the City and County of San Diego. Professor Rao added that UCSD has some of the most advanced network capabilities in the world and exceptional technical staff support, and noted Calit2's special capability of "living laboratories" that include teams of biologists, physicists, chemists, and materials scientists working together in a clean room. The materials characterization laboratory, being co-located with artists and computer scientists in the New Media Arts Facilities, includes an immersive visualization laboratory and a 3-D fabrication and scanning laboratory. Chair Powell thanked Professor Rao for his informative presentation and solicited questions from the floor. There being no questions, Professor Rao again thanked the Assembly for the opportunity to report.

Proposed Changes to Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM) Section 230-28, Academic Advancements and Reappointments

Chair Powell welcomed Associate Vice Chancellor Robert Bitmead to the Assembly. AVC Bitmead thanked the Assembly for the opportunity to present material on the proposed revisions to PPM 230-28 and briefed the Assembly of the process of compiling recommendations, drafting revisions of the policy, management consultation and formal campus review.

AVC Bitmead provided a brief summary of the proposed revisions, including updates to reflect changes and/or additions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), reorganization of sections to improve placement of policy information, technical edits, and the removal of outdated, inaccurate or duplicated information. Major changes proposed include clarification to the teaching requirement in the Adjunct Professor series, additional information on the Health Science Clinical Professor series requirement for scholarly activity, and the merging of information regarding Lecturers with Potential Security of Employment and Lecturers with Security of Employment. He noted that the revised policy as written clarifies that Research Scientists at the Associate and Full levels must contribute campus and/or professional service.

With regard to Section VI, AVC Bitmead noted that the policy has been revised to clarify that files not received by the campus deadlines would not be considered until the following year. Section VII.B. has been revised to clarify the rules for recommending a "no change" action or a deferral; salary information has also been updated. Promotion from the assistant level is not considered an acceleration unless it is to a higher-than-normal step in the rank, regardless of when it is proposed. Information on conducting a Career Equity Review has been added in Section VII.C.

With regard to Section VII.D and VII.E, the policy for evaluating assistant-rank appointees, AVC Bitmead noted that the policy recognizes the distinction between Senate appointees and non-Senate appointees and has been divided into two parts. When asked further about the reasoning for the change, AVC Bitmead explained that differences in resourcing and grievance mechanisms and compliance with APM 137 required the revision. He noted that both parts include the elimination of the sixth-year appraisal, with only one appraisal or promotion review required at the fourth year. He reported that although data indicate that most faculty are reviewed for promotion in their 6th year of appointment, reviews in the seventh year are still necessary; therefore, this section is intended to clarify when such a postponement is warranted and the process for requesting to postpone the promotion review.

Chair Powell thanked AVC Bitmead for his informative presentation and solicited questions from the floor. A member commented that with regard to evaluating assistant-rank appointees, a large number of faculty with research (non-Senate) and ladder-rank (Senate) split appointments have expressed concern that the proposed revisions make it difficult to reconcile and to treat the two series equally. In response to AVC Bitmead's reply that Marine Sciences and Health Science can develop procedures to accommodate the expectations in both of the series, the member expressed further concern for shared governance and the morale and tone of shared academic

endeavor. Another member was concerned that the proposed policy has no safeguard or mechanism in place and that all authority for reappointment for Researchers resides with the department chair. Professor Karis, chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), expressed concern for the lack of involvement and oversight by CAP being proposed in the advancement of research scientists.

After a brief discussion, a member suggested that the Assembly may want to form an *ad hoc* committee to further discuss CAP's and other faculty's concerns on this matter. AVC Bitmead noted that the June 8th deadline for comments was fast approaching. Chair Powell said that he would take the matter to the Senate Council for further discussion.

A member asked for further clarification of the one course per year or equivalent and suggested that language be modified in terms of hours of workload instead; as is, this language could represent one lecture a year for Adjunct Professors within Health Sciences.

There being no further questions, Professor Bitmead thanked the Assembly for the opportunity to report.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Consent Calendar

A member referred to the 2005-06 annual report of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and moved that the report be moved to new business for discussion. The motion was seconded and passed by show of hands.

The consent calendar, including annual reports of the Committee on Educational Policy, Graduate Council, and the Committee on International Education, was received by title for filing without objection.

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer

Faculty Research Lecturer Award Nominations for 2006-07 – Professor Richard Arneson, Chair of the Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer, reported that the Committee received very few nominations (one in the Sciences, two in the Arts/Humanities/Social Sciences) in response to its March call letter requesting nominations. The Committee will solicit nominations once more without prejudice to those nominations already received before deciding on award recipients to recommend to the Representative Assembly.

Graduate Council

Chair Powell reported that Graduate Council has four items for the Assembly's consideration today and called upon Professor Eric Watkins, Chair of the Graduate Council.

"Class 1 Re-review" of UCSD/CSUSM Joint Ed.D. Program In Educational Leadership

On behalf of the Graduate Council, Professor Watkins moved approval of the continuation of the Joint UCSD/CSU San Marcos Doctorate of Education Program in Educational Leadership. [Because the motion was made on behalf of a committee, it required no second.] The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

A Proposal for a Concentration in Cultural Studies in the Latin American Studies Master of Arts Program

On behalf of the Graduate Council, Professor Watkins moved approval of the proposed addition for a Concentration in Cultural Studies in Latin American Studies Master of Arts Program. [Because the

motion was made on behalf of a committee, it required no second.] The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

Proposal for a Master of Fine Arts: Dance Theatre

On behalf of the Graduate Council, Professor Watkins moved approval for the proposed Master of Fine Arts: Dance Theatre. [Because the motion was made on behalf of a committee, it required no second.] The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

Proposed Amendment of Regulation 716 – Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.) Degree

Professor Watkins briefly reviewed the history of the inadvertent omission in the text that had occurred when the Assembly approved Academic Senate Regulation 716 at its June 8, 2006 meeting. The changes proposed in Section (3)(3) - Advancement to Candidacy, bring Regulation 716 into compliance with Divisional Regulation 715. He noted that the proposed regulation had been found to be consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction.

On behalf of the Graduate Council, Professor Watkins moved approval for the proposed amendment of Regulation 716. [Because the motion was made on behalf of a committee, it required no second.] The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Motion Regarding Committee Chair Reports

Chair Powell briefly reviewed the motion made by Professor Morton Printz and the Assembly's decision to postpone for timely consideration of the issue at the January 23 Assembly meeting, referring to page 3 of the January 23, 2007 minutes. He said irrespective of the vote to call on chairs of the standing committees to report, committee chairs are invited to present on issues that are of interest to the Assembly. Chair Powell called upon Professor Morton Printz.

In response to Chair Powell's suggestion to withdraw the motion, Professor Printz acknowledged the Senate Council's efforts regarding regular reports from the Senate Committees this year, but believed that his motion had merit and requested that the Assembly consider the motion, previously seconded:

That the Representative Assembly of the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate receive oral reports from the Chairpersons of all major Academic Senate Standing Committees periodically throughout the academic year. Such oral reports would be designed to summarize issues under committee consideration, decisions, and recommendations the standing Committee makes at the Academic Council, review of current and/or forthcoming issues of concern to Faculty and the Administration, information from Systemwide meetings, attendance, etc. Members of the Representative Assembly would be encouraged to comment on committee deliberations and to raise issues which Members feel the Committee might/should address at their future Committee meetings. The Chair of the Academic Senate should establish and impose time limits on the oral presentations and/or subsequent discussions.

Chair Powell called for discussion. Members discussed the intent of the motion to make Senate business more broadly accessible to members, the ability of the Representative Assembly to manage issues in a timely manner, the advantage of vagueness in the language of the motion with regard to time limits, and the Senate Council's role and discretion as to which committees would report. A member expressed concern for the confidential activities of the Committee on Academic Personnel and the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

A friendly amendment was made and accepted to revise the first sentence of the motion to read as follows:

That the Representative Assembly of the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate receive oral reports periodically from the Chairpersons of all major Academic Senate Standing Committees throughout the academic year.

After a brief discussion, the amended motion was approved by show of hands, with no objections and four abstentions.

NEW BUSINESS

2005-06 Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel

Chair Powell called on Professor Printz. Professor Printz referred to CAP's chart of the titled, Ad Hoc Committee History (page 3), and recalled concerns raised last year in the Assembly regarding shared governance in the peer review process and the use of campus ad hocs, and inquired into the reason for the significant increase in the percentage of cases where the CAP acted as its own ad hoc committee over the last five years. This change is inconsistent with the second sentence of the paragraph titled, Campus *Ad Hoc* Committees, that stated the reason for CAP to look to a campus *ad hoc* committee is that it is not feasible for CAP members to possess expertise in all the specialties reviewed each year.

Professor Printz stated that disassociating faculty from the academic review process would set a dangerous precedent, and asked the Assembly to address this issue next year. Other members offered support and expressed agreement that serving on *ad hoc* committees is an important aspect of being a faculty member of this campus, key to the culture of shared governance between the Senate and the administration and to the "socialization" of faculty to the norms of faculty review beyond the department level.

CAP Chair Karis stated that the nature of the process and the volume of files have changed significantly over the past few years and that educating faculty is not the primary purpose of campus *ad hoc* committees. Campus *ad hoc* committees advise CAP when extra-departmental and field-specific expertise is needed and can be requested at any time at any stage of the review process. The decrease in the use of campus *ad hoc* committees is not only an issue of dramatically increasing the total length of time to complete a file review, it must be absolutely necessary to improve the quality of the outcome. CAP has found that better file preparation, increased use of departmental ad hoc committees, and input from department chairs has resulted in an increased flow of expert information and has reduced CAP's need for campus *ad hoc* committees.

