

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

Friday, June 3, 2011

2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Activities & Recreation Center (ARC), Ballroom A

	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Summary of the February 24, 2011 Meeting	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 Academic Federation Chair – Dan Wilson	
b. Remarks by the Divisional Chair – Bob Powell	
7. Reports of standing committees	
a. Committee on Committees	
i. Confirmation of 2011-2012 standing committee appointments	21
b. Committee on Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction	
i. Legislation Changes	
1. DDB71: Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction	25
2. DDB 80: Graduate Council	27
3. DDB 99: Committee on Research	30
4. DDR 522: General Education	32
5. DDR A540: Grades	35
c. Committee on Admissions & Enrollment	
i. Proposal for a UC Davis Freshman Admission Process Based on Holistic Review	39
8. Petitions of Students	
9. Unfinished Business	
10. University and Faculty Welfare	
11. New Business	
12. Information Item	
a. Davis Division Committee on Academic Personnel Appeal and Reconsideration Process	52

Ines Hernandez-Avila, Secretary
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 SUMMARY
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Thursday, February 24, 2011
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Activities & Recreation Center (ARC), Ballroom A

Page No.

Meeting Summary of the November 1, 2010 Meeting – Approved

Vote: 40 – 0.

1. Announcements by the President - None
2. Announcements by the Vice Presidents - None
3. Announcements by the Chancellor
 - a. State of the Campus – Chancellor Linda Katehi

Chancellor Katehi gave the State of the Campus address. Her speech is available via webcast and attached to this document.

4. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – None
5. Special Orders
 - a. Remarks by Academic Senate Chair Robert Powell

Chair Powell touched upon the following topics:

- **The Committee on Committees is working on memberships for next year.**
- **The new General Education curriculum will be in effect Fall 2011.**
- **Futures Task Force Report is out. It was previously accepted by Executive Council.**
- **Special task force is being formed to deal with course approvals, curriculum review and streamlining processes.**

6. Reports of Standing Committees
 - a. CERJ Bylaw Changes

*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 SUMMARY
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Thursday, February 24, 2011

2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Activities & Recreation Center (ARC), Ballroom A

	<u>Page No.</u>
i. DDB 48: Membership on the Instructional Space Advisory Group (ISAG)	
MOTION to approve was made and seconded. Vote: 40 – 0	7
ii. DDB 80: Membership on the Graduate Council	
MOTION to approve was made and seconded. Vote: 40 – 0	9
iii. DDB 121: Membership on the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction & Program Review	
MOTION to approve was made and seconded. Vote: 41 – 0	12
iv. DDR A540: Grades	
MOTION to approve was made and seconded. Vote: 41 – 0	16
b. Faculty Research Lecture (To be honored on May 11)	
i. Confirmation of 2010-2011 Faculty Research Lecture Award Recipient	
This is the highest honor the Davis Division accords its members. Margaret Ferguson, Distinguished Professor of English is the recipient this year.	
Motion to approve was seconded and passed. Vote: 41 – 0.	20

*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 SUMMARY
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Thursday, February 24, 2011

2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Activities & Recreation Center (ARC), Ballroom A

Page No.

- c. Public Service (To be honored on May 11)
 - i. Confirmation of 2010-2011 Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award Recipients

1. Professor Neal Fleming: Professor and medical doctor in the Department of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine
2. Professor Ross Thompson: Professor in the Department of Psychology
3. Professor Amparo Villablanca: Professor of Clinical Cardiovascular Medicine
4. Professor Jeffrey Williams: Professor in the Department of Agriculture and Resource Economics

Motion to approve the Distinguished Scholarly Public Service awardees was seconded and passed.

Vote: 41 – 0.

21

7. Petitions of Students - none
8. Unfinished Business - none
9. University and Faculty Welfare
10. New Business

- a. *College/School Bylaw and Regulations Update: School of Medicine 25
- b. *College/School Bylaw and Regulations Update: School of Veterinary Medicine 46

11. Informational Item

- a. CERJ advice on the CAPAC appeal process 50
- b. CERJ advice on Intramural Letters in Personnel Actions 52

Motion to adjourn was made and seconded. Assembly adjourned by acclamation.

Ines Hernandez-Avila, 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.

- It is a pleasure to speak with you today about our progress and our challenges – and where UC Davis stands locally, nationally and globally.
- We all know about the ongoing economic crisis that has gripped the world economy and our state.
- Still – as you see every day at UC Davis – we are moving forward with a bold vision and outstanding faculty, staff and students.
- We are a thriving center for innovation that happens at the intersections of the world’s most critical challenges ...
...the converging challenges of food, water, energy, environment, health and society.

EXAMPLES of DISTINCTION

- I want to share just a few examples of the incredible work UC Davis faculty, staff and their students are doing in each of these areas.

- **Food:**

R. Paul Singh: **2010 Nicholas Appert Award**. Paul is a joint UC Davis Professor of Food Science and Technology and Professor of Biological and Agricultural Engineering.

He was honored for preeminence in, and contributions to, the field of food science and technology, including mathematical techniques for understanding physical changes in food processing.

- **Water:**

Peter Moyle – professor in wildlife, fish and conservation biology – was honored with the **2010 Brown-Nichols Science Award** in recognition of his scientific contributions to the San Francisco Estuary and watershed.

Peter was recognized as California's **most** knowledgeable fish expert and for his long work with fisheries and the preservation of native fishes.

- **Energy:**

Ilke Arslan is an assistant professor in our Department of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science. She has received the prestigious

Presidential Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers, awarded by President Barack Obama.

Ilke was nominated for the award for her work studying nanomaterials for energy and hydrogen storage.

Jeffery Ross-Ibarra, assistant professor and plant genetics expert, received the **Presidential Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers**. He was nominated for a research project that uses a novel approach to identify genes that would improve varieties of corn.

- **Environment:**

Daniel Sperling has helped make UC Davis the energy leader in research and practical applications. Dan is leading UC Davis' efforts to rewrite the state's and the nation's fuel standards to create cleaner, more energy-efficient vehicles.

