

MEETING CALL
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Friday, June 6, 2008
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Memorial Union, MU II

Page No.

1. Transcript of the April 14, 2008 Meeting	2
(Committee on Elections, Rules, & Jurisdiction Handout from 4/14/08 meeting)	3
2. Announcements by the President - None	
3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents - None	
4. Announcements by the Chancellor - None	
5. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – None	
6. Special Orders	
a. Remarks by the Staff Assembly Vice Chair – Peter Blando	
b. Remarks by the Divisional Chair - Linda Bisson	
7. Reports of standing committees	
a. Committee on Committees	
i. Confirmation of 2008-2009 standing committee appointments	14
b. Committee on Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction	
i. Notice of Committee on Committees Election Results (informational)	18
ii. Proposed amendments to Davis Division Bylaws 10 and 13.5: Executive Director of the Davis Division	19
iii. Advice on the Appointment of Senate Faculty to Administrative Committees	20
c. Distinguished Teaching Award Committee	
i. Confirmation of the 2007 Distinguished Teaching Award recipients	21
d. Undergraduate Council: Committee on General Education	
i. General Education Proposal	26
e. Davis Division Budgetary Task Force: Presentation of the draft report by Chair Bisson (draft report will be distributed and presented during the meeting)	
8. Petitions of Students	
9. Unfinished Business	
10. University and Faculty Welfare	
11. New Business	

Susan Kauzlarich, Secretary
Representative Assembly of the
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

MEETING CALL
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Monday, April 14, 2008
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Memorial Union, MU II

Page No.

- | | |
|---|---------|
| 1. Transcript of the February 26, 2008 Meeting
Action: Approved | 2 |
| 2. Announcements by the President - None | |
| 3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents - None | |
| 4. Announcements by the Chancellor - None | |
| 5. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – None | |
| 6. Special Orders | |
| a. Remarks by the Divisional Chair - Linda Bisson | |
| b. Announcement of the Call for Nominations of Committee on Committee membership | |
| 7. Reports of standing committees | |
| a. Committee on Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction: | |
| i. Legislative Rulings and Annual Report of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction (to be distributed at meeting) | Handout |
| ii. Proposed Revisions of DDR A552 & 538 | |
| Motion: To accept changes of the regulations from CERJ | |
| Action: Unanimously approved. | |
| b. Executive Council: | 4 |
| i. Proposed Revision of DDB 73 & 87 | 6 |
| Motion: To accept changes to the bylaws | |
| Action: Unanimously approved. | |
| 8. Petitions of Students | |
| 9. Unfinished Business | |
| 10. University and Faculty Welfare | |
| 11. New Business | |
| a. Resolution for Administrative Leadership Recruitments – | |
| Motion: To approve the edited resolution, embedded in a letter to the UC President written by Chair Bisson & reviewed/approved by the Executive Council. | |
| Action: Unanimously Approved. | |
| 12. Informational Items | |
| Motion to accept recipients selected for Public Service Award | |
| Action: Unanimously approved. | |

Susan Kauzlarich, Secretary
Representative Assembly of the
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

April 14, 2008

Legislative Ruling 4.08

Defining “Passing Quality” With Respect to the Assignment of Incompletes. The grade of Incomplete may only be assigned when the student’s completed work is of “passing quality” (Davis Division Regulation A540(C)). “Passing quality” means “of D- quality or better” whether the student is taking the course for a letter grade or not. The only exception is for courses listed in the General Catalog as being graded on a Passed/Not Passed or Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory basis only, in which case the completed work must be of a quality consistent with a grade of Pass or Satisfactory.

Background

DDR A540(C) states that

The grade Incomplete shall be assigned only when the student’s work is of passing quality and represents a significant portion of the requirements for a final grade, but is incomplete for good cause as determined by the instructor.

Some departments and faculty members have interpreted this to mean that an Incomplete can only be assigned where the completed work is of C- quality or better. In other cases Incompletes have been assigned as long as the student’s work is of D- quality or better. We seek to resolve this inconsistency in grading practices.

Analysis of Relevant Legislation

Systemwide legislation (ASR 780(A)) defines grades as follows:

Except as provided in SRs 778, 782, and 784, the work of all students in the University shall be reported in terms of six grades:

1. passing: A (excellent), B (good), C (fair), D (barely passing)
2. not passing: F (failure)
3. undetermined: Incomplete

The Davis Division implementation under DDR A540(A) is less explicit:

The work of each student shall be reported in terms of the following grades: A (excellent), B (good), C (fair), D (poor), F (failure), I (incomplete), and IP (in progress). Grades of A, B, C, and D may be modified by plus (+) or minus (-) suffixes.

However, all Divisional Regulations, including grading systems, must be consistent with Systemwide Regulations (see ASB 310(A)(1)) unless the Assembly of the Academic Senate provides a variance (per ASR 778(F)). And the variance granted by the Assembly authorizing the Davis Division to define grades at variance with ASR 780(A) reiterates that a D is a passing grade:

In the Davis Division, the passing grades “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D” may be modified by plus (+) or minus (-) suffixes. (Variance approved November 3, 1969.)

The grade of D- is therefore of “passing quality” (albeit “barely passing”). This is consistent with the long-standing definition of a D as “barely passing” in the Davis General Catalog.

The minimum performance required for a grade of Pass under passed/not passed grading is a C- (ASR 778(C)(1); DDR A545(E)). Similarly, the performance required for a grade of Satisfactory is higher than the minimum passing level for letter grades (ASR 778(C)(2); DDR A548(D)). However, this does not alter the general definition of “passing” performance per ASR 780(A) for courses in which letter grades are assigned. Indeed, D grades are counted as “passing” for the purposes of the General Education requirement (DDR 522(B)(1)) and the Minimum Progress requirement (DDR A552(B)). Moreover, D grades are explicitly regarded as “passing” for minimum progress, even if the course is repeated:

If a student receives a grade of D in a course and repeats the course, the course shall be counted as units passed each time the course is passed up to a maximum of 16 units. (DDR A552(B)(1)(b).)

In a course for which letter grades may be assigned the faculty member has no official cognizance of whether a student is taking the course for a letter grade or on a passed/not passed (or satisfactory/unsatisfactory) basis. Because the faculty member submits only letter grades, the letter grading standard must apply in determining whether the work is of passing quality. However, if the course is graded *exclusively* on a passed/not passed (or satisfactory/unsatisfactory) basis then letter grades are generally not computed. In that case the completed work is of passing quality if performance at that level would earn a grade of Pass (or Satisfactory).

Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

July 20, 2007

Legislative Ruling 7.07

Committee Authority Over Student Petitions and Appeals. The Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction (CERJ) is the Divisional committee with exclusive jurisdiction to interpret Senate legislation, and it may do so by issuing Advice or Legislative Rulings. But it does not make findings of fact on individual student petitions or consider appeals of such findings of fact.

The Grade Change Committee (GCC) has exclusive jurisdiction over all grade change requests. In exercising this authority it is fully bound by the Guidelines which it is required to issue on behalf of the Division. And it has no authority to change a grade on the basis of a reassessment of the quality of a student's work, even with the concurrence of the student and the faculty member involved.

The Student-Faculty Relationships Committee (SFRC) may make appropriate recommendations on matters relating to student-faculty relations which are not the responsibility of other committees. But it has no authority to consider or to make recommendations arising out of inquiries or allegations about grading irregularities of any kind.

Bona fide appeals of committee decisions on student matters are generally referred (at the discretion of the Secretary) to the Student Petitions Subcommittee of the Executive Council. However, under Executive Council procedures appeals are limited to confirming that the committee did not act in an arbitrary or capricious manner in making its determination and that the decision was based on substantial evidence.

Background

Members of the Division have raised questions regarding the handling of student petitions and appeals. These issues have now been raised with five Senate committees: the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction, the Grade Change Committee, the Student-Faculty Relationships Committee, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and the Student Petitions Subcommittee of the Executive Council.

This Legislative Ruling clarifies the authority of the several committees over student petitions (including appeals).

Discussion of Committee Jurisdiction and Authority

The Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction (CERJ) is the committee charged

To advise the Division, its officers, committees, faculties, and members in all matters of organization, jurisdiction and interpretation of legislation of the Academic Senate and its agencies. (DDB 71(B)(5))

CERJ also has the authority to publish binding

legislative rulings interpreting the Code of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. Such rulings shall remain in effect until modified by legislative or Regental action. (DDB 71(B)(6))

In most cases CERJ provides interpretations of legislation by rendering Advice, and formal Advice of general applicability is published on the CERJ web site (academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/cerj). Such Advice, while not binding, “should nevertheless be considered authoritative” and “suggest[s] the likely outcome should...a Legislative Ruling be requested on the issues involved.” (Systemwide Legislative Ruling 12.93B.) When a Legislative Ruling is issued it is formally binding on the Division and its committees.

Therefore, CERJ is the Divisional committee with exclusive jurisdiction to interpret Senate legislation, including Bylaws and Regulations dealing with the handling of student petitions and appeals. CERJ is also authorized to resolve jurisdictional questions within the Senate. But it does not make findings of fact on individual student petitions or consider appeals of such findings of fact.