Chair Powell stated that the Assembly would discuss this matter in academic year 2007-2008. A motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously to receive by title for filing without objection the 2005-06 annual report of the Committee on Academic Personnel.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

Gaye Hill

ATTENDANCE/REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY--2006-07

MEMBERS

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:	10/24	1/23	3/6	4/24	5/10	5/22
Henry C. Powell (Chair of Division)	+	+	+	+	+	+
James W. Posakony (Vice Chair of Division)	+	+	+	+	+	+
Aleck Karis (Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel)			+			+
Hans P. Paar (Chair, Committee on Admissions)						
Theodore C. Chan (Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity)			+	+		+
Ann C. Rearden (Chair, Committee on Committees) (F)		-	-	-	-	-
William A. Coles (Chair, Committee on Committees) (W, Sp)	-	+	+	+	+	+
Alain J.-J. Cohen (Chair, Committee on Campus & Community Environment)	+	+		+		+
Scott Ashford (Chair, Committee on Educational Policy)				+		
Marjorie Flavin (Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare) (F)		-	-	-	-	-
Carlos Waisman (Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare) (W, Sp)	-		+			
Eric Watkins (Chair, Graduate Council)	+	+	+	+		+
Andrew Dickson (Chair, Committee on Planning & Budget)	+	+	+	+	+	+
Miller S. Puckette (Chair, Committee on Privilege & Tenure)						
William S. Hodgkiss (Chair, Committee on Research)		+	+	+		+
Marye Anne Fox (Chancellor)		+	+			+
Marsha Chandler (Senior Vice Chancellor – Academic Affairs)		+				
David A. Brenner (Vice Chancellor – Health Sciences)	-	-				
Anthony Haymet (Vice Chancellor – Marine Sciences)						
Arthur B. Ellis (Vice Chancellor – Research)						
AT-LARGE MEMBERS: none						
ELECTED MEMBERS: [alternates in square brackets]						
David S. Luft/[Alain J.-J. Cohen] (Divisional Representative)		[+]		+	+	+
Thomas M. O’Neil/[Virgil L. Woods] (Divisional Representative)		+	+	[+]	+	
Charles L. Perrin/[Andrew T. Scull] (Divisional Representative)	+	+	+	+	+	
Andrew T. Scull/[Francesca Torriani] (Divisional Representative)			[+]		+	
Mark Machina/[] (Revelle College)	+		+		+	
Christine Harris/[] (Revelle College)	+					
William H. Propp/[David R. Tytler] (Muir College)	+	+	[+]	+		+
Geert Schmid-Schoenbein/[David Goodblatt] (Muir College)			+		[+]	+
P. Benson Shing/[] (Marshall College)	-	+	+			
Abraham J. Shragge/[] (Marshall College)	-		+			
Kevin Quest/[Rae Armantrout] (Warren College)						+
Christopher Wills/[Kevin Quest] (Warren College)	-	-			+	+
/[] (Roosevelt College)						

	10/24	1/23	3/6	4/24	5/10	5/22
/[] (Roosevelt College)						
F. Richard Moore/[] (Sixth College)						
Phel Steinmetz/[Steven A. Wasserman] (Sixth College)			[+]			
Donald R. Helinski/[Peter Farrell] (Emeritus Faculty)	[+]	[+]				[+]
Wendy Campana/[Linda Sorkin] (Anesthesiology)			+			
Katerina Semendeferi/[Paul S. Goldstein] (Anthropology)	+		+			
David Gough/[Gabriel Silva] (Bioengineering)	-	-	-		[+]	
Timothy S. Baker/[Maarten J. Chrispeels] (Biological Sciences)	+		+			
Nigel Crawford/[Marla B. Feller] (Biological Sciences)	+			+		+
/[] (Cellular & Molecular Medicine)						
Douglas Magde/[Arnold Rheingold] (Chemistry & Biochemistry)	+	+	+		+	+ [+]
Barbara Sawrey/[] (Chemistry & Biochemistry)		+		+		
/[] (Cognitive Science)						
Michael Schudson/[Elizabeth Cartwright] (Communication)			+			
Yoav S. Freund/[] (CSE)						
Dean Tullsen/[] (CSE)						
Kenneth Zeger/[Tara Javidi] (ECE)	+	+	+	+	+	+
Massimo Francheschetti/[Gabriel Rebeiz] (ECE)						
Kate Antonovics/[Julie Cullen] (Economics)	+	+	+	[+]		[+]
Natalia Molina/[Ana C. Zentella] (Ethnic Studies)						
Steven Edland/[Susanne May] (Family & Preventive Medicine)	+	+	[+]	+	+	[+]
Judith M. Hughes/[Michael Provence] (History)	+	+				
Everard Meade/[Sarah Schneewind] (History)						
Y.-H. Tohsaku/[Stephan M. Haggard] (IR/PS)	+		+			
Amalia Arvaniti/[Chris Barker] (Linguistics)						
Roddey Reid/[Anthony Edwards] (Literature)				[+]	[+]	
Robert Cancel/[Lisa Lowe](Literature)	-		+	+	+	+
Ian Abramson/[Michael Holst] (Mathematics)						+
/[] (Mathematics)						
Miroslav Krstic/[Stefan Llewellyn Smith] (Mechanical & Aerospace Eng.)	+				+	
Steven Buckley/[Juan Lasheras] (Mechanical & Aerospace Eng.)	+		+		+	
Antonino Catanzaro/[Daniel T. O'Connor] (Medicine)			+	+		
Renate B. Pilz/[Joshua Fierer] (Medicine)		+	[+]	[+]	+	
Andrew Fry/[Edwin Harkins] (Music)	[+]					
James Brewer/[Binhai Zheng] (Neurosciences)						
Eliezer Masliah/[Anders Dale] (Neurosciences)						
/[] (Ophthalmology)						
Douglas G. Chang/[Reid Abrams] (Orthopaedics)			+			+

	10/24	1/23	3/6	4/24	5/10	5/22
Michael Kelne/[Nigel Calcutt] (Pathology)	-		+	+ [+]	+	+ [+]
/[] (Pathology)						
Joel Lavine/[Paul Grimm] (Pediatrics)						
Morton Printz/[Aikaterini Akasoglou] (Pharmacology)		+			+	+
Tracy Handel/[Tadeusz Molinski] (Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences)	+	+		+	[+]	+
Donald P. Rutherford/[] (Philosophy)	+			+		+
Frank Hsia-San Shu/[Michael L. Norman/Vivek A. Sharma] (Physics)	- [+]					
Benjamin Grinstein/[George M. Fuller] (Physics)			+	+		[+]
Clark Gibson/[Thaddeus B. Kousser] (Political Science)		+	[+]			+
Gerald Mackie/[Scott Desposato] (Political Science)	+	+	+	+	+	+
J. Vincent Filoteo/[Thomas Rutledge] (Psychiatry)	[+]	[+]	+	[+]		+
Mark G. Myers/[Laura B. Dunn] (Psychiatry)	+	[+]	+			
Ben A. Williams/[] (Psychology)	+	+	+	+	+	+
Roland R. Lee/[] (Radiology)	+	+	+	+		+
Paul Stark/[] (Radiology)	+	+	+	+		
Shunichi Shimasaki/[Emily Lukacz] (Reproductive Medicine)		+	+	[+]	+	+
Paola Cessi/[Steven Constable] (SIO)	+		+	+	+	+ [+]
Christopher Charles/[Laurence Armi] (SIO)			[+]		+	[+]
Brian Palenik/[Miriam Kastner] (SIO)	+	+	+	+		+
Douglas H. Bartlett/[T. Guy Masters] (SIO)						
David M. Checkley/[Paterno R. Castillo] (SIO)	+	+	+	+	+	
Rebecca Klatch/[David P. Phillips] (Sociology)	+	+		+	+	[+]
Yu Qiao/[Falko Kuester] (Structural Engineering)			+			
/[] (Surgery)						
/[] (Surgery)						
James Carmody/[] (Theatre & Dance)		+				
Fred S. Lonidier/[Kuiyi Shen] (Visual Arts)	-	-	+	+	+	+
Lev Manovich/[Charles (Jordan) Crandall] (Visual Arts)	-	-	-			
ADVISORS						
/[] (General Campus Research Rep)						
Peter Worcester/[Jonathan Berger] (SIO Research Rep)				+		
/[] (SOM Research Rep)						
Harry Khanna (Undergraduate Student Rep)	+					
Rabia Paracha (Undergraduate Student Rep)	+	+				
Garo Bournoutian (Graduate Student Rep)	+					
Jenny Collins (Graduate Student Rep)	+	+		+		+

KEY + = present [+]= alternate - not member

October 23, 2007

**ANNUAL REPORT
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
FISCAL YEAR 2006/07**

DIVISION COMMITTEE

The Committee on Research (COR) parent policy committee met monthly during the year to consider a number of issues. During the course of these meetings, the following principal issues were addressed and reports were prepared accordingly.

1. Annual Report, Committee on Research, FY 2005/06
2. FY 2006/07 Augmentation of COR Funding
3. Recommendations from the Joint Academic Senate and UCOP Workgroup on Recycling Multi-Campus Research Units (MRU) Funds
4. Organized Research Unit Five Year Review: Center for Molecular Agriculture
5. Five Year Review of the Glycobiology and Research Training Center (GRTC) – Response to 2005-06 Senate Council's Request for Additional Information
6. Report of the Senate Task Force on Faculty Service
7. Report of the Secretary of Education's Commission on the Future of Higher Education
8. General Campus, Health Sciences, and Marine Sciences Subcommittee on Research Policy Guidelines
9. Systemwide Review of Proposed Senate Bylaw 16 – Executive Director
10. Universitywide Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) Report, "Institutional Review Boards (IRB) at UC: IRB Operations and the Researcher's Experience"
11. Organized Research Unit, (ORU) Fifteen Year (Sunset) Review: Stein Institute for Research on Aging (SIRA)
12. Report of the Ad Hoc Work Group on Technology Transfer and Interaction with Industry [Invited Guest: Alan Paa, Assistant Vice Chancellor]
13. Organized Research Unit Sunset Review: Institute for Nonlinear Science
14. Five Year Academic Review: California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (Calit2)
15. Open Access Policy
16. UCSD-WUN Grant Competition Pilot Program

GENERAL CAMPUS SUBCOMMITTEE

The General Campus Subcommittee met on December 8, 2006; and February 15 and May 11, 2007 to review research and bridge grant applications for FY 2006/07. The Subcommittee reviewed the results of the bridge funding grants previously awarded. Based on the progress reports received on these projects, the Subcommittee was convinced of the importance and need for continuation of the Bridge Funding program initiated in FY1995/96. Due to budget constraints, the Subcommittee agreed to continue its policy limiting the ceiling for bridge funding to \$25,000. Two calls for bridge funding applications were transmitted. The Subcommittee reviewed four bridge program applications; two of the applications were funded, totaling \$50,000. Two requests totaling \$45,138 were denied because they did not meet the criteria for the bridge funding program. Applicants were required to demonstrate strong proposals for continuing research programs that had received peer-reviewed extramural funding for at least four of the last five years and, that despite efforts to re-establish funding, were without any funding between June 30 and December 31, 2006. The Subcommittee's evaluation of proposals emphasized the quality of the science, past publication record, and the likelihood of future funding. Four calls for applications to support Travel to a Scholarly Meeting were transmitted in FY 2006/07.

Existing policies regarding awards for bridge funding, individual research proposals, travel to scholarly meetings, faculty research photocopying, and the intercampus exchange program were thoroughly reviewed by the Subcommittee; a few notable modifications were incorporated in the application call letters. The Subcommittee agreed to change its policy limiting the ceiling for individual grants to \$15,000 and the maximum cumulative support figure to \$45,000 over a ten-year period. The Subcommittee decided to continue its policy of accepting applications not to exceed \$10,000/year for up to two years (i.e., two-year grants up to \$20,000) that fall within the following categories: (a) essential seed money for new projects by junior faculty, and (b) novel interdisciplinary research programs for groups of faculty. These awards do count against the 10-year cumulative support limit.