This year, he also won the **2011 Heinz Award** for his contributions to revolutionary transportation and energy research.

- **Health:**

In October, UC Davis Medical Center completed the new Surgery and Emergency Services Pavilion, the largest construction project ever undertaken in UC Davis history.

The pavilion is 472,000 square feet, cost \$424 million to build and is the most technologically advanced building on UC Davis' Sacramento campus.

Our Health System is a crown jewel and I want to mention just a few of its many recognitions this year:

- The UC Davis Medical Center was named a top hospital by the nonprofit Leapfrog group.
- Modern Healthcare named it among the top 60 most integrated healthcare networks.
- Sandy Chen Stokes, a chaplain resident at UC Davis Medical Center, has been selected to receive AARP Magazine's Inspire Award for her efforts to address end-of-life issues in the Chinese-American population.
- And our School of Medicine is now among the top 40 in the nation for National Institutes of Health funding.

- **Humanities:** Yiyun Li, UC Davis English professor, recently received the prestigious "genius award" from the MacArthur Foundation.

Yiyun is an outstanding storyteller – and through her fiction writing, she is helping societies better understand each other.

- As you can see, there are many, many acts of excellence happening on our campus every day. This was just a short acknowledgement of the exceptional work all of you are doing at UC Davis

CALL FOR FACULTY ASSISTANCE

- We are at a crossroads.
- As you know, UC Davis is growing in its impact and reputation at a time of a great crisis.
- We are now ranked among the nation's top 10 public-research universities – and that's because our faculty, staff and students are also among the best in the nation.
- You are exceptionally talented, dedicated and collaborative.
- And right now, UC Davis needs your commitment and collaborative spirit more than ever.
- We need your help as we move this campus forward – and become more efficient, more effective, more entrepreneurial and more globally connected.

FRAMING THE CHALLENGE

- Gov. Jerry Brown's 2011-12 budget for the state of California calls for a 16.4 percent cut to the UC system (\$500M to the UC).
- UC Davis' share of that is \$73 million.
- Additional fixed costs bring the shortfall for the coming year to \$99 million.
- This would mean our state funding will have dropped nearly 40 percent in just 4 years.
- This is an accelerated withdraw of the state from its contract with the public under California's Master Plan.
- If this cut materializes, our state fund will be 8% of our total budget.
- UC Davis is facing a new reality – one that requires that we change fundamentally.

- We have a choice:
 - Stay the way we are, absorb the cuts and allow the erosion that started four years ago to continue

Or

- Re-invent ourselves, re-form, re-adjust and continue with our progress.

For those of us who see ourselves as the guardians of a treasure given to us by almost eight generations of Californians, there is ONE WAY to go.

We SHOULD NOT be defined by the cuts we make

But by the VISION we follow

The RISKS we take

The INVESTMENTS we make.

BUDGET DETAILS

- **Strategy:**

The first part of the solution is the UC Davis share of university wide solutions such as the

- 2010-11 restoration funds
- 2011-12 student tuition increases and
- some share of the reductions that will be implemented centrally.

- We estimate that these actions will provide about \$39 million or 36% of the projected shortfall.

- The remaining shortfall of \$68 million will be addressed with a balanced approach including new revenue, efficiency improvements, and cost reductions.

- We are committed to making decisions that provide permanent solutions, but in some cases we will rely on transition or bridging strategies. Our expectation is that all actions will be permanently in place by the start of the third year (i.e., July 2013).

- Communication, consultation and advocacy:
 - The Provost has formed a budget task force. A new task force was appointed that includes faculty, students and staff.
 - There will also be student dialogues, open forums and regular presentations. Budget ideas are being collected using budget@ucdavis.edu. Each suggestion or inquiry receives a personal response.

REASON FOR OPTISM

- First, I want to share with you that I am optimistic.
- I am certain – that our future is bright and that we are poised for greater and greater success in scholarship, service and innovation.

- This does mean I am oblivious of the hardships we face, the sacrifice we will make and the stress we will endure.
- But I strongly believe that by minimizing our dependence on state funding, we will be a better institution.
- By any measure, our university has had an extraordinary year.
- Our academic strength has never been greater.

RESEARCH

- As I mentioned, we broke into the top 10 and are now ranked 9th among public-research universities.
- We are among the top 10 public universities in research funding, with a UC Davis record of nearly \$700 million – thanks to our faculty.
- We have 280 ARRA awards, totaling more than \$156 million.
- ARRA indirect costs will be used for a strategic investment in campus research infrastructure totaling \$19 million over 2-3 years.

STUDENTS

- We also have the highest-scoring, most competitive freshman class in our history.
- We are increasingly more selective. Our admit rate for new freshmen is now 45 percent of all applicants, compared to 69 percent just 4 years earlier.
- It is clear that we are – increasingly – a destination campus for the brightest students.
 - Nearly 60,000 students have applied for fall 2011 admission to UC Davis, which is a record for us.
 - And for the second year in a row, applications from transfer students have jumped more than 20 percent.
- At the same time, we continue to offer access to education at UC Davis. 40 percent of our freshmen classes continue to be first-generation college students.
- This year, we have enrolled a record number of low-income undergraduates who are eligible for Pell grants.
- Nearly 21,000 students received an estimated \$264 million dollars in grants and scholarships last year,

an increase of \$48 million dollars – or about 23 percent – compared with the previous year.

DISTINCTIONS

- We are now the leading publisher of scientific research on agriculture and the environment.
- We are 5th among all U.S. universities in the number of international scholars
- We are now ranked 6th in the nation for contributions to society.

GROWTH

- We have opened our newest professional school, The Betty Irene Moore School of Nursing.
- The School of Law opened a \$30 million expansion of Martin Luther King Jr. Hall.
- And UC Davis just opened the world's greenest winery, brewery and foods facility.

COMPREHENSIVE CAMPAIGN

- In October, we launched our first-ever \$1 billion dollar comprehensive fundraising campaign that will help us support our students, faculty and programs.
- We have already raised more than \$652 million.
- We will announce a new Vice Chancellor for Development next week.