The Grade Change Committee (GCC) has the authority to

adjudicate grade change requests which are not unambiguously justified by the Regulations of the Academic Senate and of the Davis Division.. (DDB 78(B))

Thus GCC has exclusive jurisdiction over all grade change requests. (Professional school courses covered by Davis Division Regulation 549(D) are not considered in this Ruling.)

Guidelines governing the administration of grade changes are issued by GCC on behalf of the Davis Division. They are published on a regular basis in the Class Schedule and Registration Guide’s section on Grade Change Guidelines. The adoption of these Guidelines is mandated by Davis Division Regulation 549(D), which states that “Approval or denial shall be governed by working guidelines that are consistent with the provisions of Davis Division Regulation A540.”

These Guidelines are promulgated under a specific grant of authority under Davis Division Regulation 549(D) and thus have greater legislative authority than the usual procedural rules which a committee might adopt under general parliamentary principles. In particular, because the Regulation specifies that GCC decisions “shall be governed” by those Guidelines, the Guidelines are fully binding on GCC itself. Of course, GCC may modify its Guidelines from time to time and provide notice of these changes by appropriate publication. But if GCC were able to ignore or waive the Guidelines on a case-by-case basis then Davis Division Regulation 549(D) would be rendered meaningless.

Furthermore, the Guidelines note that “A grade can be changed only if a ‘clerical’ or ‘procedural’ error can be documented.” This is consistent with Divisional Regulations:

All grades except Incomplete or In Progress are final when filed by the instructor in the end-of-term course report. The correction of clerical and procedural errors shall be governed by guidelines established by the Davis Division and shall be under the supervision of the Davis Division Grade Changes Committee. No change of grade may be made on the basis of reassessment of the quality of a student’s work or, with the exception of Incomplete or In Progress grades, the

completion of additional work. No term grade except Incomplete may be revised by re-examination. (Davis Division Regulation A540(E).)

In the face of this clear prohibition in the Regulations, GCC has no authority to change a grade on the basis of a reassessment of the quality of a student's work, even with the agreement of both the student and the faculty member involved and even if it were believed that doing so would not disadvantage other students in a particular case.

The Student-Faculty Relationships Committee (SFRC) has the authority to

consider all information submitted to it, relative to student-faculty relations that are not the responsibility of other committees, and may make comments and recommendations to the group or individual having specific authority regarding resolution of any problems involved. (DDB 111(B))

Thus, while SFRC has no specific decision-making authority, it has broad authority to consider issues relating to student-faculty relations and to make appropriate recommendations. However, because questions about grades are the responsibility of GCC, SFRC has no authority to consider grading inquiries or to make recommendations arising from allegation of grading irregularities, regardless of the nature of those allegations. Such allegations are considered solely by GCC, which alone has authority to take remedial action if procedural errors have been made.

Discussion of Appeals of Committee Decisions

Student petitions not covered explicitly by the Bylaws, including appeals of final decisions by a standing committee, are referred to an appropriate committee at the discretion of the Secretary as provided by Davis Division Legislative Ruling 11.05. The Secretary generally refers *bona fide* appeals to the Student Petitions Subcommittee of the Executive Council, which has been established for this purpose.

The Executive Council may establish policies and procedures for the operation of this subcommittee. On January 17, 2006 the Executive Council approved the following criteria for the evaluation of student appeals:

The role of the Student Petitions Subcommittee in reviewing a student petition appealing the action of a standing committee is to assure that the standing committee did not act in an arbitrary or capricious manner in making its determination and that the decision of the standing committee is based on substantial evidence. The Student Petitions subcommittee does not believe that it should substitute its judgment on the substantive merits of the petition for the judgment of the reviewing committee that is more directly informed of the facts and issues of the case, and to which Senate bylaws assign primary responsibility in the matter. (December 7, 2005 Report of the Student Petitions Subcommittee of the Executive Council, unanimously endorsed by the Executive Council per the Approved Minutes of its January 17, 2006 meeting.)

**Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction
Annual Report 2006-2007**

Total Meetings: In Person: 10 Electronic: approximately 30	Meeting Frequency: In person: 3-4/quarter Electronic: weekly	Average Hours of Committee Work Per Week: 10
Total bylaw and regulation proposals, other advice matters, and elections supervised: 40.	Total matters deferred from previous year: 0	Total matters deferred to coming academic year: 0

CERJ took the following actions during 2006-2007:

Formal Legislative Rulings Issued

CERJ issues formal Legislative Rulings to resolve disputes or clear up ambiguities in the Code of the Senate regarding Senate authority, procedures, or jurisdiction. Legislative Rulings are binding unless modified by subsequent legislative or Regental action.

Legislative Ruling 7.07 on Committee Authority Over Student Petitions and Appeals: On July 20, 2007 CERJ issued the following Legislative Ruling:

*The **Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction** (CERJ) is the Divisional committee with exclusive jurisdiction to interpret Senate legislation, and it may do so by issuing Advice or Legislative Rulings. But it does not make findings of fact on individual student petitions or consider appeals of such findings of fact.*

*The **Grade Change Committee** (GCC) has exclusive jurisdiction over all grade change requests. In exercising this authority it is fully bound by the Guidelines which it is required to issue on behalf of the Division. And it has no authority to change a grade on the basis of a reassessment of the quality of a student's work, even with the concurrence of the student and the faculty member involved.*

*The **Student-Faculty Relationships Committee** (SFRC) may make appropriate recommendations on matters relating to student-faculty relations which are not the responsibility of other committees. But it has no authority to consider or to make recommendations arising out of inquiries or allegations about grading irregularities of any kind.*

*Bona fide appeals of committee decisions on student matters are generally referred (at the discretion of the Secretary) to the **Student Petitions Subcommittee of the Executive Council**. However, under Executive Council procedures appeals are limited to confirming that the committee did not act in an arbitrary or capricious manner in making its determination and that the decision was based on substantial evidence.*

The Ruling, with a description of its background and rationale, is hereby reported to the Representative Assembly together with this Annual Report. (It was previously included in the October 23, 2007 Representative Assembly Meeting Call as part of the Annual Report of the Committee on Student-Faculty Relationships.)

Formal Advice Issued

Most of the work of the Committee involves advising Senate officers, Senate committees, and individual members when questions or conflicts arise. Such advice is not formally binding but suggests the likely outcome should a formal Legislative Ruling be requested. Advice of a recurring nature and/or of general importance is listed below and is also published (including expanded explanations) in CERJ's online Archive of Advice.

(1) Changing "Sections" to "Departments" in the College of Biological Sciences: CERJ advised the Dean of Biological Sciences that changing CBS sections to departments would not require modification of Divisional or College Bylaws because sections and departments are regarded as equivalent for Senate purposes under Davis Division Bylaw 153(B) and CBS Bylaw 1.

However, there is a perception (if not the reality) that sections are less permanently defined than are departments. For that reason it is clear that changing a traditional department (say, the English department) to a "section" would be a reconstitution requiring Senate approval following the procedures of PPM 200-20, because such a change could ultimately affect the departmental status of Senate members. Symmetry would suggest that changing CBS sections back to departments would also require Senate approval, even though that change is much less likely to affect Senate members. (A related issue would be changing an L&S "program" to a "department," or vice versa.)
(10/25/2006)

(2) Jurisdiction of CAP, P&T, and CERJ on Academic Personnel Matters. In reference to inquiries which raised jurisdictional questions regarding Senate committees, CERJ advised as follows:

The **Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction** (CERJ) is the Divisional committee with exclusive jurisdiction to interpret Senate legislation, and may do so by issuing Advice or Legislative Rulings.

The **Committee on Academic Personnel Oversight Committee** (CAP) is the Senate agency with authority to develop and to advise and confer with the Administration on all matters of general academic personnel policy and procedures, consistent with Senate Bylaws (as interpreted, where necessary, by CERJ). CAP's authority on matters of general policy is subject to consultation with the Executive Council (DDB 42(B)(5)), regular reporting to the Representative Assembly (DDB 42(B)(6)), and consistency with the will of the Division as expressed by the Representative Assembly or by ballot (DDB 42(B)(6-7)).

The **Committee on Privilege and Tenure** (P&T) is the Senate agency with exclusive jurisdiction to adjudicate individual grievances, consistent with Senate Bylaws (as interpreted, where necessary, by CERJ). P&T alone has the authority to advise the Administration on whether policy has, in a particular case, been implemented in a manner which violates an individual faculty member's rights, privileges, or tenure. But it does not have jurisdiction to develop, interpret, or determine the validity of Senate policy in general. (12/13/2006)

(3) The Use of Collegiality as a Factor in Academic Personnel Cases. This question has been the subject of litigation, and CERJ advised that the applicable cases allow the University to consider collegiality, but that they do not require it to do so, or to employ any particular definition of

collegiality. This is therefore a policy matter to be resolved under the principles of shared governance.