Research – Of 192 individual applications reviewed, 136 were funded for a total of \$898,540; twelve grantees returned \$2,378 in unused funds for redistribution. Four awards totaling \$33,233 were made possible by the Earl

C. Anthony Endowment Trust Fund. Fifty-six requests totaling \$409,713 were denied primarily due to budget constraints. The breakdown of awards by faculty rank is as follows:

<u>Level</u>	<u>Awards</u>
Assistant Professor	36
Associate Professor	32
Professor	64
Professor Emeritus	1
LPSOE	1
Senior LSOE	<u>2</u>
	136

The breakdown by department and discipline is as follows:

<u>Department</u>	<u>Awards</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Anthropology	7	57,088
Cognitive Science	6	51,122
Communication	4	35,867
Economics	5	37,731
Education Studies	1	9,357
Ethnic Studies	4	17,751
Graduate School of IR/PS	2	15,870
Linguistics	0	0
Political Science	6	39,886
Psychology	3	19,664
Sociology	<u>7</u>	<u>42,463</u>
Total Social Sciences	45	\$326,799
History	12	76,504
Literature	9	40,490
Music	17	85,879
Philosophy	10	45,818
Theatre & Dance	6	29,969
Visual Arts	<u>13</u>	<u>78,595</u>
Total Humanities and Arts	67	\$357,255
Biology	10	88,302
Chemistry & Biochemistry	4	37,761
Mathematics	0	0
Physics	<u>2</u>	<u>16,852</u>
Total Natural Sciences	16	\$142,915
Bioengineering	1	10,000
CSE	2	20,000
ECE	3	25,878
MAE	1	5,740
Structural Engineering	<u>1</u>	<u>9,952</u>
Total Engineering	8	\$ 71,750
Total Individual Research Awards:	<u>136</u>	<u>\$898,540</u>
<u>Bridge Funding Awards</u>		
Biology	1	\$ 25,000
Psychology	<u>1</u>	<u>25,000</u>
Total Bridge Funding Awards:	2	\$ 50,000
GRAND TOTAL:	<u>138</u>	<u>\$ 948,540</u>

Faculty Research Photocopying (FY 06/07) – Twenty-three awards totaling \$83,167 were made to academic departments in support of faculty research photocopying. A formula of \$100 per Academic Senate member was used to determine the amount of this award. Unused funds totaling \$11,322 were returned to for redistribution.

Intercampus Exchange Program (FY 06/07) – Twenty-four academic departments received grants totaling \$92,754 in support of the University's Intercampus Exchange Program. A formula of \$75 per Academic Senate

member plus \$11 per registered graduate student was used to determine the total amount of this award. Unused funds totaling \$69,926 were returned to the Subcommittee for redistribution.

Travel to a Scholarly Meeting – Of 226 applications reviewed, 214 were funded, totaling \$131,220; \$16,361 was returned for redistribution; twelve requests totaling \$8,609 were denied. Ninety-eight of the trips funded were for foreign travel and 116 for domestic travel. The breakdown by discipline and department is as follows:

<u>Department</u>	<u>Awards</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Anthropology	6	\$ 2,593
Cognitive Science	1	253
Communication	15	6,586
Economics	10	6,602
Education Studies	4	2,560
Ethnic Studies	3	2,172
Graduate School of IR/PS	4	2,609
Linguistics	3	1,151
Political Science	18	7,561
Psychology	7	3,886
Rady School of Mgmt	1	350
Sociology	<u>18</u>	<u>8,299</u>
Total Social Sciences	90	\$ 44,622
History	19	11,157
Literature	17	10,054
Music	8	4,922
Philosophy	7	2,876
Theatre & Dance	6	4,261
Visual Arts	<u>7</u>	<u>5,101</u>
Total Humanities & Arts	64	\$ 38,371
Biology	12	8,257
Chemistry & Biochemistry	13	10,336
Mathematics	0	0
Physics	<u>14</u>	<u>12,887</u>
Total Natural Sciences	39	\$ 31,480
Bioengineering	3	2,135
CSE	3	2,004
ECE	4	2,833
MAE	9	7,803
Structural Engineering	<u>2</u>	<u>1,972</u>
Total Engineering	21	\$ 16,747
GRAND TOTAL:	<u>214</u>	<u>\$ 131,220</u>

HEALTH SCIENCES SUBCOMMITTEE

The Health Sciences Subcommittee met on December 4, 2006 and February 7 and May 30, 2007 to review applications for FY 2006/07. Of the nine bridge funding applications reviewed; eight were funded, totaling \$162,771. One request for \$10,523 was denied due to budget constraints. The existing policies regarding awards for research and travel to scholarly meetings were thoroughly reviewed by the Subcommittee, and the modifications were incorporated in the application call letters. The Subcommittee agreed to continue its policy limiting the ceiling for individual grants to \$10,000 and bridge funding to \$25,000. The Subcommittee also agreed that priority will continue to be given to junior faculty; and, faculty who have received support on three consecutive occasions will be considered only for projects leading them into a different research direction. Four calls for applications to support Travel to a Scholarly Meeting were transmitted.

Research – Of 80 research applications reviewed, 28 were funded, totaling \$275,112; one grantee returned \$129 in unused funds for redistribution. Fifty-two requests totaling \$505,042 were denied primarily due to budget constraints. The breakdown of these awards by rank is as follows:

<u>Level</u>	<u>Awards</u>
Asst Professor	3
Asst Prof of Clinical X	1
Asst Clinical Professor	4
Asst Adjunct Professor	7
Asst Project Scientist	7
Assoc Adjunct Professor	1
Professor	3
Professor-in-Residence	1
Professor of Clinical X	<u>1</u>
	28

The breakdown by department is as follows:

<u>Department</u>	<u>Awards</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Anesthesiology	0	\$ 0
Cancer Center	0	0
Family & Preventive Medicine	3	26,437
Medicine	9	92,400
Neurosciences	0	0
Ophthalmology	0	0
Orthopedic Surgery	0	0
Pathology	2	20,000
Pediatrics	3	28,500
Pharmacology	1	10,000
Psychiatry	3	29,700
Radiology	2	18,075
Reproductive Medicine	3	30,000
SSPPS	1	10,000
Surgery	<u>1</u>	<u>10,000</u>
Total Individual Research Awards:	<u>28</u>	<u>\$275,112</u>
<u>Bridge Funding Awards</u>		
Anesthesiology	1	\$ 22,790
Medicine	2	20,000
Orthopedic Surgery	1	20,000
Pathology	2	50,000
Reproductive Medicine	1	25,000
Surgery	<u>1</u>	<u>24,981</u>
Total Bridge Funding Awards:	<u>8</u>	<u>\$ 162,771</u>
GRAND TOTAL:	<u>36</u>	<u>\$ 437,883</u>

Travel to a Scholarly Meeting – Of 112 applications reviewed, 100 were funded, totaling \$43,751; \$10,034 was returned for redistribution, and 1 applications totaling \$8,104 were denied. Fifty-three of the trips were for foreign travel and 47 were for domestic travel. The breakdown by department is as follows:

<u>Department</u>	<u>Awards</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Anesthesiology	2	\$ 1,000
Cancer Center	1	500
Cellular Molecular Medicine	1	500
Family & Preventive Medicine	9	3,656
Medicine	20	8,035
Neurosciences	4	2,000
Ophthalmology	0	0
Orthopedic Surgery	4	1,800
Pathology	1	389
Pediatrics	8	3,999
Pharmacology	4	2,000
Psychiatry	21	8,233
Radiology	15	6,839
Reproductive Medicine	1	500

SSPPS	3	1,500
Surgery	<u>6</u>	<u>2,800</u>
Total School of Medicine	<u>100</u>	<u>\$ 43,751</u>

MARINE SCIENCES SUBCOMMITTEE

The Marine Sciences Subcommittee reviewed FY 2006/07 applications on October 26, 2006; and February 1 and April 20, 2007. The Subcommittee agreed to maintain its policy limiting the ceiling for individual grants to \$8,000 and, in an effort to ensure a reasonable distribution of COR funds, agreed to maintain the maximum cumulative support figure of \$30,000 over a ten-year period. The existing policies regarding awards for research and travel to scholarly meetings were thoroughly reviewed by the Subcommittee. The guidelines for funding were reviewed and the modifications were incorporated in the application call letters. The Subcommittee would like new requests for support to demonstrate more evidence of results from previous Academic Senate funding, such as a manuscript or the receipt of a larger award stemming from a "seed" money grant.

Research – Of 23 research applications reviewed, 16 regular grants totaling \$108,524 and one bridge grant for \$9,210 were funded. Three grantees returned \$1,322 in unused funds for redistribution. Six requests totaling \$38,417 were denied primarily due to budget constraints. The breakdown of these awards by rank is as

<u>Level</u>	<u>Awards</u>
Assoc Professor	2
Assoc Research Scientist	2
Professor	9
Research Scientist	<u>4</u>
	17

Travel to a Scholarly Meeting – Of 17 applications reviewed, 15 were funded totaling \$12,001; \$1,000 was returned for redistribution. Two applications totaling \$3,106 were denied. Eleven awards were for foreign travel and four were for domestic travel.