MOVING FORWARD

- We will focus on innovation to reduce costs and generate new revenue — and continue to maintain our standards of excellence and academic integrity.
- As we move into the future, we must be bold and creative.
- We will redesign our structure and accelerate change to adapt to our new reality.
- We are moving forward with the conviction that the era of heavy state investment in higher education is behind us.

- Going forward, we will be more entrepreneurial.
- We will be a strong economic driver, pushing our ideas from the lab to the marketplace.
- We will more actively pursue research funds, public-private partnerships, and private and corporate giving.
- Remaining in place means compromising quality, and that is not an option.
- Change is painful, but it can also be liberating.
- At UC Davis, we will hold on to what we believe in.
- We will remain a land-grant institution.
- We will remain committed to access to excellence and improving quality of life for all.
- We will remain a vibrant community of learning and scholarship, and we will continue our upward trajectory.
- We are ambitious. Our vision is bold. And we are doing all of this in the midst of a devastating financial crisis in the state, the nation and the world.

OUR GREATEST STRENGTHS

- We are making lives better every day – through society, energy, water, environment, food and health.

- In closing, I urge you to continue.
 - Continue to be creative and collaborative.
 - Take risks.
 - Innovate.

- Worldwide competition will only intensify.
- We want to be at the forefront – because of our vibrant, intellectual and interdisciplinary culture.
- Now is the time.
- We want to be there:
 - saving lives
 - answering the world's needs for food security
 - solving global water challenges
 - making breakthroughs in energy efficiency and cleantech
 - and helping societies better understand each other.

Committee on Committees Standing Committee Appointment Report

Divisional Officers –2011-2012

Chair: Linda Bisson (one-year term 2011-2012)

Vice Chair: Bruno Nachtergaele

Secretary: Ines Hernandez-Avila

Parliamentarian: G.J. Matthey

Academic Federation Excellence in Teaching Award:

Charles Walker

Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Gregory Miller, Chair, James Beaumont, Evelyn Lewis, Kwan-Liu Ma, Frank Verstraete, Jane Ling-Wang

UCAF Davis Divisional Representative: Gregory Miller

Academic Personnel Appellate Committee

Bryce Falk, Chair, Jeannie Darby, Leslie Kurtz, Dean Simonton, Dennis Styne

Academic Personnel Oversight Committee

Shirley Chiang, Chair, Daniel Gusfield, John Hall, Kari Lokke, N. James MacLachlan, Kyaw Tha Paw U, Martin Usrey, Andrew Vaughan, Richard White

UCAP Davis Divisional Representative: Kyaw Tha Paw U

Admissions and Enrollment

Ralph Aldredge, Chair, Prabir Burman, Orhan Orgun, Ning Pan, Joseph Sorensen

BOARS Davis Division Representative: Ralph Aldredge

Affirmative Action and Diversity

Susan Rivera, Chair, Kyu Kim, Tina Jeoh, Courtney Joslin, Francis Lu, Cynthia Pickett, , Monica Vazirani

UCAAD Davis Divisional Representative: Monica Vazirani

Courses of Instruction

Ben Shaw, Chair, Marta Altisent, Richard Green, David Hawkins, Nelson Max, Terence Murphy, David Webb, Becky Westerdahl

Distinguished Teaching Awards

John Harada, Chair, Ronald Olsson, Kent Pinkerton, Peter Wainwright, Charles Walker

Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

G. J. Matthey, Chair, James Fadel, Mark Grismer

Committee on Committees

Standing Committee Appointment Report

Emeriti

Charles Hess, Chair, Karen Bales, Joann Cannon, Joel Dobris, John Fetzer, J. Paul Leigh, Rajinder Singh

Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisers

Daniel Link, Chair, Y. Hossein Farzin, Mark Matthews, Joy Mench, Motohico Mulase, Ian Kennedy, Walter Stone

Faculty Research Lecture Award

Not Yet Complete

Faculty Welfare

Stuart Hill, Chair, Michael Dahmus, Joel Hass, Alan Jackman, Bernard Levy, Lisa M. Miller, Saul Schaefer

UCFW Davis Divisional Representative: Stuart Hill, Saul Schaefer-Alternate

Grade Changes

Jeffrey Williams, Chair, Liz Applegate, James Boggan, Benjamin Highton, Thomas Munn

Graduate Council

Andre Knoesen, Chair, Alan Buckpitt, Vice Chair, Enoch Baldwin, Patrick Carroll, Christiana Drake, David Fyhrie, Lev Kavvas, Ari Kelman, Peter Lichtenfels, James Murray, Blake Stimson

CCGA Davis Divisional Representative: Alan Buckpitt

Graduate Student Privilege Advisor

Robert Bayley

Information Technology

Paul Gepts, Chair, Francois Gygi, Anupam Chander, Sue Stover, Felix Wu

UCCC Davis Divisional Representative: Felix Wu

International Studies and Exchanges

Jeannette Money, Chair, Leo Bernucci, Kentaro Inoue, Sheldon Lu, Julia Menard-Warwick, Halifu Osumare, Gang Sun

UCIE Davis Divisional Representative: Jeannette Money

(A/F) Joint Federation/Senate Personnel

William Casey, Jack Hicks, Randal Southard

(A/F) Administrative Series Personnel Committee

Howard Schutz

Committee on Committees

Standing Committee Appointment Report

Library

Brian Kolner, Chair and Timothy Morton

UCOL Davis Divisional Representative: Timothy Morton

Planning and Budget

Ann Orel, Chair, Gregory Clark, Tom Famula, John (Jack) Gunion, Jerold Last, Jonna Mazet, Doug Nelson, David Simpson, Christopher van Kessel

UCPB Davis Divisional Representative: Chris van Kessel

Instructional Space Advisory Group (subcommittee of Planning and Budget)

Susan Keen and Kent Wilken (Chair and one other member is selected by Planning and Budget Committee from its membership)

Privilege and Tenure – Hearings

Floyd Feeney, Chair, David Biale, Angela Cheer, Al Conley, Katherine Florey, Anna Kuhn, Albert Lin, Terence Nathan, Annabeth Rosen, Janet Shibamoto Smith, Valley Stewart, Ebenezer Yamoah