CERJ further advised that Davis Division Bylaws 42(B)(6), 42(B)(8), and 45(A) require that standards for personnel actions be established, reported to the Representative Assembly (which retains final authority over Senate policy under Davis Division Bylaw 42(B)(7)), and made widely known (generally through publication on a Web site). Policies adopted by the Committee on Academic Personnel Oversight Committee can only be viewed as representing the position of the Senate if these reporting procedures are followed. This ensures that both faculty under review and those involved with the review process at all levels are aware of and consistently apply well-defined established standards. (12/13/2006)

(4) The Appealability of Career Equity Reviews. CERJ advised that the Career Equity Review as currently administered is not limited to claims that a committee “has failed to apply established standards of merit or has failed to follow established procedures,” and it is not heard by the Committee on Academic Personnel Appellate Committee (CAPAC). Unless a Career Equity Review is limited to such claims and is heard by CAPAC, it is not itself an appeal within the meaning of Davis Division Bylaw 45(A).

Davis Division Bylaws 42(C)(A) and 45(A) provide for appeals to CAPAC of any personnel action considered by the Committee on Academic Personnel Oversight Subcommittee (CAP) or any other personnel committee. Therefore, CERJ advised that the Career Equity Review as currently administered is subject to appeal to CAPAC, subject to normal time limits and procedures.

CERJ regarded its advice as only addressing pending and future cases. However, the Vice Provost chose to extend the benefits of the advice further, allowing appeals by any faculty member whose Career Equity Review was denied within the preceding three years. (12/13/2006)

(5) Obligation of a Committee to Respond to an Inquiry or Suggestion: Advised that, where a faculty member makes an inquiry or suggestion to CAP or another Senate committee -- even if the inquiry is styled as a “formal request” -- the Bylaws impose no requirement on the committee to respond in a particular way, or at all, to such an inquiry. All committees have limited time and resources and it is within the discretion of each committee to give an inquiry whatever attention it judges to be appropriate, from proposing a major policy change to determining that the inquiry does not warrant consideration on the agenda. Except as governed by specific Bylaw provisions, other standing committees and divisional officers do not have the authority to direct how a committee sets its priorities.

However, as prudential advice CERJ noted that it would be appropriate for the Committee to respond--even if only to say that it did not feel that further consideration of the matter was warranted--so that the inquiring party knows that his or her inquiry did not simply slip between the cracks. (2/16/2007)

(6) Voting on cases of Non-Senate Instructional Faculty Not Covered by a Collective Bargaining Agreement. A department inquired as to whether the Administration could require a vote by a non-Senate faculty peer group during the review of non-Senate instructional faculty not covered by a collective bargaining agreement.

CERJ advised that Systemwide Legislative Ruling 7.06, establishes that “only members of the Academic Senate may vote on the departmental recommendation in a merit action involving non-Senate instructional faculty. A department may solicit a recommendation or vote from non-Senate instructional faculty to be used in its deliberations.” That is, the final vote of the Department conducted pursuant to Academic Senate Bylaw 55 is limited to Senate members. The Ruling goes on to state that any vote by non-Senate faculty must not be conflated with the Senate vote or reported in the department letter in which the Senate vote is reported.

In our November 12, 2004 brief to the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, CERJ wrote that “While CERJ accepts that a vote of this restricted kind would be permissible, we can see practical difficulties in requiring it.” But neither the Ruling nor any Senate legislation prevents the Administration from requiring a vote of non-Senate faculty if it is reported in a manner consistent with this Ruling. Whether the burdens of conducting such a vote outweigh the value of the information it provides is a policy question which, under the principles of shared governance, is resolved by the Administration (after Senate consultation) by publication of the Academic Personnel Manual. Because the APM is an Administration and not a Senate document, we lack jurisdiction to interpret its provisions.

In sum, Senate legislation and rulings neither preclude nor require a vote by non-Senate instructional faculty, and an Administration requirement to conduct such a vote does not violate Legislative Ruling 7.06. (3/5/2007)

(7) Petitions to Interchange P/NP Grades for Normal Letter Grades. The Grade Change Committee asked whether it had the authority to interchange P/NP grades with normal letter grades (for example, to grant a request to change a grade of NP to a D+). CERJ advised that GCC has no authority to consider such requests for two reasons:

First, the GCC’s published guidelines clearly state that “Requests to interchange P, NP, S, or U and normal letter grades, based upon student need (e.g., NP to D to allow graduation, P to B for entrance to professional school, etc.) do not involve clerical or procedural errors; these petitions are denied automatically.” The committee is bound to follow its own guidelines until such time as it establishes new guidelines.

Second, systemwide Legislative Ruling 3.67B is dispositive on this issue: “Only the grade Not Passed may be assigned to a student whose work is not of passing quality in a course in which he was enrolled on the basis of Senate Regulation 782 [Passed or Not Passed grades].”

Therefore, GCC has no authority to change a duly-awarded NP grade (that is, one which is not the result of a clerical or procedural error) to a letter grade. (4/10/2007)

(8) Receiving Fewer Nominations for Committee on Committees than the Number of Vacancies to be Filled. CERJ advised that, when fewer nominations are received for the Committee on Committees than the number of vacancies to be filled, the Bylaws do not provide the authority to reopen nominations. Instead Davis Division Bylaw 16(B) refers to a specific “date and time after which nominations will no longer be accepted.” And while the Committee on Committees has the authority to make nominations for Divisional Representatives when there are insufficient nominations, there is no such authority to make nominations for the Committee on Committees itself.

Instead, Davis Division Bylaw 16(C)(5) states that “In case the number of persons nominated as herein above prescribed is not in excess of the number of places to be filled, the election by ballot shall be omitted and the Secretary of the Davis Division shall, if so instructed by the Representative Assembly, declare all nominees elected.”

And Davis Division Bylaw 40(A) requires that the new Committee convene to fill the remaining vacancies in its membership, with the members so appointed serving “until the next regular election of members of the committee.” (5/7/2007)

(9) Senate Authority Over Name Changes for Majors. CERJ advised that the Undergraduate Council, acting for the Davis Division of the Academic Senate, has authority over proposed changes in the names of undergraduate majors.

Policy and Procedure Manual 220-20 states that changes of names of academic units require Senate approval. Policy and Procedure Manual 200-25 addresses degree programs, but does not speak directly to name changes. However, a name change could alter the whole meaning of a degree, and Senate authority under Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(b) (“The Academic Senate shall authorize and supervise all courses and curricula...”) is stronger over degree programs than over academic units. (7/18/2007)

Other Advice Provided

The following advice relates to matters which are of a one-time nature or of less general applicability than the formal advice listed above. Only selected matters are reported here.

Reporting of W-2 Information to TALX. Advised the Divisional Chair regarding issues involved with opt-out arrangements for releasing W-2 information to the company TALX (which was subsequently acquired by Equifax).

Designated Emphases: Advised the Divisional Chair and Graduate Council regarding the status of designated emphases under the Code of the Senate. Observed that the Assembly-Approved variance authorizing Designated Emphases at Davis lists specific emphases, and the list has not been updated to reflect current practice. Berkeley has recently been granted a “generic” variance for offering designated emphases, and it would be appropriate for Davis to request a similar open-ended variance.

Research Payroll Titles for Faculty For Effort-Reporting Purposes: Advised regarding the implications of temporary appointments of Senate members to research titles for effort-reporting purposes.

Davis Division Bylaw 64 (Committee on International Studies and Exchanges): Advised regarding the drafting of a Bylaw to change the composition of the Committee on International Studies and Exchanges.

Davis Division Bylaw 73 (Academic Senate Emergency Preparedness Legislation): Advised the Pandemic Planning Task Force and the Executive Council regarding proposed legislation allowing Senate action in emergency situations.

Davis Division Regulation 520(C) (Dissertation and Final Examination for the PhD): Worked with the Graduate Council to draft legislation clarifying the complicated and unclear language of DDR 520(C) spelling out the requirements for the PhD degree under Plans A, B and C.

Davis Division Bylaw 16 (Electronic Voting): Drafted legislation for the implementation of electronic voting in the Division.

General Education Requirement: Advised the General Education Task Force regarding drafting considerations for their pending proposal for revisions of the General Education requirement.

Student Sounding Board: Advised that a proposed “Student Sounding Board,” envisioned as a self-perpetuating subcommittee of the Executive Council consisting solely of student members, would likely be in violation of Senate Bylaws for two reasons: First, it may not be permissible for a formal Senate subcommittee to consist solely of persons who are not Senate members. (This may violate DDB 29(A).) And second, it may not be permissible for a Senate subcommittee to be self-perpetuating. (This may violate DDB 29(F).)

In addition, a self-perpetuating body provides no student recourse if the body, appointing its own successors, who in turn appoint their own successors indefinitely, becomes unrepresentative of its constituencies.

Supervision of Routine Elections of the Division.