	Respectfully submitted,
Division Committee	Elizabeth Newsome Immo Scheffler Anthony Wynshaw-Boris William Young Arthur B. Ellis, <i>ex officio</i> Theodore Groves, UCORP Representative Pamela Mellon, Vice Chair William Hodgkiss, Chair
General Campus Subcommittee	James Hollan Robert Schmidt Vivek Sharma Gabriel Silva Stefan Tanaka Elizabeth Newsome, Vice Chair Immo Scheffler, Chair
Health Sciences Subcommittee	David Broide Christina Chambers Wolfgang Dillmann Andrew Mizisin Anthony Wynshaw-Boris, Chair
Marine Sciences Subcommittee	Duncan Agnew Philip Hastings William Young, Chair

October 23, 2007

2007-2008 SENATE COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

<u>Members</u>	<u>Department/Section</u>	<u>Division</u>
James W. Posakony (Chair of Division)	Cell & Dev. Biology	Biological Sciences
Daniel J. Donoghue (Vice Chair of Division)	Chemistry/Biochemistry	Physical Sciences
Donald P. Rutherford (Chair, Academic Personnel)	Philosophy	Arts & Humanities
Hans P. Paar (Chair, Admissions)	Physics	Physical Sciences
James E. Rauch (Chair, Affirmative Action & Diversity)	Economics	Social Sciences
Paul A. Libby (Chair, Campus & Community Environment)	MAE	Engineering
J. Hampton Atkinson (Chair, Committees)	Psychiatry	Health Sciences
Kim Griest (Chair, Educational Policy)	Physics	Physical Sciences
Carlos H. Waisman (Chair, Faculty Welfare)	Sociology	Social Sciences
Vistasp M. Karbhari (Chair, Graduate Council)	Structural Engineering	Engineering
Richard A. Firtel (Chair, Planning & Budget)	Cell & Dev. Biology	Biological Sciences
Miller S. Puckette (Chair, Privilege & Tenure)	Music	Arts & Humanities
William S. Hodgkiss (Chair, Research)	SIO/MPL	Marine Sciences
Charles Perrin (Divisional Representative)	Chemistry/Biochemistry	Physical Sciences
Andrew Scull (Divisional Representative)	Sociology	Social Sciences
_____ (Representative Assembly)	--	--
_____ (Representative Assembly)	--	--

<u>Divisional representation:</u>		
	Arts	1
	Biological Sciences	2
	Engineering	2
	Humanities	1
	Physical Sciences	4
	Social Sciences	3
	Health Sciences	1
	Marine Sciences	1

<u>Departmental representation:</u>		
	Cell & Developmental Biology	2
	Economics	1
	Chemistry/Biochemistry	2
	Mech. & Aerospace Eng.	1
	Music	1
	Philosophy	1
	Physics	2
	Psychiatry	1
	SIO/MPL	1
	Structural Engineering	1
	Sociology	2

2007-2008 Representative Assembly Membership

Elected Members:

Divisional Representatives

		Charles L. Perrin	('08)
		Andrew T. Scull	('08)
		Richard E. Attiyeh	('09)
		Joel E. Dimsdale	('09)
Revelle College	(2)	Mark J. Machina	('08)
		Christine Harris	('08)
John Muir College	(2)	Geert Schmid-Schoenbein	('08)
		Alan J. Daly	('09)
Marshall College	(2)	P. Benson Shing	('08)
		Abraham Shragge	('08)
Earl Warren College	(2)	_____	
		Christopher Wills	('08)
Roosevelt College	(2)	_____	
Sixth College	(2)	_____	
		Phel Steinmetz	('08)
Emeritus Faculty		_____	
		Peter Farrell	('08)
Anesthesiology	(1)	Wendy Campana	('08)
Anthropology	(1)	Keith E. McNeal	('09)
Bioengineering	(1)	David Gough	('08)
Biological Sciences	(2)	Timothy S. Baker	('08)
		Nigel Crawford	('08)
Cellular/Molecular Med.	(1)	_____	
Chemistry/ Biochemistry	(2)	Joseph W. Watson	('08)
		Emmanouil Theodorakis	('09)
Cognitive Science	(1)	Jaime A. Pineda	('09)
Communication	(1)	Michael Schudson	('08)
CSE	(2)	_____	
ECE	(2)	_____	
Economics	(2)	_____	
		Kate Antonovics	('08)
		Mark J. Machina	('08)
Ethnic Studies	(1)	_____	
Family & Prev. Medicine	(1)	Steven Edland	('08)
History	(2)	Judith M. Hughes	('08)
		Luis A. Alvarez	('09)
IR&PS	(1)	Richard E. Feinberg	('09)
Linguistics	(1)	Rachel I. Mayberry	('09)
Literature	(2)	Robert Cancel	('08)
Mathematics	(2)	_____	
		James R. Bunch	('09)
		John D. Eggers	('08)
MAE	(2)	Steven Buckley	('08)
Medicine	(2)	_____	
		Joshua Fierer	('09)
		Renate Pilz	('08)

Music	(1)		
Neurosciences	(2)	Eliezer Masliah	('08)
		Binhai Zheng	('09)
Ophthalmology	(1)		
Orthopaedics	(1)	Douglas J. Chang	('08)
Pathology	(2)	Michael J. Kelner	('08)
Pediatrics	(2)		
Pharmacology	(1)	Morton Printz	('08)
Pharmacy & Pharm Sci	(1)	Tadeusz Molinski	('09)
Philosophy	(1)	Gila Sher	('09)
Physics	(2)	John Goodkind	('09)
		Frank Hsia-San Shu	('08)
Political Science	(2)	Gerald Mackie	('08)
		Thaddeus Kousser	('09)
Psychiatry	(2)		
Psychology	(1)	J. Vincent Filoteo	('08)
Radiology	(2)	Vladimir J. Konecni (F)	('08)
Reproductive Medicine	(1)		
SIO	(5)	Douglas H. Bartlett	('08)
		David M. Checkley	('08)
		LeRoy M. Dorman	('09)
		Joel R. Norris	('09)
		George Sugihara	('09)
		Rebecca Klatch	('08)
Sociology	(1)		
Structural Engineering	(1)		
Surgery	(2)		
Theatre and Dance	(2)	James Carmody	('08)
Visual Arts	(2)	Fred Lonidier	('08)
		Lev Manovich	('08)
Advisors:			
Research - GC	(3)		
- SIO		Bruce Cornuelle	('09)
- HS			
Undergraduate Students	(2)		
Graduate Students	(2)	Charles Saenz	('08)

October 23, 2007

Appointment of Members of Committee on Committees

In accordance with the Bylaws of the San Diego Division, the Representative Assembly shall appoint a replacement for a member of the Committee on Committees who will be absent for a period of at least two months but not exceeding twelve months. There are two vacancies to be filled by appointment for Fall Quarter, 2007.

- John Hildebrand (Professor, SIO/MPL), SIO member of the Committee on Committees, will be absent from campus during Fall Quarter, 2007. The individual appointed will serve a term that will begin immediately and end December 31, 2007.
- Ruth Williams (Professor, Mathematics), Sciences member of the Committee on Committees, will be absent from campus during Fall Quarter, 2007. The individual appointed will serve a term that will begin immediately and end December 31, 2007.

Service on the Committee on Committees is of great importance to the Academic Senate, because that committee appoints the members of all committees of the Academic Senate and nominates Academic Senate members for service on administrative committees. Therefore, it is essential that members of the Committee on Committees be faculty with Academic Senate experience and with sufficient knowledge about the faculty in their disciplinary area to make appropriate selections.

Current Membership of the Committee on Committees

Name	Department	ConC Member	Term Expires
J. Hampton Atkinson, Chair	Psychiatry	Health Sciences	August 2009
Patricia S. Churchland	Philosophy	Humanities	August 2009
John W. Fonville	Music	Arts	August 2009
Peter A. Gourevitch	IRPS/Political Sci.	Social Sciences	August 2010
Cecil W. Lytle	Music	At-large	August 2010
John A. Hildebrand	MPL	SIO	August 2008*
Carol A. Padden	Communication	Social Sciences	August 2008
Henry C. Powell	Pathology	Health Sciences	August 2010
Nicholas Spitzer	Neurobiology	Sciences	August 2009
Jan B. Talbot	MAE	Engineering	August 2010
Stephen I. Wasserman	Medicine	Health Sciences	August 2008
Ruth J. Williams	Mathematics	Sciences	August 2010*

*Appointment of replacement for Fall Quarter, 2007

REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

The Graduate Council supports the proposal for a Joint Doctoral Program leading to a Ph.D. degree in Geophysics with an emphasis in Earthquake Science and Applied Geophysics offered jointly by the University of California, San Diego and San Diego State University. The proposal builds on current relationships between geophysicists at both institutions and would further enrich opportunities for research collaborations. The Graduate Council recommends that the Representative Assembly grant its approval for the proposed Joint Doctoral Program leading to a Ph.D. degree in Geophysics with an emphasis in Earthquake Science and Applied Geophysics.

Vistasp M. Karbhari, Chair
Graduate Council

The complete proposal is available for review in the Academic Senate Office, 215 University Center.

**Proposal for a Joint Doctoral Program in
Geophysics with Emphasis in Earthquake Science and Applied Geophysics
University of California, San Diego and San Diego State University**

Executive Summary

Eleven geophysicists at The University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and six from San Diego State University (SDSU) propose the establishment of a joint Ph.D. program in Geophysics (emphasizing Earthquake Science and Applied Geophysics). The faculty members are from the UCSD Scripps Institution of Oceanography Graduate Department, Geophysical Curricular Program, and from SDSU's Department of Geological Sciences. Geophysics is the study of Earth's interior, primarily using seismology, geodesy, gravity, magnetics, and electromagnetics. Subdisciplines include geodynamics, earthquake science, space physics, planetology, marine geophysics, and applied geophysics.

The proposed program builds on an unusually vigorous, ongoing collaboration between geophysicists at UCSD and SDSU in ways that would further enrich the opportunities for both faculty and students. Research interests of the faculty are not duplicated at either school. Rather, they are strongly complemented as is emphasized independently by letters of support from two UC campuses, two major oil companies, two federal laboratories, two California-based geophysical firms, and the Southern California Earthquake Center. All express a critical need in the workplace for Ph.D. level geophysicists to address pressing issues in energy, environmental, resources, and earthquake hazards.

The proposed Ph. D. program is designed to educate students in the broad skills needed to address the local and global societal problems where geophysics can contribute to the solutions. Integrating geophysics at the two universities will provide strong capabilities in: 1) earthquake-hazard understanding (incorporating tools such as observational and computational seismology, airborne and satellite-based geodesy and remote sensing, and earthquake geology), and 2) energy, resource, and environmental exploration methods (mainly land and marine seismology and electromagnetics). The program will capitalize on an explosion in quantitative geoscience that has yielded new observation and computation tools allowing unprecedented simulations and predictions of geophysical processes. As active participants in these advances, the geophysics researchers at UCSD and SDSU will combine their skills to establish a unique, top-quality geophysics Ph.D. program. The program will: 1) provide doctoral-level education that integrates basic and applied geophysics with computational modeling and field observations at temporal and spatial scales that address local, regional, and global needs; 2) educate geophysicists who can immediately enter the workforce and assume leadership roles in critical societal needs; 3) prepare Ph.D. level geophysicists to serve as university faculty, government scientists, and energy-industry researchers; 4) promote joint research opportunities and student support between geophysicists at UCSD and SDSU; and 5) attract graduate students who would not normally apply to either UCSD or SDSU. Faculty participants in the joint Ph.D. proposal are all active researchers in their individual specialties as evidenced by publications, research grant activity, and student involvement. Commitment to the program by SDSU is nearly \$1.6 million for the 5-year start up period. There is a fully funded annual budget that supports a faculty coordinator, a clerical position, graduate assistantships and fee waivers, and supplies and services.

REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

The Graduate Council supports the proposal for an interdisciplinary graduate program in Computational Science, Mathematics, and Engineering (CSME) leading to a M.S. degree in. The proposed interdisciplinary program would draw upon faculty from 11 campus departments in addition to expertise from the San Diego Supercomputer Center and the Scripps Research Institute. The program will be administered by the Department of Mathematics. The Graduate Council recommends that the Representative Assembly grant its approval for the proposed Joint Doctoral Program leading to an M.S. degree in Computational Science, Mathematics, and Engineering.

Vistasp M. Karbhari, Chair
Graduate Council

The complete proposal is available for review in the Academic Senate Office, 215 University Center.

**Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in
Computational Science, Mathematics, and Engineering (CSME)**

Executive Summary

Aims and Objectives

This proposal describes a new interdisciplinary graduate program to be offered at UCSD in Computational Science, Mathematics and Engineering (CSME) leading to an M.S. degree in Computational Science.

The CSME Program will draw upon the expertise of faculty from Bioengineering, Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Computer Science, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Mathematics, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Physics, Structural Engineering, the Scripps Institution of Oceanography as well as research staff with instructional titles from the San Diego Supercomputer Center and the Scripps Research Institute.

In broad terms, computational science comprises the use of computers to analyze scientific problems. We distinguish it from computer science, which is the study of computers and computation, and from theory and experiment, the traditional forms of science. Computational science seeks to gain understanding principally through the analysis of mathematical models on high performance computers. The term computational scientist has been coined to describe scientists, engineers and mathematicians who apply high performance computer technology in innovative and essential ways to advance the state of knowledge in their respective disciplines. Thus computational science is a blend of applications, computer simulations, and mathematics. It is a mode of scientific investigation that supplements the traditional laboratory and theoretical methods of acquiring knowledge. This is done by formulating mathematical models whose solutions are approximated by computer simulations. By making a sequence of adjustments to the model and subsequent computations, one can gain new insights into various areas of science.

This proposal recognizes the nation's growing and continuing need for broadly trained advanced computational scientists in academia, industry and government laboratories. The following remarks of June 17, 2004 by Dr. Arden L. Bement, Jr., Acting Director of the National Science Foundation, express the core importance of the field:

"Computational science is driving discovery and innovation across all fields of science and engineering today. The extraordinary advances in information technology of the past several decades have ushered in a new era of scientific exploration—an era that promises not simply incremental advances, but a revolution in the way we conduct scientific investigation and in the complexity and depth of the new knowledge we can generate."

Historical Background

The field of computational science had its beginnings in the early 1940s. With the development of the computer in the midst of World War II, researchers experimented with various problems and methods that could use the advancing computer technology. Numerical tools had existed for centuries, but they were used by hand and were, therefore, slow. The computer motivated mathematicians to reexamine some of

the older methods and to develop new ones. Over the years, the increasing speed of computers and advances in numerical methods has made it possible to solve most small problems rapidly, using readily available software. Hence the attention of many computational scientists has turned to the solution of problems so large that they require enormous amounts of computer memory and time. This need for vast amounts of computer resources has motivated the development of Computational Science over the last 15 years. Computational science has emerged as a powerful and indispensable method of analyzing a variety of problems in research, product and process development, and manufacturing. Computational simulation is being accepted as a third methodology in scientific research, complementing the traditional approaches of theory and experiment. Computer simulations provide both qualitative and quantitative insights into many phenomena that are too complex to be dealt with by analytical methods or too expensive or dangerous to study by experiments.

Program Administration

The UCSD Mathematics Department will serve as the administrative home for the proposed program. This organizational plan will leverage existing strengths that, along with a small additional investment in staff, will provide an efficient management core. Moreover, the historical and continuing strengths of the Mathematics Department in the core foundational areas of computational science such as numerical analysis and partial differential equations makes it a natural foundation for the program.

The CSME graduate program will be managed principally by an executive committee of 5-8 faculty together with a director (or co-directors), to be selected initially by the Division of Physical Sciences. The Executive Committee will have operational and implementation responsibilities for the program and are expected to have a high frequency of interactions. In addition, an advisory committee will be in place. This committee will include representatives from the Executive Committee and other participating faculty. The role of the Advisory Committee will be to participate in curriculum development and to provide long-range guidance. To ensure that the program remains interdisciplinary, dynamic, and representative of the wide range of interests of the faculty at UCSD, co-directors will always be selected from different academic departments, and the Executive and Advisory Committees will strive to have at least one representative faculty from each of the participating departments. The Director(s) will work with the Executive Committee, the Advisory Committee, an admissions committee and qualifying exam committee in the management of the program.

Program

The M.S. component of the CSME Graduate Program at UCSD will be a stand-alone program resulting in an M.S. degree in Computational Science. It is felt that a stand-alone program is appropriate for scientists and engineers who would like some specialized training in computational science at the level of a Master's degree but who are not interested in or are not appropriate candidates for a Ph.D. program. The CSME M.S. component is designed to be a 2-year program centered around lecture and laboratory courses which focus on obtaining mastery of the primary tools used in computational science. The M.S. students who graduate from the CSME Program will gain both a solid theoretical foundation and practical experience in solving real scientific problems which should make them very attractive to help fill the needs of industry and government for expertise in computational science.

New courses developed in support of the CSME program will join our existing courses in computational science as general service courses that will benefit the entire UCSD campus as well as local industry in the San Diego area. The courses will also be a resource for graduate students in engineering and the sciences who do not necessarily want to focus on computational science, but, nevertheless, have need for some simulation or large computation in their research. Such students can use the core courses to gain a solid introduction to such topics as algorithms, parallel computing or stochastic methods that they may need to understand to further their research. Thus, we expect that the courses that we develop for the CSME Program will be of use to many graduate students in engineering and science.

We anticipate 30-35 M.S. students at steady state.



John B. Oakley
Distinguished Professor of Law, U.C. Davis
Telephone: (510) 987-9303
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: John.Oakley@ucop.edu

Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

August 31, 2007

SYSTEMWIDE SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIRS
DIVISIONAL SENATE CHAIRS

RE: Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy

Dear Colleagues:

The enclosed document is being forwarded for your review and comments. As background information, BOARS voted unanimously to endorse the BOARS Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy at its May 4, 2007 meeting. The proposal, which would substantially alter UC's existing eligibility policy, was presented at the June 27, 2007, Academic Council meeting, where Council agreed to send out the proposal for systemwide Senate review in the fall.

The Council would very much appreciate receiving responses by **December 5, 2007**. Please be advised that the practice of the Academic Council for general reviews is to send the comments to all Systemwide Committees. **Each committee may decide whether or not to opine.** Please notify the Senate Office either directly, by emailing Executive Director María Bertero-Barceló (maria.bertero-barcelo@ucop.edu), or through your Committee Analyst, if your committee chooses not to participate in this review.

Sincerely yours,



John B. Oakley, Chair
Academic Council

Encl: 1
Copy: María Bertero-Barceló, Executive Director
Divisional Senate Directors
Academic Senate Committee Analysts



BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)

Mark M. Rashid, Chair
mmrashid@ucdavis.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9466
Fax: (510) 763-0309

June 11, 2007

**JOHN B. OAKLEY, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

Re: BOARS' UC Freshman Eligibility Reform Proposal

Dear John,

I am pleased to report that BOARS, at its May 4, 2007 meeting, unanimously endorsed the enclosed UC Freshman Eligibility Reform proposal. As you know, this year the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has undertaken a comprehensive examination of UC's freshman eligibility policy. Presentation of BOARS' UC Freshman Eligibility Reform proposal to the Academic Council this month is an exciting threshold for BOARS, which looks forward to continued work to see this proposal to its fruition with the Board of Regents next year.

On behalf of BOARS, I respectfully request that the Academic Council approve BOARS' UC Freshman Eligibility proposal to be distributed for systemwide Senate review.

I look forward to Council's action at the June 27 meeting.

Best wishes,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Mark M. Rashid".

Mark M. Rashid, Chair
BOARS

Encl: 1

cc: BOARS

Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Executive Director, Academic Senate

MMR/mr

A PROPOSAL TO REFORM UC'S FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY POLICY

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools
16 May, 2007

I. SUMMARY

At present, UC determines who, among California's graduating high-school seniors, is in the top one-eighth based on an Eligibility Index involving GPA and standardized test scores. California's Master Plan for Higher Education instructs that UC should “draw from” this portion of the graduating class for its freshman entrants. UC has long construed this Master Plan provision to imply a guarantee of admission, somewhere in the system, to all students who meet the GPA/test score Eligibility Index.

In recent decades, space limitations have obliged most campuses to select from among their UC-eligible applicants, with a few campuses becoming extremely selective. Selection for freshman admission to a particular UC campus is made on the basis of a comprehensive review of the entire application file, which contains much information about academic and non-academic achievements, as well as the circumstances and context in which those achievements were made. Admission to the UC *system* (i.e. UC eligibility), on the other hand, is based simply on course-taking and GPA in those courses, and test-taking and scores on the required tests. UC eligibility engenders rigidly-enforced criteria which are, individually, arbitrary and difficult to justify educationally. Further, recent data suggests that eligibility depends heavily on merely *taking* UC's required pattern of standardized tests, which itself is not an educationally valid metric of academic achievement.

In short, UC's values and goals in freshman admissions, with respect to both academic quality and equity in access to the University, would be better served by establishing eligibility for UC on the basis of a complete review of each UC aspirant's qualifications. Accordingly, a replacement for the existing eligibility policy is proposed. The main purpose of the proposed change is to invite applications from a larger number of qualified applicants, and then use full information from the application itself to decide which applicants are truly in the top one-eighth.

II. BACKGROUND

Freshman admission to the University of California is defined by two main concepts: *eligibility* and *selection*. *Eligibility* identifies students who are invited to apply, and simultaneously guarantees them admission to the UC system, though not necessarily to a campus to which they apply. *Selection* is the process by which campuses choose from among applicants. Since 2001, selection has employed “comprehensive review” of each entire application. The eligibility concept originated in 1960, and since 1968 has relied only on the grade-point average across all UC-approved courses, and test scores.

The 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education instructs UC to “draw from the

top one-eighth” of the State’s graduating high school seniors. This stipulation has, since 1988, been interpreted as a guarantee that UC will admit, to some campus in the system, all California high school graduates in the top one-eighth who apply. Eligible status does not, however, guarantee admission to a campus of the applicant’s choosing. Applicants who wish to enroll at a campus with more eligible applicants than space permits must be selected by that campus. At present, seven of the nine general campuses are obliged to select from among their eligible applicants. The Riverside and Merced campuses currently admit all eligible applicants who apply to them. To fulfill UC’s guarantee of admission, UC-eligible applicants who are not admitted to any campus to which they apply are referred to Riverside and Merced for admission. These *referral-pool* admission offers are declined by the vast majority of their recipients: in 2006, only 6% of referral-pool admits submitted a Statement of Intent to Register.