Privilege and Tenure – Investigative

Philip Kass, Chair, Andrea Bjorklund, Prem Devanbu, Nancy Lane, Stephen Lewis

UCPT Davis Divisional Representative: Philip Kass

Public Service

Marc Schenker, Chair, Trish Berger, Robin Erbacher, Philip Martin, Michael O'Mahoney

Research – Grants

Kathryn Olmsted, Chair, Gino Cortopassi, David Hwang, Judy Jernstedt, Marjorie Longo, Nelson Max, Sally McKee, John (Don) Ragland, Baki Tezcan, J. Edward Taylor, Xiangdong Zhu

Research – Policy

Kathy Olmsted, Chair, Zhaojun Bai, Sue Bodine, Kent Erickson, Oscar Jorda, Michael Kleeman, Mark Matthews, Chris Miller, Martin Privalsky, Subhash Risbud, Bella Merlin

CORP Davis Divisional Representative: Michael Kleeman

Committee on Committees

Standing Committee Appointment Report

Undergraduate Council

Jon Rossini, Chair, Colin Carter, Christiana Drake, Gregory Dobbins, Patrick Farrell, Susan Keen, Maggie Morgan, Janet Roser, Diana Strazdes, Matthew Traxler, Carl Withaus, Jeffrey Williams

*UCEP Davis Divisional Representative: **Vacant***

UGC – General Education

Maggie Morgan, Chair, Steven Carlip, Ron Hess, John Smolenski, Craig Warden, **Vacant**

UGC – Preparatory Education

Christiana Drake, Chair, Julia Menard-Warwick, Liz Miller, Robert Newcomb, Ning Pan

UCOPE Davis Divisional Representative: Christiana Drake

UGC – Special Academic Programs

Diana Strazdes, Chair, Cynthia Ching, Thomas Lee, Keith Watenpugh, Gina Werfel

UGC – Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review

Carl Withaus, Chair, Tim Lewis, Stephen Wheeler

Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes

Rajiv Singh, Chair, Hussain Al-Asaad, Lawrence Bogad, Patricia Boeshaar, R. Holland Cheng, Ian Faloon, John Gates, Joanna Groza, Bruce Haynes, Carlos Jackson, Matthias Koeppe, Kristin Lagatutta, Richard Levin, Christopher Loar, Kenneth Loh, Markus Luty, Cristina Martinez-Carazo, Marina Oshana, Teresa Steele, Pieter Stroeve

Davis Division Representative to the Assembly of the Academic Senate

Alternates:

1st Alternate: Brian Morrissey, 2nd Alternate: Jeffrey Williams, 3rd Alternate: William Casey

**PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION BYLAW 71
COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS, RULES AND JURISDICTION**

Submitted by the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

Endorsed by the Executive Council

Davis Division Bylaw 71(B)(1) permits the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction (CERJ) to make editorial changes to the Bylaws and Regulations of the Division. This proposed amendment would expand the scope of the kind of changes which are considered “editorial,” allowing changes in name (e.g. of a campus program) or title (e.g. of a position in the administration).

Rationale.

Changes in name and title do not clearly fall under the rubric of items “similar” to those for which editorial changes by CERJ are permitted. Such changes are currently brought before the Executive Council and the Representative Assembly, which is an unnecessary use of Council and Assembly time and effort. Under Bylaw 71, any such changes must be reported to the organization affected by the Bylaw change, so the possibility of abuse is minimal.

It is proposed that this amendment to Bylaw 71 become effective immediately upon adoption.

Proposed Revision: Davis Division Bylaw 71 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by ~~strikeout~~; additions are in **bold type**.

71. Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

A. This committee shall consist of three members.

B. The committee shall have the following responsibilities:

1. To prepare and report for action by the Representative Assembly such changes and additions to the Bylaws and Regulations as it may deem advisable; to submit to any Faculty of the Davis Division such changes and additions to their Bylaws and Regulations as it may deem advisable. The committee is authorized to make editorial and conforming non-substantive changes in Bylaws and Regulations with regard to numbering, headings, cross-references, organizational titles, details of style, **changes in name or title**, and similar items. It shall report such changes to the organization directly concerned.
2. To review all changes in Bylaws and Regulations submitted to the Representative Assembly or to a Faculty of the Davis Division by other committees or by individuals to verify and ensure conformity of such proposed legislation with the format and content of the Code of the Academic Senate. The committee or individual responsible for any legislation found not compatible with the Code of the Academic Senate is to be informed of the section(s) of the Code with which the proposed legislation is in conflict.

3. To edit and publish, at such intervals as it may deem expedient, the Manual of the Academic Senate, Davis Division.
4. To advise the Chairperson of the Division as to whether proposed legislation is solely of Divisional concern.
5. 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.
6. To issue, upon a formal request from a member of the Division, 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. Rulings of the committee in these matters must be published in the Call for the first regular Division meeting next following the committee's decision, and all rulings of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction not superseded by legislative or Regental action shall appear in an appendix of the Divisional Manual. (Am. 10/20/97)
7. To advise the Registrar regarding disposition of his or her responsibilities in administering the Regulations of the Academic Senate and its agencies. (Am. 10/19/71; 11/17/75)
8. To supervise, in accordance with such rules as the Davis Division may determine, all elections of the Division. The committee shall also supervise the voting on propositions submitted to the Davis Division by ballot. In the exercise of this function, the committee may engage the assistance of the Secretary of the Division and such tellers, as the committee deems necessary. (Am. 6/7/83, 6/7/07)

PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION BYLAW 80 GRADUATE COUNCIL

Submitted by the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

Endorsed by the Graduate Council and the Executive Council

The proposed amendment would change a clause in Davis Division Bylaw 80(C), which would specify that the Graduate Council has the authority to approve or recommend to the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) the following specific changes in graduate programs: transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance. The clause would also be re-worded to reflect better the current practices of the Graduate Council. It would clarify that its authority extends not only to what are designated as “programs,” but also to any course of study that bears the seal of the University of California.

Rationale.