Respectfully Submitted,

L. Jay Helms, Chair
Thomas Farver
G.J. Matthey

Appointments – Reported to Representative Assembly

Divisional Officers – 2008-2009

Chair: Robert Powell (confirmed by RA 2/26/08)

Vice Chair: Pablo Ortiz

Secretary: Donald Price

Parliamentarian: L. Jay Helms

Academic Federation Excellence in Teaching Award:

Brenda Schildgen

Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Gregory Pasternack, Chair, James Beaumont, Carlton Larson, Nelson Max, Joan Rowe

UCAF Davis Divisional Representative: Gregory Pasternack

Academic Personnel Appellate Committee

Stuart Cohen, Chair, Judy Callis, Bryce Falk, Biswanath Mukherjee, Walter Stone

Academic Personnel Oversight Committee

William Casey, Chair, Xiaomei Chen, Robert Feenstra, Laurel Gershwin, Hung Ho, Ahmet Palazoglu, Gregg Recanzone, Scott Simmon, John Widdicombe

UCAP Davis Divisional Representative: Ahmet Palazoglu

Admissions and Enrollment

Keith Widaman, Chair, Penny Gullan, A. Katie Harris, Nasim Hedayati, Ronald Phillips

BOARS Davis Division Representative: VACANT: COC is attempting to fill the vacancy ASAP

Affirmative Action and Diversity

Jon Rossini, Chair, Elizabeth Miller, Ann Orel, Susan Rivera, Sharon Strauss, Monica Vazirani and Eddy U

UCAAD Davis Divisional Representative: Ann Orel

Courses of Instruction

Gregory Clark, Chair, Julian Alston, Robert Bell, Matthew Bishop, Michael Hill, Marcel Holyoak

Distinguished Teaching Awards

Gina Werfel, Chair, Norman Matloff, Kent Pinkerton, John Harada, James Wilen

Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

G. J. Matthey, Chair, Tom Farver, and Donna Shestowsky

Emeriti

Appointments – Reported to Representative Assembly

Tom Rost, Chair, Joann Cannon, Bill Lasley, Paul Leigh, Maria Manoliu, John Reitan, Robert Smiley

Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisers

Martine Quinzii, Chair, Chris Calvert, Ed Imwinkelreid, Erich Loewy, Motohico Mulase, Ann Orel

Faculty Research Lecture Award

Alan Hastings, Chair, Anna Marie Busse Berger, J. Clark Largarias, , Zuhair Munir, Alan S. Taylor

Faculty Welfare

Joel Hass, Chair, Michael Dahmus, Alan Jackman (Emeritus member), Norma Landau, Saul Schaefer, Lisa Tell, Chi-Ling Tsai
UCFW Davis Divisional Representative: Lisa Tell

Grade Changes

Robert Becker, Chair, James Boggan, Carlitto Lebrilla, David Webb, Jeffery Williams

Graduate Council

Jack Gunion, Chair, Andre Knoesen, Vice Chair, Alan Buckpitt, Peggy Farnham, Rachel Goodhue, Adrienne Martin, Miroslav Nincic, Martha O'Donnell, Jeffrey Schank, Blake Stimson, Jeffrey Stott, Brian Weare
CCGA Davis Divisional Representative: Andre Knoesen

Graduate Student Privilege Advisor

Chris Calvert

Information Technology

Michael Hogarth, Chair, Giulia Galli, Niels Jensen, Douglas Kahn, Felix Wu
ITTP Davis Divisional Representative: Felix Wu

International Studies and Exchanges

Frank Verstraete, Chair, Carlson Arnett, Robert Borgen, Robert Flocchini, Cristina Martinez-Carazo, Philip Rogaway, Xiaoling Shu
UCIE Davis Divisional Representative: Robert Flocchini

(A/F) Joint Federation/Senate Personnel

Philip Shaver, Bernard Levy, Judy Jerstedt

(A/F) Administrative Series Personnel Committee

Diana Strazdes

Appointments – Reported to Representative Assembly

Library

Andrew Waldron, Chair and Norma Landau
UCOL Davis Divisional Representative: Andrew Waldron

Planning and Budget

Bruno Nachtergaele, Chair, James Chalfant, Zhi Ding, Gail Finney, Jeannette Money, Alexandra Navrotsky, Philip Shaver, Steve Tharratt, Michael Turrelli
UCPB Davis Divisional Representative: James Chalfant

Instructional Space Advisory Group (subcommittee of Planning and Budget)

Patricia Boeshaar and Joseph Sorensen (Chair and one other member is selected by Planning and Budget Committee from its membership)

Privilege and Tenure – Hearings

Lisa Ikemoto, Chair, James Adams, Diane Amann, David Biale, Mary Christopher, Deborah Diercks, Robert Hendren, Nelson Max, Rachel Parrenas, Francene Steinberg, Fern Tablin, Bassam Younis

Privilege and Tenure – Investigative

Greg Kuperberg, Chair, Andrew Chan, David Hollowell, Philip Kass, Louise Jackson
UCPT Davis Divisional Representative: Andrew Chan

Public Service

Vito Polito, Chair, Rachael Goodhue, Carlton Larson, Norman Matloff, Cynthia Passmore

Research – Grants

Robert Berman, Chair, Katharine Burnett, Gino Cortopassi, David Ferrenc, David Fyhrie, David Hwang, Saud Joseph, Levent Kavvas, Guido Kuersteiner, Gerhard Richter, Reen Wu

Research – Policy

Robert Berman, Chair, Raul Aranovich, Eduardo Blumwald, Carolyn de la Pena, Adela de la Torre, Russell Hovey, Lyn Kimsey, Julie Leary, Gregory Miller, Jon Ramsey, Rena Zieve,
CORP Davis Divisional Representative: Gregory Miller, Julie Leary as alternate

Student-Faculty Relationships

Raul Piedrahita, Chair, Gail Goodman, Lori Lubin, Philip (Rick) Vulliet

Transportation and Parking

Charles Hunt, Chair, Shelley Blozis, Yu-Fung Lin, Joanna Groza, J. Paul Leigh

Appointments – Reported to Representative Assembly

Undergraduate Council

Thomas Famula, Chair, Christiana Drake, Tim Lewis, Doug Miller, Diana Strazdes, Shrini Upadhyaya, Kent Wilken, John Yoder, Elizabeth Constable, Krishnan Nambiar, John Bolander, Dan Potter

UCEP Davis Divisional Representative: John Yoder

UGC – General Education

Elizabeth Constable, Chair, Patricia Boeshaar, Ron Hess, Ted Margadant, Patricia Moran

UGC – Preparatory Education

John Bolander, Chair, Demitri Fuchs, Richard Levin, Alyson Mitchel, Ning Pan

UCOPE Davis Divisional Representative: Richard Levin

UGC – Special Academic Programs

Krishnan Nambiar, Chair, Harry Cheng, Jerold (Jerry) Last, Brenda Schildgen, Diana Strazdes,

UGC – Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review

Dan Potter, Chair, Joseph Biello, Kyu Hyun Kim

Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes

Rajiv Singh, Chair, Toby W. Allen, Hussain Al-Asaad, Raul Aranovich, Patricia Boeshaar, Andrew Chan, Joanna Groza, Mark Halperin, Bruce Haynes, Carlos Jackson, Kristin Lagatutta, Richard Levin, Sebastian Schreiber, Ann Stevens, Julie Sze, David Van Vuren

May 18, 2008

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS, RULES AND JURISDICTION
ELECTION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

An election for five (5) vacancies on the Committee on Committees has been conducted by electronic means, with ballots due on May 15, 2008. Of these five positions, three expire in spring 2011, one expires in spring 2010, and one expires in spring 2009. The staggered terms are required because two vacancies (one expiring in 2010, one expiring in 2009) occurred in June 2007 and were filled by interim appointments pending the next regular election. The votes received are as follows:

Adela de la Torre, Chicana/o Studies	205
***Matthew Farrens, Computer Science	314
***Sharon Hietala, Vet Med: Medicine and Epidemiology	318
**Suad Joseph, Anthropology	270
Krishnan Nambiar, Chemistry	262
*James R. Rustad, Geology	263
***Richard Sexton, Agricultural & Resource Economics	275
David Simpson, English	257

Davis Division Bylaw 16(E)(3) specifies that "In elections to fill vacancies with different length terms, the candidates receiving the highest numbers of votes shall be declared elected to the longer terms of office in the order of their total votes." Therefore Professors Hietala, Farrens and Sexton (indicated with three asterisks above) are declared elected to three-year terms (through spring 2011); Professor Joseph (indicated with two asterisks above) is declared elected for a two-year term (through spring 2010); and Professor Rustad (indicated with one asterisk above) is declared elected for a one-year term (through spring 2009). In accordance with Davis Division Bylaw 39(A)(1), all five new members assume office immediately and serve until the election of their successors.

Members continuing in office until the election of their successors in spring 2010 are Trish Berger (Animal Science) and Michelle Yeh (East Asian Languages and Cultures). Members continuing in office until the election of their successors in spring 2009 are Zhaojun Bai (Computer Science) and Brian Mulloney (Neurobiology, Physiology & Behavior).

Respectfully submitted,

L. Jay Helms, Chair
Thomas B. Farver
G. J. Matthey

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO DAVIS DIVISION BYLAWS 10 and 13.5:
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE DAVIS DIVISION**

May 15, 2008

Submitted by the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction.
Endorsed by the Executive Council

Rationale:

The systemwide Academic Senate and each of the Divisional Senate offices have an Executive Director who has executive responsibility for their respective Senate offices. Over the past several years, significant changes have been made at both the systemwide and the Divisional levels to ensure that a high level of professional support is available for faculty who help fulfill the responsibilities of the Academic Senate in shared governance.