The main route to UC eligibility – called “eligibility in the statewide context” – requires: a) successfully completing a set of college-preparatory courses, described in UC policy as “a through g courses,” each of which has to be approved by UC at the student’s high school in order to count toward eligibility; b) taking UC’s full pattern of standardized tests, consisting of the SAT Reasoning exam or ACT with Writing, plus two SAT Subject exams in different a-g subject areas; and c) achieving test scores and an honors-course-weighted GPA in the a-g subjects that together exceed the threshold established by UC’s Eligibility Index. This Index specifies the minimum test scores required for a given GPA. At present, the minimum GPA required for eligibility is 3.0. The required test scores decrease as GPA increases above this minimum.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) conducts a study every few years to estimate the number of the state’s graduating seniors who are UC-eligible. Based on these periodic studies, the Eligibility Index is adjusted to maintain the proportion of UC-eligible students at one-eighth the number of graduating high school seniors.

Beginning in 2000, an additional route to establishing UC eligibility was added: Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC). Students whose honors-weighted GPA in a-g subjects places them in the top 4% of their junior class, as determined by transcript evaluations performed by UC, are deemed eligible, provided they complete their remaining a-g subject requirements and take all the tests required for eligibility in the statewide context. These students are therefore guaranteed admission somewhere in the system, as are statewide-eligible students. Although ELC students must still complete the full test pattern, the scores themselves do not affect their ELC status in any way. Near-total overlap exists in the two main eligibility pathways: over 95% of ELC students are also eligible in the statewide context. However, there is some evidence to suggest that UC’s congratulatory notification of ELC status stimulates some students who would not have done so otherwise to complete their a-g course requirements and then apply to UC.

A third, minor pathway exists, in which UC eligibility is established solely on the basis of very high scores on the required standardized tests. This pathway is maintained for the purpose of affording access by students who, for various reasons, cannot present the traditional evidence of academic achievement in the form of grades in approved a-g courses. The number of students who are eligible by this pathway alone is only a few

hundred each year.

Whereas *admission to the system* – i.e. eligibility – is determined solely on the basis of course-taking, GPA, test-taking, and test scores, *selection* by a particular campus is based on a *comprehensive review* (CR) of the applicant’s file. CR ideally uses all the information in the application, as well as information about the high school from which the applicant graduated. CR is governed by a single, overarching set of principles and criteria, but campuses have considerable latitude in the formulation of their specific processes and procedures. It is through CR that all facets of an applicant’s academic preparation and other accomplishments can be carefully considered, in the context of the opportunities and challenges inherent in their school and family circumstances. Campus-based CR processes range in character from numerical formulas to more holistic judgments. In all cases, CR processes are subject to extensive guidelines, rigorous norming, and continuous monitoring of the results to ensure objectivity and consistency. In conformance with California state law, race, ethnicity, gender, and national origin do not enter into the decisions made under CR in any way.

Eight of the nine general campuses currently conduct CR processes. The newest campus, UC Merced, will likely develop its own CR process in due course. Campuses vary considerably in their levels of selectivity. Two campuses, Berkeley and Los Angeles, could be called hyper-selective: they are able to admit only about one-quarter of their UC-eligible applicants. In recent years, the Santa Cruz campus has found it necessary to select from among its eligible applicants, and currently admits about three-quarters of its eligible applicants. UC Riverside has in recent years come very close to the selectivity threshold, and consequently has conducted a CR process in anticipation of becoming fully selective. UC Merced is currently able to admit all UC-eligible applicants that apply. The other four general campuses (San Diego, Irvine, Santa Barbara, and Davis) generally select for admission between 40% and 60% of their eligible applicants.

III. RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSED POLICY CHANGES

Regents’ policy directs UC to “... seek out and enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California.” UC seeks to identify and admit freshman entrants who have prepared well by challenging themselves academically, and who have successfully met these challenges. Admissions criteria should directly relate to, and accurately measure, the applicant’s potential for success in college and beyond. These criteria should be applied in ways that fairly evaluate each applicant’s potential to benefit from, and contribute to, the university experience. Fixed, minimum measures on any particular criterion are inherently arbitrary, are difficult to justify educationally, and should be avoided. Admissions decisions should always be made with due regard for the challenges and opportunities inherent in each applicant’s circumstances.

UC’s present collection of admissions policies falls short of these aspirations in a number of important ways:

- 1) *The current procedure for determining UC eligibility fails to use all the available*

information about applicants. By relying entirely on the grade point average and test scores, current eligibility procedures ignore everything else in a student's application, which includes pages of information about special academic attainments, leadership and other non-academic accomplishments, and a personal statement that allows applicants to explain their achievements in the context of their school and family circumstances. In addition, an applicant's achievements can and should be compared with those of other UC applicants who have similar profiles of opportunity and disadvantage. Quantitative studies show that using additional information, including information comparing a student to others from the same school, produces a more accurate prediction of who will succeed at UC. All selective private colleges and universities use some form of comprehensive review rather than a simple index of grades and test scores. Individual UC campuses have in place procedures for whole-file review. Continued reliance on a simple index for eligibility therefore seems educationally unjustifiable.

- 2) *Eligibility, as presently constructed, contains rigid minimums that lack sound educational justification.* The current eligibility requirements consist of a set of minimums, none of which *by itself* can be justified on educational grounds as a requirement for UC admission. For example, failure to complete a single required course on the a-g list renders a student ineligible, even if the school does not offer enough sections of that course to permit all students to take it, or no one told the student that the course was required for UC, or the student actually did take the course but the school failed to submit the required paperwork to UC for course certification. A 2004 CPEC report¹ estimated that about 1.9% of California school graduates – 6500 students – took all the required exams, and achieved a GPA and test scores that met the eligibility index, but failed eligibility because of a single a-g course deficiency. Other studies have found that only 45% of California's public high schools offer enough sections of a-g courses to permit all students to satisfy UC requirements². The course minimums therefore exclude many students who failed to satisfy the requirement through no fault of their own. Similarly, the statewide Eligibility Index requires unvalidated minimum test scores, a practice contrary to best practices in admissions testing (see the National Academies Press' 1999 "Myths and Tradeoffs: The role of Tests in Undergraduate Admissions," the recommendations of test producers including ACT Inc. and the College Board, and the 1999 Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA, APA, NCME)). Finally, in light of the highly varied grading practices and access to GPA-enhancing honors courses, both between and within schools, the GPA minimum for eligibility is itself suspect. Taken together, these realities indicate that many graduating high school seniors who are academically strong and would perform well at UC are denied eligibility because they fail to meet just one of the minimum requirements.
- 3) *For all its apparent simplicity in concept, the actual determination of an individual student's eligibility can be quite complicated.* Aside from the a-g course-taking

¹California Postsecondary Education Commission, "Factors Limiting Eligibility for the University of California" (OP/04-03), December 2004.

²J. Oakes, J. Rogers, D. Silver, S. Valladares, V. Terriquez, P. McDonough, M. Renee, and M. Lipton, "Removing the Roadblocks: Fair College Opportunities for All California Students," UC/ACCORD and UCLA/IDEA, November 2006.

requirement, the testing requirement, and the Eligibility Index, the policy contains extensive provisions relating to grade levels in which some of the required courses must be taken, mechanisms for “validating” missing courses either by subsequent courses in an area of “sequential knowledge,” relevant standardized-test performance, or by other means; determination of grade points for repeated courses, etc. Some high schools do not maintain up-to-date lists of UC-approved courses on the “Doorways” web site, and students in those schools therefore may not get credit for some courses that should satisfy a-g requirements. Students from advantaged backgrounds who attend well-resourced schools with strong college-going cultures are likely to have access to the guidance needed to negotiate the bureaucratic complexities of UC eligibility. For example, such students are likely to receive strong advice to take UC-certified English courses beginning in the 9th grade, and thereby remain on track to complete the required four years of English by the end of the 12th grade. On the other hand, students from schools that send few students to UC, and/or whose parents and teachers cannot provide ready UC guidance, are placed at a disadvantage. It bears mention that the requirements of eligibility must be, and are, strictly enforced, because eligibility confers a valuable commodity – a freshman admission slot at UC.

- 4) *In practice, the impact of the testing requirement for eligibility depends almost entirely on whether or not a student takes the tests, not on the performance on the tests. Test-taking by itself is not an educationally justifiable criterion for admission. In its 2003 eligibility study, CPEC found that 14.4% of the state’s graduating seniors were fully UC-eligible. However, that is only slightly less than the 14.8% who completed the a-g curriculum as well as the full UC test pattern. Less than half a percent of the state’s graduating seniors are taking all required courses and tests, but failing to achieve eligibility due to inadequate performance. And, virtually all of these 0.4% missed the Eligibility Index by a very narrow margin. CPEC further found that the single most prevalent reason for ineligibility was simple failure to take the required SAT Subject exams. CPEC also reported that, among those who completed the a-g curriculum and took the SAT Reasoning exam but not the required SAT Subject exams, fully three-quarters would have become UC eligible if they had taken the SAT Subject tests and received scores at least equal to their SAT Reasoning-exam average. The state’s UC eligibility rate would thereby have jumped from 14.4% to 20.7%. Taken together, these facts indicate that eligible status is much more a matter of mere willingness to submit to test-taking or knowledge of UC’s testing requirement, than it is a rational assessment of academic achievement. Students who successfully complete the a-g curriculum and merely take the required battery of tests are very likely to be eligible.*
- 5) *The two SAT Subject tests required by UC are taken in subjects elected by the student. In quantitative studies, BOARS has repeatedly found that, while the predictive power of all standardized admissions tests is quite modest, scores on these elective subject tests make a negligible contribution to predictions of initial academic performance at the University. In 2006, UC’s required test pattern changed in response to changes introduced in the SAT Reasoning exam. These Reasoning-test changes, in turn, were compelled by then-president Atkinson’s call on the College Board to more closely align the SAT with the curricula that college-bound students are actually expected to learn before enrolling in postsecondary institutions. The College Board’s response*

consisted mainly of incorporating the old SAT Subject test in Writing into the core Reasoning exam, along with some elements of the old SAT Subject Math level 1C exam. Additionally, analogies were dropped from the old Verbal section of the core exam, as were quantitative comparisons from the old Math section. The ACT Assessment, on the other hand, did not change in response to President Atkinson's call, but an optional writing component (required for UC applicants) was introduced in order to provide a comparable alternative to the SAT Reasoning test for UC applicants. The extent to which these changes bring the SAT and the ACT into conformance with BOARS' 2001 testing principles remains under study. However, these new test configurations have, in the meantime, compelled a change in UC's required test pattern: prior to 2006, *three* SAT Subject tests were required along with the core exam, but two of the three were mandated to be the Writing and Math tests, with the third one in an elective subject area. With the inclusion of the Writing test and aspects of the Math Subject test in the core exam, the test pattern was changed to specify *two* SAT Subject tests, both in elective (but different) subject areas. Under the old test pattern, the Writing and Math Subject tests, but not the third (elective) test, showed reasonable predictive validity for freshman GPA. Thus, the only predictive elements of the old SAT Subject test requirement have been incorporated into the core exam, leaving a Subject test requirement that contributes very little to UC's ability to predict which applicants will perform well initially at UC.