DDB 80(C)(10) grants to the Graduate Council the authority to make determinations or recommendations concerning the qualifications of departments or graduate groups regarding changes in established graduate programs. This clause has been interpreted as conferring on the Graduate Council the authority to approve changes in degree requirements, membership in graduate programs, and other such specific changes internal to graduate programs. There is another class of changes, namely transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance of graduate programs, which do not clearly fall under DDB 80(C)(10).

The CCGA Handbook states that “divisional Graduate Councils are involved in transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance actions (both de jure and de facto actions) involving degree programs” (Appendix P, “Role of CCGA in the Transfer, Consolidation, Disestablishment, and Discontinuance of Academic Programs and Units”). It also states as a role of CCGA that it “review transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance proposals while they are still at the divisional level to make certain that the divisional Graduate Council is appropriately involved” (Handbook, Appendix P).

The Davis Division Graduate Council has been involved in these matters on the Davis campus and is expected by its systemwide counterpart to be so involved. The proposed amendment to DDB 80 would make its authority for such involvement explicit.

The current wording of DDB 80(B)(10) authorizes the Graduate Council to act for the Division in making recommendations to the systemwide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs regarding the qualifications of departments and graduate groups for initiating new programs and for making changes in existing programs. The proposed wording would authorize the Council to make recommendations regarding all aspects of the initiation of new programs. It would also state that the Graduate Council has the authority to approve or disapprove changes in graduate programs at the Divisional level.

The proposed new wording of DDB 80(B)(10) parallels the statement of duties of the Undergraduate Council, in DDB 121(B)(3).

Proposed Revision: Davis Division Bylaw 80 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by ~~strikeout~~; additions are in **bold type**.

80. Graduate Council

A. This council shall consist of twelve Senate members (including a chair, a vice chair, and the Dean of Graduate Studies non-voting ex officio), four graduate student representatives (the Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor selected by Graduate Studies, the Graduate Student Association Chair, the GSA Vice Chair, a fourth graduate student selected by GSA) two postdoctoral scholar representatives (the Postdoctoral Scholar Association Chair and another postdoctoral scholar selected by the PSA) and two representatives appointed by the Davis Academic Federation. The Dean of Graduate Studies shall not be chair or vice chair. A chair and vice-chair of this council shall be named by the Committee on Committees. Any member from the Davis Division on the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs who is not a regular member of the Graduate Council shall be an additional ex officio member of this council. The council shall be organized into subcommittees to facilitate the conduct of its business. Subcommittees of the Graduate Council shall be appointed by the Chair and shall serve from the first day of September each year. Deans of Graduate Studies may be appointed to subcommittees but shall not serve as chair of any subcommittee. The Chair of the Graduate Council shall appoint additional Academic Senate members to the subcommittees as deemed necessary. (Am. 6/7/1983)

B. It shall be the duty of the Graduate Council with respect to the Davis campus:

1. To grant certificates of admission to qualified applicants for graduate status; to admit qualified students to candidacy for degrees to be conferred on graduate students; to appoint committees in charge of candidates' studies, who shall certify for every candidate before recommendation for a higher degree that the candidate has fulfilled the requirements of the University pertaining to that degree. (Am. 11/25/96)
2. To make final reports to the Executive Council concerning the conferring of graduate degrees.
3. To advise the Chief Campus Officer concerning relations with educational and research foundations.
4. To regulate the conduct of graduate work of the Division with a view to the promotion of research and learning. (Am. 10/22/2002)
5. To supervise the conduct of public and other examinations for higher degrees.
6. To make recommendations to the Representative Assembly and to the statewide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs concerning the establishment of new graduate degrees.
7. To report and to make recommendations to the Representative Assembly on matters pertaining to graduate work.
8. To coordinate the procedures of the various departments and schools on the campus insofar as they relate to the conferring of degrees higher than the Bachelor's degree.
9. To recommend and supervise all new, changed, or deleted graduate courses of instruction in the Division. In discharging this responsibility, the Graduate Council presents its

recommendations to and shall maintain liaison with the Committee on Courses. (Am. 12/15/1967)

10. **Consistent with the rights of the Faculties under the Standing Orders of the Regents (105.2.b), To determine for the Division and to make recommendations to the statewide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs concerning the initiation of new programs by the qualifications of departments and graduate groups for initiating new programs and to approve or decline to approve and for making changes in established programs leading to existing graduate degrees, including, but not restricted to, the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment and discontinuation of existing graduate programs.** (Am. 11/1/2005)
11. To set policies and standards for admission to full- and part-time graduate status. (Am. 10/19/1971)
12. To make rules governing the form of presentation and the disposition of dissertations. (Am. 12/15/1967)
13. To recommend the award of fellowships and graduate scholarships, including honorary travel fellowships, according to the terms of the various foundations. (Am. 12/15/1967)
14. To set policies and standards for appointment of graduate students to be Teaching Assistants, Teaching Fellows, Research Assistants, and recipients of University Fellowships. (Am. 12/15/1967)
15. To limit at its discretion the study lists of students who are employed.
16. To set policies and standards for appointment of postdoctoral scholars or their academic equivalent and for their enrollment by the Graduate Division. (Am. 12/15/1967)
17. To conduct regular reviews of current graduate programs for their quality and appropriateness. (Am. 11/25/1996)
18. To establish policy on and exercise authority on academic disqualifications and/or dismissals as well as over all graduate academic transcript notations. (En. 12/15/1967)
19. To recommend the award of the Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Award, according to the terms of the Academic Senate.

C. The annual report of the Graduate Council will be presented at the first regular meeting of the Representative Assembly in the fall term. (En. 6/4/85)

D. At its discretion and consistent with Senate Bylaws 20 and 330(C), the Graduate Council may delegate to the Dean of Graduate Studies administrative decisions related to the academic regulations and policies of the Graduate Council. The Dean of Graduate Studies will report on and Graduate Council will review these delegated decisions annually. (En. 2/28/05 & eff. 2/28/05)

PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION BYLAW 99 COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Submitted by the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

Endorsed by the Committee on Research and the Executive Council

The proposed amendment would change the structure of the Committee on Research. At present, the Committee consists of two subcommittees: Research Policy and Faculty Grants. The primary duty of the Faculty Grants subcommittee is to review research grant applications. The proposal would consolidate the two subcommittees into a single committee, a subcommittee of which would review grant applications. The subcommittee would consist of the voting Senate members of the parent committee.