The systemwide Executive Director was recently designated a “non-Senate officer of the Academic Senate” (ASB 16, adopted May 9, 2007) to ensure appropriate recognition by administrative bodies of the critical importance of the Executive Director to the effective functioning of the Senate. For the same reason, the Davis Division wishes to acknowledge the essential role of the Divisional Executive Director in the work of the Senate and the complexity of the Executive Director’s responsibilities. This proposal, then, mirrors the change effected last year at the systemwide level.

Proposed Bylaw 13.5 recognizes the responsibilities of the Executive Director as falling into two general areas: chief of staff and policy advisor. Thus the Executive Director is responsible for overseeing the budget of the Division and for supervising the staff of the Divisional office, as well as for providing policy advice to Divisional officers and committees. Additional responsibilities include managing policy analyses, overseeing the maintenance of the historical record of the Davis Division, ensuring facilitation and coordination of all activities of the Representative Assembly and its agencies, and providing effective advocacy for the role of the Davis Division and for the resources it needs to fulfill its shared-governance responsibilities.

Proposed Revision: The following amendment to Davis Division Bylaw 10 and the following new Davis Division Bylaw 13.5 are hereby proposed. (Deletions are indicated by ~~strikeout type~~; additions are in **bold type**.)

Davis Division Bylaw 10

The officers of the Davis Division shall be a Chair, a Chair-Elect, a Vice Chair and a Secretary. Their terms of office and duties are prescribed in DD Bylaws 11-13, subject, however, to the provisions of DD Bylaw 40 I. **In addition, the Executive Director shall be a non-Senate officer of the Davis Division.**

Davis Division Bylaw 13.5. Executive Director

- A. Upon recommendation of the Executive Council, and in accordance with applicable policies and procedures, the Chair of the Davis Division shall appoint an Executive Director of the Davis Division. The Executive Director shall report to and receive general direction from the Chair of the Davis Division, with guidance and input from the Executive Council as necessary.**
- B. The Executive Director, as a non-Senate officer of the Davis Division, among other duties, shall serve as chief of staff for the Davis Division and as policy advisor to the officers of the Division.**

Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction
Advice on the Appointment of Senate Faculty to Administrative Committees
 May 8, 2008

Background

Committee on Committees Chair Craig Tracy has asked CERJ to review Senate authority regarding the appointment of Academic Senate members to administrative committees.

Advice

Davis Division Bylaws give the Executive Council the responsibility to

be available for consultation with the Chief Campus Officer concerning the establishment of Administrative task forces, and communicate with appropriate Divisional committees relative to the establishment of task forces by the campus Administration. (Davis Division Bylaw 73(C)(2).)

Administration requests for the appointment of Academic Senate representatives on administrative task forces--or any administrative committee, however styled--should therefore be addressed to the Executive Council through the Chair of the Division. The Executive Council may delegate the appointment authority to the Chair, to the Committee on Committees, or to the appropriate standing committee, subject to the provision that

No member of the Division holding an administrative title of Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Provost, Vice Provost, Dean, Associate Dean or titles with equivalent levels of administrative responsibility may serve as a member of a divisional committee or as a representative of the Davis Division to any taskforce, committee, or agency (except in a non-voting, ex officio capacity.) These restrictions do not apply to chairs of academic departments or programs. (Davis Division Bylaw 28(C).)

Only Academic Senate members appointed by the Division in this manner may be regarded as being representatives of the Academic Senate.

In instances where the administration appoints Senate members to administrative committees without following these procedures,

Lacking formal connection to the Senate, such committees cannot provide advice to the Administration on behalf of the Senate as called for in the Standing Orders. The formation of an administrative advisory committee does not represent consultation with the Senate. (*Mending the Wall: Report of the Special Committee on Shared Governance and Senate Operations* (December 13, 2004), Section 2.3.)

DAVID BLOCK

Undergraduate Category

Professor David Block has two home departments: Chemical Engineering and Material Science, and Viticulture and Enology. Prof. Block's research focuses primarily on Bioprocess optimization. Upon arrival at UC Davis in 1996, making good use of his prior industrial experience, he established two new courses: "Biotechnology Facility Design and Regulatory Compliance (ECH 161)" and Wine Technology and Winery Systems (VEN 135)." In ECH 161, Prof. Block covers the material necessary for the design and operation of a facility producing biopharmaceuticals with an emphasis on therapeutic recombinant proteins. He discusses the design of the equipment for each process area, and covers the issues related to compliance with current laws. He brings equipment vendors to his class for demonstrations and takes his students on tours of local biotech facilities. The course also incorporates a quarter-long group design project giving students a real-life hands-on experience. The students create a performance plan and partake in a self and group evaluation exercise conducting a performance review. Prof Block published a paper in Chemical engineering education describing his ECH 161 experience, thus sharing his teaching experience with other biochemical engineering instructors. In Wine Technology and Winery Systems (VEN 135) course, he also adopted a design project to accompany the description of the winery equipment in the lecture. He positions each piece of winery equipment in the "class winery". By the end of the course, he has a complete winery equipment lay out. Students get a real hands-on education in this course. "Recognizing the educational gaps in the current UCD CEMS and VEN curricula, Prof. Block created and taught courses uniquely relevant to either program" wrote the chair. The course brings together the very practical aspects of equipment specifications, design, selection and validation for bioprocess equipment" wrote another colleague. He uses a class project to enhance the understanding of each major system.

Student comments are equally glowing: "Awesome lecturer who knows his material." "Best class I ever had at UC Davi." "I acquired so much practical knowledge in this class." "Prof. Block had an extraordinary sense in teaching practical skills that can be applied almost immediately after completing the course." "This was by far the most hands-on course I have ever taken." "This is my all-time favorite class." "World class." Prof. Block's high student evaluation scores (6.8-6.94/7) testifies to his teaching excellence. Prof. Block is also an excellent mentor. "Excellent instructor and a nurturing mentor," wrote a student describing his help as she sought graduate school admission.

Prof. Block's teaching excellence has been recognized previously. He received the "Chemical Engineering Professor of the Year Award" 2001-2002 from the UCD chapter of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers and the AIChE Award for Chemical Engineering Excellence for Academic Training" in 2007 from the Northern California Section.

The DTA committee concurs with the comments from Prof. Block's students and faculty colleagues. In recognition of his teaching excellence, we are pleased to present Prof. Block the 2008 Distinguished Teaching Award in the Undergraduate Category.

RANDY DAHLGREN

Undergraduate Category

A wide range of students, staff, alumni, and faculty colleagues all proclaim that Professor Randy Dahlgren does the incredible! He takes the most pedestrian of topics, the soil under our feet, and elevates it to one of the most scintillating courses on campus.

One student reported that she entered the introductory soil science class with no interest in “*dirt*” and expected it to be “... a dull but necessary requirement,” but her attitude changed dramatically because of “Randy’s enthusiasm for the complex and fascinating soil environment...” That student is now a Ph.D. soil chemist!

One of his senior colleagues with decades of experience and a reputation as an outstanding teacher himself says that he has not “...witnessed anyone else with his mix of enthusiasm, energy, ...and mastery of speaking.”

Professor Dahlgren pioneered the environmental track in the Science and Society program and developed the course SAS 5 (Crisis in the Environment?) because of his interest in teaching non-science students how science is used to understand and solve environmental issues. The course promotes environmental literacy, critical thinking, research skills, written communication skills, and debate.

His inspiring commitment to undergraduate education does not stop at the classroom. As Director of the Kearney Foundation of Soil Science, a UC research unit, he has instituted an undergraduate internship program, the first in the long history of the Kearney Foundation.

The Committee is delighted to recognize this outstanding and inspirational teacher with the 2008 Distinguished Teaching Award.

ROY DOI

Graduate and Professional Category

Professor Roy Doi's career has been marked by consistent research excellence as well as his outstanding commitment to ideals in graduate, undergraduate and postdoctoral training. Prof. Doi is one of the pioneers in the study of RNA polymerase function and gene regulation. In the 1980's he shifted his research to enzymology, structure and function of cellulosome, a complex of cellulolytic enzymes that can convert cellulose (plant waste products) into glucose which can be fermented to produce ethanol. This is the idea behind converting waste biomass into biofuel. Prof. Doi is an international leader in this field. He has been very successful in his research activities and his election to the National Academy of Sciences in 2006 was indeed a well deserved recognition.

Professor Doi's lab has been a successful training ground for a large group of junior scientists. Nearly half of his doctoral and postdoctoral trainees have gone on to distinguished careers as professors at major universities around the world. Others are in highly placed government agencies and biotechnology or pharmaceutical industries. UCD faculty Chet Price (FST), Valerie Williamson (Nematology) and Prof. Kenneth Burtis, now the Dean of the College of Biological Sciences, received their training with Prof. Doi. His mentoring abilities in training graduate students and postdoctoral fellows engendered in them respect and gratitude, and they are now emulating his training model in their own research laboratories. Typical comments from his former trainees include: "Calm, stable and encouraging work environment in the lab," (His) "open-door policy: never too busy to discuss a scientific problem or to offer a thoughtful advice," "ability to promote in students a sense of intellectual ownership of their project," "ability to think independently," "promoted lab-wide brainstorming," "fostered creative and critical thinking." He involves his students in writing papers and encourages them to present their results at scientific meetings. He treats them as colleagues and helps them network with other scientists in the field. Prof. Doi's interest in his students' careers and his efforts to promote their success continue long after they leave his lab. He continues to mentor them in progressing through their career.