- 6) *The SAT Subject test requirement, in particular, contributes to underrepresentation of certain groups.* From an analysis of 2004 CBEDS and College Board data, it is estimated that 54% of all a-g completers also took the eligibility-enabling SAT Subject exams required by UC³. However, among African American students, only 35% of those completing the a-g curriculum also took the required SAT Subject exams. Among Chicano/Latino students the number was 38%. These gaps in SAT Subject test-taking behavior have a major negative impact on the size of the pool of high-achieving ethnic-minority students who are visible to UC.
- 7) *UC's eligibility construct denies certain UC campuses the benefits of selecting their admitted classes on the basis of a comprehensive review of each applicant.* For two campuses, eligibility serves as a *de facto* admissions process, with a third campus in nearly the same circumstances. For these campuses, the ideals of comprehensive review, whereby individual applicants are judged within the context of their own opportunities and circumstances and assessed against the campus's own goals in constructing classes, simply do not apply. Further, the admit pools for these campuses are artificially constrained by rather arbitrary requirements that bear little relation to actual academic achievement, as explained above.
- 8) *The prominence of existing eligibility requirements in official UC publications and*

³ These figures are only estimates. CBEDS (California Basic Educational Data System) contains estimates of a-g completion rates at California high schools, whereas the College Board maintains data on the number of California students who complete SAT Subject tests. CBEDS does not contain a-g data records for individual students, so it is not possible to match students between the CBEDS and College Board datasets. Accordingly, it is assumed that SAT Subject-test takers are also a-g completers. While this is an assumption, it is thought to be quite accurate, in light of the fact that any student who completes UC's distinctive required pattern of tests very likely intends to apply to UC.

presentations deters non-eligible students from applying, and therefore renders invisible to UC many graduating high school seniors who could potentially excel as UC students. The vast majority of California high school seniors who apply to UC do satisfy the formal requirements for eligibility. However, many other California seniors who have strong academic records in high school do not meet all the technical requirements for UC eligibility. Some of these currently non-eligible students would be *more* likely to succeed at UC than some of the students who are currently deemed eligible. But under existing procedures many of these academically talented students are not applying to UC.

IV. PROPOSAL FOR A NEW ELIGIBILITY POLICY

Following extensive study and deliberation, BOARS has concluded that UC's current eligibility construct hampers and will prevent, if unaltered, the University from achieving its admissions objectives over the long term. Accordingly, BOARS proposes that the University change its admissions policies to better honor the values inherent in its status as an elite, publicly-funded land-grant institution of higher education.

The various elements of the existing eligibility policy are defined by UC Systemwide Senate Regulations 418, 420, 424, 428, 440, 450, and 476, and also by two Regents' policies. The policy changes recommended by BOARS will require substantial amendments to the above-listed Senate Regulations. The specific changes to Senate Regulations are not detailed here; instead, the recommended policy itself is described in full detail. In order for the proposed policy to take effect, The Regents would also need to make conforming amendments to the existing Regents' policies on undergraduate admissions and admission requirements. Accordingly, the present document should be understood as: 1) a recommendation to the Academic Senate to seek, through the President, regental approval of the proposed policy; and 2) pending regental approval of the proposed policy, a request to authorize BOARS and UCRJ to work together to draft the specific amendments to Senate Regulations required to effectuate the new policy. The draft SR amendments would then be subject to Senate-wide review for clarity and conformance with the previously-approved policy.

Entitled to Review: Description of the Proposed Policy

BOARS recommends that the present practice of providing a guarantee of admission to all students who meet a narrow set of criteria based on course-taking, GPA, test taking, and test scores be replaced. The new policy would guarantee not admission, but *consideration for admission through a comprehensive review* at each campus of application, to all students who meet certain basic criteria of academic achievement. Guaranteed admission to the UC system, albeit not necessarily to the campus of a student's choice, would continue to be extended to California-resident applicants who are found by UC to be in the top 4% of their high school graduating class, as is presently the case under the ELC program.

The details of the proposed "entitled to review" (ETR) policy are as follows:

1. All California-resident applicants who:
 - complete a prescribed 11 of the 15 required a-g courses by the end of the 11th grade,
 - achieve an unweighted GPA of 2.8 or higher in all a-g courses taken in the 10th and 11th grades, and
 - take the SAT Reasoning test or ACT with Writing,

would be entitled to a review (ETR) at each campus to which they apply. Submitted test scores do not affect ETR status, but may be used in comprehensive review. Students who are entitled to a review by this pathway are expected to complete the full set of 15 required a-g courses prior to enrolling. Failure to do so is grounds for cancellation of admission, although this is not automatic. The provisions of this paragraph are similar to the current “eligibility in the statewide context” policy, except that no SAT Subject tests are required, and test scores are immaterial in the determination of ETR.

2. The ELC program continues in essentially its present form: California-resident applicants with ETR status as described in paragraph 1 above, and who are found, by a UC transcript analysis, to be in the top 4% of their high school class at the end of the 11th grade, would be offered admission to at least one campus in the system, provided they complete the required 15 a-g courses prior to enrolling. The ranking used to determine the top 4% is to be based on uncapped, honors-weighted GPA in all a-g courses completed. No guarantee is made of admission to any campus to which the applicant actually applied. Applicants who are not admitted to any campus to which they applied would be referred for admission to campus(es) that are open for referral admission. It is noted that this “ELC only” referral pool would be much smaller than the referral pool under the present policy, which usually consists of several thousand applicants. This can be inferred from the fact that under the current policy, typically only about 100 ELC applicants end up in the referral pool. In contrast to the current policy, under the proposed policy ELC status would no longer require the taking of SAT Subject tests.
3. All applicants who achieve very high scores on a prescribed battery of standardized tests are accorded ETR status, irrespective of their high school records. The battery consists of the SAT Reasoning test or the ACT with its optional Writing component, and two SAT Subject tests in different subject areas. This test pattern is identical to the one required under the current eligibility policy. This testing-only provision in the ETR policy is similar to the existing Eligibility by Exam Alone pathway, the intent of which is to provide a route into UC for those applicants whose circumstances prevent them from presenting conventional academic credentials (e.g. home-schooled students). At present, the number of students eligible by this pathway alone is very small – typically 200-300.
4. Nonresident applicants who achieve an unweighted GPA above a prescribed

threshold in all a-g subjects taken in the 10th and 11th grades are accorded ETR status. The exact GPA threshold will be determined to maintain a similar proportionality between resident and nonresident ETR students as now exists among resident/nonresident UC-eligible students.

5. Students who miss ETR status under paragraphs 1, 3, and 4 above, but who nonetheless can demonstrate substantially equivalent academic preparation as determined by campus-based comprehensive review of their applications, are still invited to apply. Though not strictly entitled to a review, such students will generally receive a comprehensive review at each campus to which application is made. This provision is intended to avoid exclusion of students who, for example, have course records that reflect minor variances from the a-g curriculum, but whose overall academic records are clearly consistent with an ETR level of preparation and achievement. Students in this category whom a campus wishes to admit will be offered admission on a “by-exception” basis, entirely consistent with the existing Admission by Exception (A by E) policy. The A by E policy is a long-standing, regentally-approved mechanism by which applicants who are not strictly UC-eligible can be admitted to a campus. It is limited to a maximum of 6% of the enrolled freshman class, although in practice the A by E mechanism is used far less extensively even than this.

The intent of paragraph 5 is to allow some flexibility in the policy, so that no student is unduly penalized for circumstances that may be beyond the student’s control, or for minor variances from the a-g requirements in an otherwise strong record of achievement. This flexibility is compelled, among other factors, by the realities of K-12 education in California: many students attend poorly-resourced schools whose administrative capacities may not allow for diligent upkeep of UC-approved a-g course lists. Some students at these schools may pursue the most rigorous college-preparatory course of study available to them, but nonetheless fall victim to the administrative failings of their school in the matter of actually achieving a-g completion. Other reasons exist that can prevent high-achieving and high-potential students from attaining the technical requirements of ETR status. In light of the fact that ETR status guarantees only a review – for which the applicant pays a \$65 fee for each campus to which application is made – and not admission, it would seem inappropriate to deny this benefit on the basis of a set of criteria that only tends to suggest promise, but does not precisely partition students into those with promise and those without.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

If the ETR proposal, as defined in the above section, is approved, conforming amendments to Senate Regulations will be drafted to enact its provisions. However, in order for this substantial change in UC admissions policy to reach its full potential, or indeed even to become fully effective, other changes in the admissions-policy landscape should be made. BOARS has identified two areas where concurrent changes would be beneficial: the comprehensive review guidelines, and admissions-process management. With respect to the former, recommendations to amend are within the purview of BOARS and the Senate. Admissions-process management, on the other hand, is an administrative function, and while Senate consultation is desirable from the standpoint of

achieving the best outcome, decisions about implementation are ultimately in the hands of the administration.

The following two sections outline BOARS' current thinking with respect to desirable future policy evolution in both the CR-guidelines and admissions-process management. BOARS believes that the plans described below represent a possible way forward that could maximize the benefit of the ETR policy. These plans are tentative at this stage, and subject to ongoing and broad consultation and input. BOARS' intention in describing these plans here is simply to illustrate the nature of the changes that would be desirable or required in the event that the ETR policy is enacted.

It is noted that no concrete implementation timeline is included here, because the required discussions between the Senate and the responsible administrative units have not yet occurred. A policy change of this magnitude obviously would need to be widely and publicly disseminated. UC's past practice has been to provide sufficient advance notice of changes to eligibility policy so that students now in high school are not adversely impacted. Therefore, BOARS expects that the ETR policy, if approved, would apply to freshman entrants who first enroll in Fall 2009 or after.

A. Revision of the Comprehensive Review Guidelines

The main policy document that governs campus-based comprehensive-review practices is entitled “Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions” (the “Guidelines”). Dating from 2001, the Guidelines have governed all CR practices beginning with the Fall 2002 entering class. The main provisions of the Guidelines include a statement of eight guiding principles, and an enumeration of 14 selection criteria that may be used by campuses in formulating their CR processes. Among the eight guiding principles of Comprehensive Review, the first two merit explicit mention here:

1. The admissions process honors academic achievement and accords priority to students of high academic accomplishment. At the same time, merit should be assessed in terms of the full range of an applicant’s academic and personal achievements and likely contribution to the campus community, viewed in the context of the opportunities and challenges that the applicant has faced.
2. Campus admissions procedures should involve a comprehensive review of applications using a broad variety of factors to select an entering class.