Rationale.

The immediate impetus for the proposal is that it would reduce staffing needs by consolidating what are virtually two separate committees. The proposal would also reduce the workload of the Committee on Committees, who would have ten fewer members to recruit. Moreover, there has been a continuing difficulty in the recruitment of members of the Faculty Grants subcommittee, in that members could not compete for non-travel research grants due to conflict of interest.

One minor editorial change is also proposed.

Proposed Revision: Davis Division Bylaw 99 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by ~~strikeout~~; additions are in **bold type**.

It is proposed that if passed, this amendment become effective September 1, 2012.

99. Research

A. This committee shall ~~be composed of two subcommittees, the Subcommittee on Research Policy and the Subcommittee for the Faculty Grants Program.~~ **consist of fifteen Divisional Senate members (including a chair and the Vice Chancellor for Research non-voting ex officio) and one representative of the Academic Federation.**

~~B. The Subcommittee on Research Policy shall consist of a chairperson who will chair both subcommittees, 10 members, the Vice Chancellor for Research non-voting ex officio, one member of the Subcommittee for the Faculty Grants Program ex officio and one representative of the Academic Federation. The ex officio member of the subcommittee for the Faculty Grants Program shall be appointed by the committee chairperson. Members of the Subcommittee of Research Policy shall be appointed for a three year term, with the possibility of appointment to a second term that is not to exceed two years. Members shall be selected in consideration of the diversity of research activities on the Davis campus.~~

B. The committee shall have the following duties: (Am. 12/15/1967, 2/24/2009)

1. Consult regularly with the Vice Chancellor for Research. Advising the Chief Campus officer and the Division concerning: faculty perspectives on the research mission of the Division and the University; budgetary needs to support research infrastructure; policy and strategy regarding the pursuit and acceptance of research support; and promotion and coordination of multidisciplinary research among faculty members.
2. Formulate policy governing acceptance of extramural funding.
3. Provide periodic evaluation of administrative units that support faculty research.
4. Provide review of Organized Research Units and make recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Research that are based on reports of organized research Units. (Am. 6/7/1983)
5. Maintain formal liaison with relevant Senate committees.
6. Establish policies and procedures governing allocation of funds within the jurisdiction of the Faculty Grants Program Subcommittee for the conduct of research and travel to attend scholarly meetings; inform the Division of these policies, and evaluate them periodically.
7. Provide review of applications from various calls for research proposals that are associated with the Limited Submission Program of the Office of Research when so requested by the Vice Chancellor for Research.

~~C. The Subcommittee for the Faculty Grants Program shall consist of a chairperson who will chair both subcommittees, and 10 members. Members will be selected in consideration of the diversity of research activities on the Davis campus. In order to secure appropriate expertise, the committee is authorized to appoint senate members who are not regular members of the subcommittee to serve on ad hoc committees to review grant applications. In the Spring Quarter of each academic year, the committee shall form a subcommittee consisting of the Senate members of the committee with the exception of the Vice Chancellor for Research. This subcommittee~~ The Subcommittee for the Faculty Grants Program shall have the following duties.

1. Implement policies and procedures governing the award of research support in programs falling under its jurisdiction.
2. Implement policies and procedures governing the allocation of support for research related travel to scholarly meetings. (Am. 4/25/1983)

PROPOSED REVISIONS OF DAVIS DIVISION REGULATION 522

BACCALAUREATE DEGREE REQUIREMENT IN GENERAL EDUCATION

Submitted by the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

Endorsed by the Undergraduate Council, the General Education Committee, the Committee on Courses of Instruction, and the Executive Council

Three revisions of Regulation 522 are proposed. The proposed revisions are the result of plans for the implementation of the General Education requirement in Fall, 2011.

The first revision corrects an oversight in the formulation of the Regulation. As currently stated, the Regulation deems that any student who has completed the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) is exempt from all General Education requirements. The amendment would exempt such students from all General Education requirements that can be met at the lower-division level. As a consequence, students who have completed the IGETC would be subject to upper-division requirements, which at present are college-level English composition requirements.

The second revision would make an exception to the prohibition of the use of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate credit toward satisfying the General Education requirements. Such credit would be applicable to the English Composition requirement.

The third revision would delegate to the deans of the colleges the authority to determine the suitability for satisfaction of General Education requirements of courses which are not UC Davis courses. The current Regulation delegates this authority to the deans for courses taken previous to matriculation by transfer students but is silent on courses taken by matriculated students.

It is proposed that the amendment to Regulation 522 be effective immediately.

Rationale.

The IGETC is based on an agreement between the University of California, California State University and the California Community Colleges. The agreement was intended to cover only lower-division courses. The original intention of DDR 522(D)(7), was not to exempt students completing the IGETC from all General Education requirements, but rather those General Education requirements that were intended to be satisfied by completion of the IGETC, i.e., only lower-division courses.

The English Composition component of the Literacy with Words and Images requirement is satisfied by meeting the English Composition requirement of the student's college. The College of Engineering allows the use of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate credit to satisfy the lower-division component of its requirement. Since the intention of the English Composition requirement was that it be met by satisfying the college requirements, there is an inconsistency between the General Education and College of Engineering requirements. This inconsistency is resolved by allowing current college requirements to be satisfied as the colleges see fit, rather than creating a situation where the college requirement is satisfied by the General Education requirement is not.

The current Regulation delegates to the college deans the determination of the suitability for meeting the General Education requirement of all courses taken by transfer students prior to transfer. However, this is not the only way in which courses on other campuses may be taken, as matriculated students may still take courses on other campuses. For example, some students take community college courses to finish their degrees near to home, and some take courses in non-UC Davis study abroad programs. (Education Abroad Program courses are UC Davis courses and do not require evaluation.) Since there are a number of types of non-UC Davis courses taken by matriculated students, it is not advisable to attempt to specify in the Regulation which courses would and which would not satisfy the General Education requirements. It seems most suitable for this determination to be made by the deans, who already are authorized to make that determination for transfer students.