Prof. Doi made an immense impact on graduate training on UCD campus through his leadership role in establishing the "UC Davis Biotechnology Program." He was the PI on the first NIH Biotechnology Training Grant awarded to the campus in 1991. This program has been a continuing success on our campus. He also designed and established the course curriculum that is still part of the UCD Biotechnology Program. He designed the 'Emphasis in Biotechnology' program for graduate students. This program now involves 24 graduate groups and nearly 100 faculty trainers at UCD. Prof. Doi was also involved in securing NSF grants that helped train science teachers for California schools. Prof. Doi made great contributions to classroom instruction. He was involved the design of several graduate and undergraduate courses. His high scores in student evaluations even in large enrollment (300-400) undergraduate courses (BIS 103) are testimonials to his excellent teaching techniques.

We concur with all the sentiments expressed by Prof Doi's students and colleagues regarding his exemplary record in undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral training. We are proud to present Prof. Doi the 2008 Distinguished Graduate and Professional Mentoring Award.

BRUCE HAMMOCK

Graduate & Professional Category

Bruce Hammock, Professor of Entomology and Environmental Toxicology, is as, his recommenders attest, “first and foremost a talented scientist” of exceptional achievement. His own research fuels his stimulating teaching, and provides a model to which students aspire, even as it makes both colleagues and students grateful for his generous commitment to bringing others up to his own high level. In over thirty years at UC Davis, Hammock has mentored hundreds of students and professional researchers. He reaches beyond the one-on-one work that defines what mentoring means and how it functions in many disciplines, to create infrastructures that facilitate interaction and development. He not only creates a “lab culture” and “research environment” that students praise for promoting professional development, collaboration, and ethical awareness, he also pioneers extraordinary and exemplary structures for training and mentoring students. He not only has bright ideas about how to serve students better, he makes those ideas realities. He then sustains his commitment to them, quarter by quarter, and year by year, by making these innovations integral to the training of scientists in his department.

Every Wednesday Hammock’s entire research group of 40-50 individuals meets so that one member can present a formal research seminar and receive critique and advice. These meetings include undergraduates, graduate students, postgraduates and visiting scientists. In addition, Hammock meets weekly for an hour or more in a formal setting with the members of each of the three major research groups in his lab, thus each scientist gains experience in presenting formal scientific talks. Because of this comprehensive approach to training, scientists not only learn research methodology but also presentation skills and interdisciplinary interaction. They emerge as top-notch independent scientists skilled at conducting and communicating collaborative, integrated research. They go on to achieve national and international recognition and to land leadership positions. Hammock’s support for his students continues uninterrupted long after graduation.

Hammock has developed two extramurally funded training programs, the NIEHS Superfund Basic Research and Training Program (for which he’s served as director since 1987) and the NIH Training Program in Biomolecular Technology (for which he’s continuing as PI as it enters its second five-year term). He also participates in several graduate groups. In the classroom, as in the laboratory, Hammock never cuts corners. Instead, he seems to wrack his brain to come up with better ways to train students, such as the time-consuming but rewarding practice of administering individual oral examinations in Entomology 102.

The result of Hammock’s deeply personal commitment to teaching, and his talent in building that commitment into viable, durable infrastructures, is a research impact far beyond what one individual scholar could ever achieve. Praised by former students as both “nurturing” and “intellectually stimulating,” stabilizing and exciting, Hammock is truly a distinguished teacher.

PETER WAINWRIGHT

Undergraduate Category

Professor Peter Wainwright of the Department of Evolution and Ecology is an extraordinarily effective teacher at all levels, from introductory undergraduate courses to graduate classes and post-doctoral mentoring. He plays a pivotal role in the Introductory Biology course at UC Davis, a course that is the gateway to university biology for a vast array of majors and career paths. Virtually all majors from the College of Biological Science, Agricultural and Environmental Science, and the pre-health sciences pass through Introductory Biology, and a large number have the good fortune to learn from Professor Wainwright. This last fall Professor Wainwright's Introductory Biology enrolled 500 students, the largest class in its history. While such large classes are notoriously difficult to manage if not to motivate, Professor Wainwright earned an "overall instructor" rating of 4.78 out of 5.0. These kinds of course evaluations are rarely within reach for the rest of us mere mortal instructors, even for much smaller and intimate seminar classes. How does Professor Wainwright do it? As his students comment: with a mixture of charisma, intelligence, and energy, coupled with a heartfelt interest in engaging each student in the process of intellectual discovery. One letter describes his style as follows: "he poses problems such as the nature of biological diversity...and then chronicles throughout the course the way insights into major questions evolve, emphasizing changes in social and intellectual context, personalities of people who do science, and the process by which they do it. He relates the excitement of scientific research, not just in terms of experiments and observations, but in terms of the way different people attack long-standing problems, and why they saw what they did (and failed to see what now seems obvious). He concludes nearly every lecture with questions about what remains to be discovered."

Outside of the classroom, Professor Wainwright also takes unusual and exemplary steps to motivate and mentor undergraduates. As his lab director reports, he makes efforts to attend each of his 21 lab sections, an effort that spans various labs that meet from 7:30 in the morning until 7 at night. Another letter relates that he recently invited the top 40 students in his class to meet with him individually to discuss research opportunities in biology. Such a personal touch is unusual in large-enrollment undergraduate courses, but Professor Wainwright took it one more step. From that top 40 he recruited 8 students from under-represented groups to participate in research in his lab. Several of these students went on to publish research papers as undergraduates and enter graduate programs around the country. Professor Wainwright is a "full service" mentor to many students, advising them about career options, research topics, and educational opportunities throughout their careers at Davis and beyond. One student wrote that "Professor Wainwright first motivated me as a student in a large science prerequisite class and has since mentored me to become a successful science major and undergraduate researcher. No other faculty member has had such a profound influence on my personal and academic development as a student; the depth and breadth of his dedication... makes him a bona fide exemplary instructor." Professor Wainwright truly embodies all that we strive to be as teachers, and we are happy to honor his service with a Distinguished Teaching Award.

Outline

GE Proposal

revised March 10, 2008

A. Topical Breadth Component	52 units
1. Arts and Humanities	12-20
2. Science and Engineering	12-20
3. Social Sciences	12-20
B. Core Literacies Component	35 units
1. Literacy with Words and Images	20
a. English Composition (college).....	8
b. Writing experience coursework in the student's major or elsewhere.....	6
c. Oral skills coursework or additional writing experience coursework.....	3
d. Visual literacy coursework	3
2. Civic and Cultural Literacy	9
a. American Cultures, Governance, and History:.....	6
*at least 3 of the units must be in a course certified as addressing issues of domestic diversity (such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, sexuality, or religion.	
b. World Cultures	3
3. Quantitative Literacy	3
4. Scientific Literacy	3

*changed by the Undergraduate Council on 10 March 2008 after considering feedback from both the Senate Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity and from members of the Representative Assembly at the 26 February 2008 discussion of the GE proposal.

Sufficient seats are available in courses that should qualify as meeting the domestic diversity requirement.

**Revised General Education Requirement
March 2008 revision**

The General Education (GE) requirement reflects the faculty’s image of “the well-educated person.” All students have the opportunity to develop expertise in depth in their majors, minors, or a combination of these. The GE requirement adds to that depth a breadth of knowledge and experiences represented by coursework outside of the area of the student’s major. The GE requirement also trains the student in four core “literacies” that the faculty considers crucial for success in one’s profession but also crucial to thoughtful, engaged participation in the community, nation, and world.

The GE requirement has two components: **Topical Breadth**, and **Core Literacies**.

The GE requirement is defined in terms of units, not courses. The units of every course at UCD (with very few exceptions) are assigned to one of the three **Topical Breadth Areas** or are certified as interdisciplinary. *Unless otherwise restricted, every course unit that a student takes, including courses for major and minor requirements, will be counted toward the required minimum number of units in each Topical Breadth Area.* In the case of a course that has been certified as interdisciplinary, a student may count the units of the course in only one of the areas in which it has been certified.

With the exception of units used to satisfy the English Composition element (1a) of the four **Core Literacies** (see below), units approved for a **Core Literacy** will be accepted toward satisfaction of the appropriate **Topical Breadth** component. *However, units may be counted toward satisfaction of only one Core Literacy.*

Students may take courses P/NP to fulfill their GE requirements, up to the limits set by college and campus regulations. Students may not present Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate credit in satisfaction of GE requirements.

- A. Topical Breadth Component 52 units**
- Arts and Humanities12-20
 - Science and Engineering 12-20
 - Social Sciences12-20

- B. Core Literacies Component 35 units**
- 1. Literacy with Words and Images at least 20 units**

The ability to form, organize, and communicate one’s ideas is at the center of the faculty’s notion of what it means to be an educated person. The objective of this core literacy is to help create graduates who can communicate their ideas effectively in written, oral, and visual forms. The requirement also seeks to enhance students’ critical judgment of oral, written, and visual messages created by others.