Among the 14 selection criteria are the academic GPA, scores on UC’s required pattern of standardized tests, the volume of and performance in a-g courses beyond the minimum required for eligibility, the “quality of academic performance relative to the academic opportunities available in the applicant’s secondary school,” and special talents. Also explicitly included is personal hardship or challenges that may have diminished the applicant’s ability to demonstrate their full academic potential. The Guidelines do not address the relative weights assigned to the various criteria, nor do they require that specific criteria actually be used in a campus’s CR process (beyond the stipulation that a broad variety of criteria should be used).

BOARS believes that the present Guidelines are conceptually sound and consistent with UC's values. However, in light of the proposed ETR policy, BOARS also believes that an addition to the Guidelines is desirable in order to effectively guide the future evolution of campus-based CR processes. Specifically, BOARS proposes that a ninth principle be added:

The full course-work record, including courses taken in relation to what was available to the applicant, performance in them, and standing among the applicant's peers along both of these dimensions, is the primary basis on which to assess academic achievement. Scores on standardized tests can be useful for enhancing subject-specific understanding of an applicant's level of preparation, but should not be construed as providing an indispensable and independent measure of overall college readiness.

The intent of this additional CR principle is to make clear that a thorough analysis of the academic record, in all its various context-dependent aspects, is the critical element in any sound CR process. Test scores can and should be used for purposes of enhancing and confirming readers' assessments of subject mastery, but are not to be considered indispensable measures of "overall college readiness." Through this ninth CR principle, BOARS aims to discourage the rigid weighting of test scores in campus-based CR processes.

Also, because the proposed ETR policy does not include the SAT Subject test requirement of the existing eligibility policy, some adjustments to the language of Selection Criterion 2, which deals with test scores, is desirable. The following replacement language is proposed:

Scores on the SAT Reasoning test or ACT with its optional Writing component. Scores on other widely-administered standardized tests, such as SAT Subject tests or Advanced Placement exams, although not required, can be considered if submitted.

B. Guidance to Prospective Applicants

UC's admissions policies serve the dual purposes of: a) determining the procedures by which applicants are admitted to the University, and b) signaling to students and their parents, and to schools, what UC considers appropriate preparation for freshman enrollment at the University. The supposed simplicity of the existing eligibility construct is often cited as supporting the signaling function, and is therefore promoted as a major strength of the existing policy. However, as explained in section III above, the determination of eligibility for an individual applicant can actually be quite complicated. UC's admissions policies and practices have always been the subject of confusion and anxiety on the part of prospective students, their parents, and their teachers and counselors. This anxiety is due in part to the existence of two separate policy concepts – eligibility and selection. Public understanding of eligibility, selection, and the difference between them is extremely limited, and is highly heterogeneous across demographic groups.

BOARS believes that the changes proposed here offer an opportunity to bring some much-needed clarity to the public message conveyed by UC admissions. This clarity can be effected through direct, narrative communication explaining the values, goals, and criteria attending UC's admissions policy. This narrative statement should be fairly short, accurate with respect to all CR processes across the system, and meaningful to students seeking specific guidance on how best to prepare themselves for UC. BOARS recognizes that the public articulation of admissions policy, including any related guidance offered to students and their parents and counselors, is within the domain of the University's administration. However, as originator of the ETR proposal, BOARS believes that a collaborative effort between the administration and the Senate is likely to result in the most effective articulation of the policy to the public. It is in this spirit that the following is offered as a candidate narrative-guidance statement.

Admission to University of California campuses is competitive. UC seeks to admit students whose records demonstrate strong academic preparation, within the context of each student's educational opportunities. UC is also looking for evidence that applicants possess a level of maturity that will allow them to benefit from, and contribute to, the educational experience offered by the University. UC accords admission priority to applicants whose records indicate a willingness to challenge themselves academically, and an ability to rise to those challenges.

All aspects of your academic record will be taken into account, including:

- the courses you took and are now taking in high school,
- the courses available at your school,
- your course grades,
- how you did in comparison to other applicants from your school and from other schools,
- any special academic projects you undertook while in high school, and
- any improvement in your grades over your high-school years.

All standardized test scores that you submit will also be considered. These include your scores on the required SAT Reasoning test or ACT with Writing, as well as your scores on any additional standardized tests you may elect to take, such as SAT Subject tests or AP exams. UC uses test scores only to enhance our understanding of your mastery of specific subjects, and not as overall indicators of college readiness. Merely taking many tests does not, by itself, enhance your standing in UC's admissions process. In most cases, test scores are consistent with the course-work record. In these cases, the scores have neither a positive nor a negative effect on the admissions decision. In some circumstances, however, test scores can

provide important information not otherwise available to UC. Examples of these circumstances include:

- Your school does not assign conventional grades.
- You did not have access to a UC-approved a-g curriculum.
- You are missing one or more of the 15 required a-g courses.
- You feel that your grades in one or more subject areas do not reflect your true level of mastery of the subject.

In these circumstances, scores on standardized tests in the appropriate subject areas can help UC gain the understanding of your qualifications needed to make the correct admission decision. So, take the required SAT Reasoning test (or ACT with Writing), and in addition, strongly consider taking SAT Subject tests or AP exams if any of the above apply to you.

UC is also very interested in your experiences and achievements outside the classroom. The University views all your achievements in the context of the educational opportunities available to you through your school and otherwise, as well as in the context of particular challenges you may face in your life circumstances. Extracurricular achievements of all kinds can be important factors in admissions decisions, particularly if they are substantial and sustained, demonstrate leadership qualities, or make real contributions to the school, community, or society at large.

It is of the utmost importance to recognize that there is no single qualification or attribute that means certain admission or certain denial at any UC campus. Each year, each UC campus admits many students with very high grades but few if any extracurricular achievements. And, each year, each campus admits many students with more modest coursework performance, but exceptional records of leadership outside the classroom and/or of overcoming obstacles and challenges. The great majority of successful UC applicants fall somewhere between these extremes. Only you can decide how to spend your time as you prepare for college, but make academics a priority. Above all, if you apply your best effort to all that you do, it will show in your application, and you will have the best chance of being admitted to the UC campus of your choice.

C. Admissions-Process Management: Admission and Enrollment Targets

In order to effectively manage undergraduate enrollment, any UC freshman admission system must serve two essential functions: 1) It must provide for admission, somewhere in the UC system, of approximately one-eighth of California's graduating seniors, as called for in the Master Plan; and 2) it should facilitate achievement of an enrolled freshman class on each campus that closely matches the numeric enrollment target on

that campus. Under the present admissions system, each of these functions is effectuated by a separate policy instrument: eligibility enforces the Master Plan, and campus-based selection serves to modulate freshman enrollment levels to match campus capacity. No consideration is given to the Master Plan at the level of campus-based selection. Likewise, periodic adjustments to the Eligibility Index are made only on the basis of CPEC eligibility studies, generally without consideration for matching enrollments with projected capacity.

Ultimately, capacity should grow with the enrollment demand dictated by the Master Plan's one-eighth provision and California's population of graduating high-school seniors. The participation rate, i.e. the proportion of California's graduating seniors who enroll at UC as freshmen, has remained fairly stable at between 7.5 and 8%. In light of this observation, UC's compliance with the Master Plan can alternatively be stated in terms of freshman enrollment, as compared to the population of graduating seniors. Under the proposed policy, although the number of students entitled to review is not directly regulated, the number of admits – and therefore the size of the enrolled freshman class – of course would continue to be regulated on each campus. Accordingly, the admission and enrollment data following each annual admission cycle could be analyzed to help determine how enrollment targets should be adjusted for the next cycle, in order to meet UC's Master-Plan obligations as well as its other institutional objectives.

It is clearly the case that the volume of applications would increase under the proposed policy. In fact, a major goal of the policy is to make better admissions decisions by reviewing more applications comprehensively. The associated fiscal burden would be partially if not fully offset by the additional revenue from the application fee, which at present stands at \$60 for each campus to which an application is submitted (\$70 for international applicants). In an effort to understand the possible magnitude of the application-processing increase, BOARS has studied estimates of the ETR pool based on the 2003 CPEC dataset. Those analyses suggest that the ETR pool would be perhaps 50% larger than the UC-eligible pool. Specifically, the 2003 CPEC study estimated a 14.4% UC eligibility rate, while BOARS' analysis based on the same data indicates a rate of 21.6% for the ETR pool. However, not all ETR students would apply to UC. A rough idea of potential application volume can be gained by considering the number of ETR students in 2003 who enrolled at *any* four-year college in the Fall. This is estimated at 15.4% of California graduating seniors. The proportion of ETR students who enrolled at any postsecondary institution, including two-year colleges, was 19.5%.

It is noted that opportunities presently exist to achieve economies in the read process, through sharing of application-read information between campuses. Any increase in application volume is likely to draw further attention to this fact. BOARS believes that much might be gained, both in terms of CR process improvement as well as efficiency, through collaborative sharing of application-read information among campuses with common applicants. BOARS further believes that these gains can be achieved while simultaneously respecting campus autonomy in the freshman selection process.

D. Admissions-Process Management: Application Referral

UC's current practice is to refer eligible applicants who are denied admission at all

campuses to which they apply, to one or more referral campuses for admission. In recent years, only the Riverside and Merced campuses have remained open for referral admissions. It is through this referral-pool mechanism that UC honors its commitment to admit all UC-eligible applicants. Although the yield rate for referral admission offers is very low (6% for Fall 2006 enrollment, or in the neighborhood of 1% of the systemwide entering freshman class), the referral pool does yield a not insignificant number of enrollees for the Riverside and Merced campuses. Further, the referral pool serves the important function of conferring a systemwide character to UC admissions.

BOARS believes that the proposed ETR policy offers an opportunity to strengthen the referral-pool mechanism, making it a more robust and attractive route into the University. In broad outline, one way to accomplish this might be as follows. In the course of comprehensively reviewing applicants, campuses could refer some applications to a central “recommended pool.” Campuses could elect to do this in cases where the applicant's credentials would seem to merit admission somewhere in the UC system, but where space limitations preclude an admission offer from the reviewing campus itself. An applicant in the recommended pool would be removed from the pool if any campus to which the applicant applied makes an admission offer. The remaining recommended pool would consist of applications that one or more campuses considered sufficiently strong to merit admission somewhere in the system, but which did not receive a favorable admission decision from any campus. All campuses would then be invited to consider applications in the recommended pool using their comprehensive review processes, and to extend admission offers as appropriate. A process of this sort, particularly if executed in a timely manner, might help to distribute the enrollment demand more uniformly across the UC system. It would also tend to preserve the systemwide character of UC freshman admission.