Proposed Revision: Davis Division Regulation 522 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by ~~strikeout~~; additions are in **bold type**.

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. (Am. 6/6/2008)

(1) The Topical Breadth component shall be separated into three subject matter areas: Arts and Humanities; Science and Engineering; and Social Sciences. (Am. 6/6/2008)

(2) The Core Literacies component shall have four parts: Literacy with Words and Images; Civic and Cultural Literacy; Quantitative Literacy; and Scientific Literacy. (En. 6/6/2008)

(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. (En. 6/6/2008)

(C) The Core Literacies component shall be satisfied by passing at least the specified number of units of coursework in the following four parts: (En. 6/6/2008)

(1) Literacy with Words and Images shall be satisfied with: (En. 6/6/2008)

- 8 units or the equivalent of English Composition coursework (as specified by the candidate's college); (En. 6/6/2008)
- 6 units of designated writing experience coursework in the candidate's major or elsewhere; (En. 6/6/2008)
- 3 units of additional designated coursework in either oral skills or writing experience; and (En. 6/6/2008)
- 3 units of designated coursework in visual literacy. (En. 6/6/2008)
- Civic and Cultural Literacy shall be satisfied with (En. 6/6/2008)
 - 6 units of designated coursework in American cultures, governance and history, of which at least 3 units must be in domestic diversity; and (En. 6/6/2008)

- 3 units of designated coursework in world cultures. (En. 6/6/2008)
- (2) Quantitative Literacy shall be satisfied with 3 units of designated coursework in quantitative literacy. (En. 6/6/2008)
 - (3) Scientific Literacy shall be satisfied with 3 units of designated coursework in scientific literacy. (En. 6/6/2008)
- (D) In satisfying the General Education requirement: (Am. 6/6/2008)
- (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. (En. 6/6/2008)
 - (3) No course may be counted by a student toward the satisfaction of more than one of the four Core Literacies. (En. 6/6/2008)
 - (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. (En. 6/6/2008)
 - (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. (Am. 6/6/2008)
 - (6) Candidates may not present Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate credit in satisfaction of General Education requirements, **except insofar as it may be applied to the English Composition component of the Literacy with Words and Images requirement.** (En. 6/6/2008)
 - (7) Transfer students who have successfully completed the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) are exempt from all General Education requirements **that may be met with lower-division courses.** (Am. 6/6/2008)
 - (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.~~ (Am. 6/6/2008)
 - (9) **The Committee on Courses of Instruction has authority to delegate and to rescind prior delegation to the Deans of the undergraduate colleges the authority to determine the suitability of non-UC Davis courses presented by new and continuing undergraduate students in satisfaction of General Education requirements.**
 - (10) Subject to the limits otherwise applicable, candidates may elect Passed/Not Passed grading for courses fulfilling General Education requirements. (En. 6/6/2008)

PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION REGULATION A540

GRADES

Submitted by the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

Endorsed by the Graduate Council and the Executive Council

A revision of Regulation A540 is proposed. The revision changes the policy on the repetition of courses by graduate students. At present, a graduate student may repeat up to nine units of courses in which he or she has received a grade below B. The proposed revision would allow the repetition of up to three courses.

Rationale.

The present restriction on repeating courses by graduate students is based on the previous norm of three units per course. As a consequence, the intent of the existing policy was that a graduate student could repeat three courses under the prescribed conditions. Given the reality that at present there are a sufficient number of courses which are four-unit courses, the intent of the policy would be more accurately reflected if it explicitly states that a graduate student is eligible to retake three courses instead of courses with a total of nine units of credit.

Proposed Revision: Davis Division Regulation A540 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by ~~strikeout~~; additions are in **bold type**.

A540.

Except as provided otherwise in Davis Division Regulations A545 and A548, and in Regulation 70 of the Faculty of the School of Medicine, the following provisions apply to the grading of the work of all students subject to Davis Division Regulations.

(A) 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. (Am. 4/23/78, App. by Assembly 11/28/79)

(B) Grade points per unit shall be assigned by the Registrar as follows: A - 4; B -3; C - 2; D - 1; F, I, or IP - none. "Minus" grades shall be assigned three-tenths grade point less per unit than unsuffixed grades, and "plus" grades (except A+) shall be assigned three-tenths grade point more per unit. The grade of A+ shall be assigned 4.0 grade points per unit, the same as for an unsuffixed A; but when A+ is reported it represents extraordinary achievement.

(C) 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. "Good cause" may include illness, serious personal problems, an accident, a death in the immediate family, a large and necessary increase in working hours, or other situations deemed to be of equal gravity. The student is entitled to replace this grade by a passing grade and to receive appropriate grade points and unit credit provided he or she satisfactorily

completes the work of the course in a way specified by the instructor before the end of the third succeeding term of the student's academic residence. If a degree is conferred upon the student before the expiration of the time limit for conversion, the time limit for conversion for the graduated student shall be the end of the third regular term succeeding the term in which the Incomplete grade was assigned. If the time limit for conversion expires before a degree is conferred upon the student and the Incomplete grade has not been replaced, the grade shall revert to an F, a Not Passed, or an Unsatisfactory, depending on the grading system in effect in the particular instance. If the time limit expires after a degree has been conferred and the Incomplete grade has not been replaced, the Incomplete grade shall remain on the student's record. If the work has not been completed before the end of the term three calendar years after the grade Incomplete has been assigned, the grade Incomplete shall remain on the student's record, unless the course is repeated. This time-limit for the completion of courses assigned the grade Incomplete shall apply to all and only those courses in which the grade Incomplete is assigned on or after September 1, 2010. (Am. 1/20/75, App. by Assembly 5/29/75, effective Fall 1975; Am. 10/25/76, effective Winter 1977; Am. 6/4/79, App. by Assembly 11/28/79, effective Fall 1980; Am. 6/3/80, App. by Assembly 12/3/80; Am. 4/25/83; App. Assembly 11/30/83)