- a. English Composition (8 units)**
(College of A&ES, College of L&S, College of Biological Sciences, College of Engineering)

b. Writing experience coursework in the student's major or elsewhere (at least 6 units)

Writing experience coursework provides students instruction on how to communicate ideas in the subject matter of a course. Students write in appropriate forms under the guidance of faculty and graduate students. The opportunity to revise writing after having received careful commentary is crucial to this requirement.

c. Oral skills coursework or additional writing experience coursework (at least 3 units)

The skills involved in the effective communication of ideas through oral presentation build on and strengthen the critical thinking skills exercised through writing. As an alternative to developing oral communication skills, the student may take additional coursework certified as writing experience (see requirement b).

d. Visual literacy coursework (at least 3 units)

The objective of this requirement is to provide graduates with the analytical skills they need to understand how still and moving images, art and architecture, illustrations accompanying written text, graphs and charts, and other visual embodiments of ideas inform and persuade people. Coursework may stress the skills needed to communicate through visual means as well as the analytical skills needed to be a thoughtful consumer of visual messages.

NOTE: A student must have completed the Entry Level Writing Requirement (formerly known as the Subject A requirement) before receiving credit for coursework satisfying requirements a, b, and c.

2. Civic and Cultural Literacy at least 9 units

The objective of this core literacy is to prepare people for thoughtful, active participation in civic society. Such graduates think analytically about American institutions and social relations, understand the diversity of American cultures, and see the relationships between the national and local cultures and the world.

a. American Cultures, Governance, and History (at least 6 units, of which at least 3 units must be in a course certified as focusing on issues of domestic diversity)

The objective is to create graduates who have an understanding and appreciation of the social and cultural diversity of the United States and of the relationships between these diverse cultures and larger patterns of national history and institutions. Such graduates are able to bring historical understanding and analytical skills to their participation in the civic spheres of

society and are able to think analytically about the nature of citizenship, government, and social relations in the United States.

b. World Cultures (at least 3 units)

The objective is to create graduates with a global perspective, graduates who can live comfortably and productively in a world where communication technologies, economic relationships, and the flow of people across national borders increasingly challenge national identities and create transnational cultures. Students can satisfy this requirement through coursework or through certified study abroad.

3. Quantitative Literacy at least 3 units

The objective is to create graduates who understand quantitative reasoning and who are capable of evaluating claims and knowledge generated through quantitative methods.

4. Scientific Literacy at least 3 units

The objective is to create graduates who understand the fundamental ways scientists approach problems and generate new knowledge, and who understand how scientific findings relate to other disciplines and to public policy.

PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION REGULATIONS 522-524: General Education Requirement

Submitted by the Undergraduate Council.

Rationale: The General Education (GE) requirement is designed to deliver a broad education to all undergraduates. This is the only requirement imposed by UC Davis on all students earning bachelor's degrees in 104 majors in four different colleges. The campus-wide scope of the UC Davis GE requirement is unique within the UC system; the GE Committee and GE Task Force affirmed that this approach be continued in order to preserve one of the core strengths of undergraduate education at UCD.

The current GE requirement was approved in 1996. Over time, faculty realized that it needed to be strengthened in several respects and made more international in scope. In response to these needs, the revision: increases flexibility in implementation of the GE requirement for students in unit-heavy majors; increases the emphasis on building writing skills as a component of critical thinking; adds training in quantitative and scientific reasoning; and, emphasizes examination of social and cultural diversity in both domestic and international settings. Moreover, the external review team for UC Davis noted in its 2003 accreditation report that the current GE requirement, which can be fulfilled with as few as 18-24 units of coursework, falls far short of the minimum 67.5 quarter units recommended to balance breadth with depth in a university undergraduate education. UC Davis must respond to this criticism in an interim report and during the next review. Aside from its many other benefits, accreditation is essential for our students to receive federal financial aid.

Nearly 4 years of effort by the GE committee and the GE Task Force generated a revised GE requirement designed for the common good of all undergraduates. The revision is carefully balanced to meet the goals outlined below and to enable completion within 4 years. The first version was sent to all faculty in February 2007; the plan has been revised three times in response to feedback provided in many venues. Seats are available in appropriate courses. Setting Fall 2010 as the implementation date allows time to make the necessary changes in course designations and to educate faculty and staff advisors about the revised program.

Within the mission of UC Davis as a public university, the objectives of the GE requirement are to educate students to:

- become thoughtful, civically engaged participants of society;
- learn the information and thinking skills to consider matters requiring a critical understanding of science, history and governance, social relations, and global forces;
- communicate ideas effectively through written, spoken and visual means;
- understand that ideas have consequences and that we all have the responsibility to consider those consequences; and
- develop a cosmopolitan view of the world.

Incorporation of the College English requirements emphasizes the importance of learning to write well. Colleges retain the ability to specify how the 8 unit requirement is met.

Students must take courses in all areas of three topical breadth and courses required by their majors may be used for GE credit. This eliminates the need to classify each major in a topical

Draft 10-5-07

breadth area. In fact, many majors require an interdisciplinary spectrum of courses. The number of topical breadth GE courses is greatly increased because most undergraduate courses will be assigned to a topical breadth area.

The revised GE requirement integrates training in essential skills and core literacies into courses in topical breadth. Literacy with words and images, civic and cultural literacy, quantitative literacy, and scientific literacy are crucial for a sound education and success in one's profession as well as for a thoughtful, engaged citizenship in the community, nation and world.

Writing strengthens a student's ability to think clearly and communicate effectively. The proposed writing experience requirement defines pedagogically effective writing both in terms of the context of the writing and a framework for effective learning. Process is emphasized over the total amount of writing. Feedback and the opportunity to revise part of the writing are essential and are specified in the new requirement, formalizing the policy implemented in 2000 by the Committee on Courses of Instruction.

Effective presentation of one's own ideas is strengthened by the requirements for courses in oral literacy and visual literacy.

As well as learning about the history and governance of the United States, students need to think critically about issues arising in multicultural societies that are increasingly interconnected across national boundaries. The revision therefore incorporates socio-cultural diversity into Civic and Cultural Literacy. Issues of domestic diversity are considered as one part of the requirement in American Cultures, Governance and History. In addition, socio-cultural diversity is embedded in the World Cultures requirement.

A course in quantitative reasoning and a course in scientific literacy are included because both are essential to understand and evaluate information and new knowledge at the heart of major public policy debates and decision-making.

Conversion to a unit-based requirement allows 1-2 unit courses such as Freshman Seminars to qualify for GE credit. These are ideal settings for intellectual discourse and developing written and oral literacy skills. This increases GE opportunities in small classes for all students. The change will also let the GE program work better for students whose majors have heavy unit loads.

Allowing students to elect P/NP grading for GE courses encourages them to explore beyond their known academic strengths and acquire a truly general education without undue concern about the impact on GPA. Note that a P grade imposes a higher standard than earning a D- or above, which does accrue GE credit.

Additional detailed information about the revised GE requirement, the rationale underlying the proposed changes, and documents describing criteria for certification of individual courses can be found at <http://ge.ucdavis.edu>

Proposed Revision: It is proposed that Davis Division Regulations 522 (Baccalaureate Degree Requirement in General Education), 523 (Substitution of Course Sequences and Clusters in the General Education Requirement), and 524 (Assignment of Majors to General Education Areas) be repealed (see below) and that the following new Regulations 522 and 523 be adopted, to be effective September 1, 2010.

Regulation 522. Baccalaureate Degree Requirement in General Education.

- (A) Each candidate for a baccalaureate degree shall satisfy a General Education requirement comprising two components: Topical Breadth and Core Literacies.
- (1) The Topical Breadth component shall be separated into three subject matter areas: Arts and Humanities; Science and Engineering; and Social Sciences.
 - (2) The Core Literacies component shall have four parts: Literacy with Words and Images; Civic and Cultural Literacy; Quantitative Literacy; and Scientific Literacy.
- (B) The Topical Breadth component shall be satisfied by passing between 12 and 20 units of courses in each subject matter area, for a total of 52 units from all three areas.
- (C) The Core Literacies component shall be satisfied by passing at least the specified number of units of coursework in the following four parts:
- (1) Literacy with Words and Images shall be satisfied with:
 - 8 units or the equivalent of English Composition coursework (as specified by the candidate's college);
 - 6 units of designated writing experience coursework in the candidate's major or elsewhere;
 - 3 units of additional designated coursework in either oral skills or writing experience; and
 - 3 units of designated coursework in visual literacy.
 - (2) Civic and Cultural Literacy shall be satisfied with
 - 6 units of designated coursework in American cultures, governance and history, of which at least 3 units must be in domestic diversity; and
 - 3 units of designated coursework in world cultures.
 - (3) Quantitative Literacy shall be satisfied with 3 units of designated coursework in quantitative literacy.
 - (4) Scientific Literacy shall be satisfied with 3 units of designated coursework in scientific literacy.
- (D) In satisfying the General Education requirement:
- (1) Course units that satisfy requirements in the candidate's major or majors may also be counted toward satisfaction of General Education requirements.
 - (2) While some courses may be certified in more than one of the three subject matter areas for Topical Breadth, no student may count a given course in more than one subject matter area.

- (3) No course may be counted by a student toward the satisfaction of more than one of the four Core Literacies.
- (4) With the exception of the 8 units of designated English Composition coursework, a course offered toward the satisfaction of the Core Literacies component may also be offered in satisfaction of the Topical Breadth component.
- (5) No course passed prior to satisfaction of the Entry Level Writing Requirement shall be offered toward satisfaction of the General Education requirements for writing experience coursework.
- (6) Candidates may not present Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate credit in satisfaction of General Education requirements.
- (7) Transfer students who have successfully completed the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) are exempt from all General Education requirements.
- (8) Students transferring to UC Davis who have not completed the IGETC curriculum shall satisfy all General Education requirements as specified by this Regulation, but may offer previously completed coursework toward their satisfaction. The Committee on Courses of Instruction may delegate to the Deans of the undergraduate colleges the authority to determine the suitability of previously completed coursework for satisfying General Education requirements.
- (9) Subject to the limits otherwise applicable, candidates may elect Passed/Not Passed grading for courses fulfilling General Education requirements.

Regulation 523. Criteria for General Education Certification.

- (A) Any undergraduate course carrying credit toward graduation is eligible for assignment to a Topical Breadth area if it takes a critical, analytical perspective on knowledge, considering how knowledge has been acquired, and the assumptions, theories, or paradigms that guide its interpretation. Where appropriate, a course may be assigned to more than one Topical Breadth area, and most courses are expected to be assigned to one or more areas.
- (B) The criteria for the English Composition requirement shall be specified by the several undergraduate colleges, subject only to the condition that no fewer than 8 units or the equivalent shall be required.
- (C) The Committee on General Education's criteria governing certification of courses for the Core Literacies component of General Education shall be consonant with the following:
 - (1) A course providing Writing Experience promotes the student's ability to think clearly and communicate effectively about the course material through guided writing assignments completed in stages. Guidance may take the form of class discussions, peer feedback, individual or small group conferences, or written (including online) feedback. Students must be given feedback designed to promote improvement; a draft of at least one substantial assignment must receive

written comments and then may be revised. Students receive the current version of the handout on plagiarism from Student Judicial Affairs. Grading criteria are articulated in advance of the due date. The writing is evaluated for content, clarity, organization, and logic. A 1 unit course requires a minimum of 5 pages of writing; a course of 2 or more units requires a minimum of 10 pages, possibly in a series of staged tasks or shorter assignments. Approval may be sought for shorter assignments that total fewer than 5 or 10 pages when they are appropriate and clearly justified.

- (2) A course in Oral Skills strengthens a student's ability to understand and orally communicate ideas while using critical thinking.
 - (3) A course in Visual Literacy improves a student's ability to understand ideas presented visually and to communicate knowledge and ideas by visual means.
 - (4) A course in American Cultures, Governance and History provides an understanding of the historical processes, institutional structures, and core analytic skills necessary to think critically about the nature of citizenship, government and social relations in the United States.
 - (a) A course in Domestic Diversity provides an understanding of issues such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, sexuality, and religion within the United States, and develops the student's ability to think critically about diverse socio-cultural perspectives.
 - (5) A course in World Cultures combines the historical and social context with the core analytic skills necessary to understand and adopt a critical perspective on society, politics and/or culture in one or more cultures outside the United States.
 - (6) A course in Quantitative Literacy develops a student's ability to reason quantitatively and to evaluate quantitative arguments encountered in everyday life.
 - (7) A course in Scientific Literacy instructs students in the fundamental ways scientists use experimentation and analysis to approach problems and generate new knowledge, and presents the ways scientific findings relate to other disciplines and to public policy.
- (D) In extraordinary circumstances, for example, for majors subject to external accreditation, the General Education Committee may certify that the fulfillment of the major requirements meets specified parts of the General Education requirement. The major requirements must include courses that fulfill the objectives of the relevant parts of the General Education requirement.

Existing General Education Regulations that would be repealed under this proposal:

~~522. Baccalaureate Degree Requirement in General Education.~~

- (A) ~~Each candidate for a baccalaureate degree in the College of Agricultural and Environment Sciences, the College of Engineering, and the College of Letters and Science at UCD shall satisfy a General Education requirement:~~
- ~~(1) The three components of General Education shall be: Topical Breadth, Social-cultural Diversity, and Writing Experience.~~
 - ~~(2) The topical breadth component shall be separated into three subject matter areas; science and engineering, social sciences, and arts and humanities.~~
 - ~~(3) A candidate shall satisfy the topical breadth requirement in each subject matter area that does not include the candidate's major.~~
 - ~~(4) A minor or second major in a subject matter area that does not include the first major shall satisfy the General Education requirement in the area to which it is assigned.~~
 - ~~(5) Multidisciplinary individual majors may satisfy the General Education topical breadth requirement in one or all subject matter areas, as determined in each case by the faculty of the undergraduate colleges.~~
- (B) ~~The General Education requirements shall be satisfied as follows:~~
- ~~(1) Each candidate shall satisfy this requirement by passing three approved General Education topical breadth courses in each subject matter area (specified in A.2) that does not include the major, three approved courses in writing experience, and one approved course in social-cultural diversity.~~
 - ~~(2) A course offered toward satisfaction of the General Education requirement in one component (specified in A.1) may also earn credit toward satisfaction of requirements in either or both of the other components.~~
 - ~~(3) Courses that satisfy requirements in the candidate's major may also earn credit toward satisfaction of the General Education requirements in the subject matter areas of social-cultural diversity and writing experience. Courses taken to complete major requirements may also earn credit toward satisfying the requirement in the area of topical breadth when they are classified in subject matter areas that do not include the major.~~
- (C) ~~Transfer students who have successfully completed the Transfer Core Curriculum (TCC) or the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) prior to entering UCD are exempt from all General Education requirements.~~
- (D) ~~Students transferring to UCD who have completed neither the TCC nor IGETC curriculum shall satisfy all General Education requirements, but may offer previously completed course work toward satisfaction. The Committee on Courses of Instruction may delegate to the Deans of the undergraduate colleges the authority to determine the suitability of previously completed course work for satisfying General Education requirements.~~
- (E) ~~The faculties of the undergraduate colleges shall determine the appropriate subject matter area classifications of their respective majors and minors.~~
- (F) ~~All courses offered in satisfaction of the General Education requirement shall be taken for a letter grade.~~
- (G) ~~No course passed prior to satisfaction of the University Subject A requirement shall be offered toward satisfaction of the General Education requirement in the writing experience component~~
- (H) ~~A course in the topical breadth component is characterized by the following features:~~
- ~~(1) It addresses broad subject matter areas that are important to a student's general knowledge.~~

- (2) It takes a critical analytical perspective on knowledge, considering how knowledge has been acquired, and the assumptions, theories, or paradigms that guide its interpretation
- (3) It requires readings from a range of sources.
- (4) The Committee on Courses of Instruction may certify for General Education credit a course that does not embody all these features if, in its judgment, the course has other qualities that make its inclusion in the program desirable.
- (I) A course in the social-cultural diversity component is any course that deals with issues such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, sexuality, or religion.
- (J) A course in writing experience normally requires a minimum of five pages of writing in a block, which will be evaluated not only for content, but also for organization, style, use of language, and logical coherence. The Committee on Courses of Instruction may, however, approve for General Education credit some other form of satisfying the writing requirement if, in its judgment, the alternative meets the goals of encouraging students to think critically and communicate effectively

523. Substitution of Course Sequences and Clusters in the General Education Requirement.

- (A) The Undergraduate Council's Committee on General Education may approve introductory sequences of courses that are not approved General Education courses as a substitute for any single introductory course in the same area of General Education. Necessary features of such sequences are:
 - (1) The sequence must extend over at least two quarters;
 - (2) The courses in the sequence must have explicit methodological and conceptual content; and
 - (3) The courses in the sequence must present material that is coherent and cumulative. Normally, the courses involved will bear the same number, and course A will be prerequisite for course B, and so on.
 - (4) The Undergraduate Council's Committee on General Education may authorize substituting clusters of two or three certified introductory General Education courses for the three General Education courses required in a given area, as specified in DDR 522, provided that:
 - (a) At least two courses demand the levels of student participation and expository writing that characterize non-introductory General Education Courses.
 - (b) The instructors in charge of the courses certify that there is substantial and explicit coherence of content and approach among the three courses, and that instructors will remain in active consultation to assure that coherence is maintained.

524. Assignment of Majors to General Education Areas

- (A) The faculty of each college offering a baccalaureate degree shall assign each of its major programs to one or more of the three areas of General Education. The Undergraduate Council's Committee on General Education must approve the assignment of a major to more than one General education area. In each case in which the area of assignment may vary, depending on the particular courses selected by the student, the college shall indicate to which areas the majors may be assigned, and shall determine the particular area for each student in their major programs.

Draft 10-5-07

- ~~(B) A student's General Education requirement shall be based on his/her major at graduation. In a case in which a student is certified as meeting the requirements of majors assigned to two separate General Education areas, the student shall meet the General Education requirement in the third area and any additional requirement imposed by the college(s).~~
- ~~(C) The colleges shall provide, for dissemination and publication, list(s) showing the assignment of their majors to General Education areas (En. 6/7/83).~~