In calculating an undergraduate student's grade point average, grade points and units for courses graded Incomplete shall not be counted except that, in ascertaining compliance with the 2.000 minimum grade point average required for the receipt of a bachelor's degree, all incomplete units attempted for a letter grade shall be counted and assigned a grade point value of zero. Any undergraduate student who accumulates more than 16 units of Incomplete for which final grades have not been assigned shall be subject to academic probation or disqualification. (Am. 1/27/81)

In calculating a graduate student's grade point average, grade points and units for courses graded Incomplete shall not be counted except that, in ascertaining compliance with the minimum grade point average required for receipt of a degree, all incomplete units attempted for a letter grade shall not be counted and assigned a grade point value of zero. Any graduate student who accumulates more than 8 units of Incomplete for which final grades have not been assigned shall be subject to academic probation. (Am. 10/25/76, effective Winter 1977; Am. 1/27/81)

(D) For a course extending over more than one term, where the evaluation of the student's performance is deferred until the end of the final term, provisional grades of In Progress shall be assigned in the intervening terms. Subject to the provisions of Academic Senate Regulation 634, grade points and units for courses graded In Progress shall not be counted in calculating a student's grade point average. Provisional grades shall be replaced by final grades if the student completes the full sequence. The student may receive final grades, grade points, and unit credit for completed terms when he or she has not completed the entire sequence if the instructor certifies that the course was not completed for good cause.

(E) 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.

(F) Repetition of courses not authorized by the Davis Division Committee on Courses of Instruction to be taken more than once for credit is subject to the following conditions.

(1) An undergraduate student may repeat only those courses in which he or she received a grade of D, F, or Not Passed, as well as courses in which a grade of I has become permanent on the student's record because the work was not completed within three years, as described in (C) above. Departments may restrict repetition of a course if it is a prerequisite to a course already completed with a grade of C- or better. Courses in which a grade of D or F has been earned may not be repeated on a Passed or Not Passed basis. (Am. 4/21/80, Assembly approval 3/11/81)

(2) A graduate student, with the consent of the appropriate graduate adviser and the Dean of Graduate Studies, may repeat any course in which he or she received a grade of C, D, F or Unsatisfactory, as well as courses in which a grade of I has become permanent on the student's record because the work was not completed within three years, as described in (C) above, up to a maximum of ~~nine units~~ **three courses** for all courses repeated. Courses in which a grade of C, D, or F has been earned may not be repeated on a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory basis. (Am. 10/25/76, effective Winter 1977)

(3) Repetition of a course more than once requires approval by the appropriate dean in all instances.

(4) Degree credit for a course will be given only once, but the grade assigned at each enrollment shall be permanently recorded. (Am. by mail ballot 5/7/74)

(5) In computing the grade point average of an undergraduate who repeats courses in which he or she received a grade of D or F, only the most recently earned grade for each course and corresponding grade points shall be used for the first 16 units repeated. In the case of further repetitions, the grade point average shall be based on all grades assigned and total units attempted.

(6) In computing the grade point average of a graduate student who repeats courses in which he or she received a grade of C, D, or F, only the most recently earned grade for each course and corresponding grade points shall be used.

(G) The instructor in charge of a course shall enter the notation "Enrolled-No Work Submitted" (E-NWS) on the end-of-term course report for a student who, to the best of the instructor's knowledge, did not present any work subject to grading. The course number and the notation shall be omitted from the official transcript. (Am. 11/30/98; eff. immediately and retroactive)

(H) The Registrar shall enter the notation "NG" on the end-of-term course report and on the student's record for a student whose instructor has not yet submitted an appropriate grade (letter grade or P, NP, S, U, I, or IP) nor designated the student as E-NWS. The instructor must indicate in the "memorandum" column on the course report the reason for not submitting a grade. Conditions for removing the NG are:

(1) The NG notation shall be replaced by the appropriate grade upon written submission of that grade by the instructor.

(2) The NG and relevant course notation both shall be deleted from the student's transcript if it is established that an administrative error resulted in improper assignment of NG to the student.

(3) The Registrar shall change the NG notation to an F grade if the NG has not been removed under the provisions of 1 or 2, unless the instructor in charge indicates otherwise to the Registrar. To ensure that the student is aware that an NG must be removed, the Registrar shall provide the following written notification to all affected students: NG must be removed within one term or the NG will be changed to a grade of F. If this course appeared on your midterm course check list, see your instructor immediately; if it did not appear, see the Registrar.

PROPOSAL FOR A UC DAVIS FRESHMAN ADMISSION PROCESS BASED ON HOLISTIC REVIEW

**Prepared by the 2010-2011
Admissions & Enrollment Committee
of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate**

**R. C. Aldredge & M. M. Rashid (Co-Chairs), O. C. Orgun, N. Pan, J. Sorenson
C. J. Bates (Acad. Fed. Rep.), L. J. Bossio (Acting Ex-Officio), R. J. Meyerhoff (ASUCD Rep.)**

Background

The Resolution Regarding Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions (Appendix A) adopted by the UC Regents on January, 19 2011 requires (a) that each applicant to the UC receive an individualized, comprehensive review in which trained readers examine the applicant's full file to evaluate accomplishments in the context of opportunity and (b) that single-score holistic review be the explicit means of comprehensive review. Single-score holistic review (HR) involves the assignment of a single score to an applicant on the basis of an individualized comprehensive review involving a human read of the entire application. The comprehensive review considers a wide range of both academic and non-academic achievements evaluated within the context of available high-school and life opportunities, while accounting for how fully the applicant has taken advantage of opportunities and resources. Fourteen specific comprehensive criteria considered are listed in the attached Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions adopted by the Academic Senate in 2002 (Appendix B).

Currently, a two-stage, multiple-score implementation of comprehensive review is employed at UC Davis for evaluation of applicants and selection for admission. This process involves the combination of a purely computational evaluation which renders 87.7% of the final score and a reader's evaluation which renders the remaining 12.3% of the final score. Applicants with sufficiently high scores based only on the computational evaluation, for a given major, are admitted without an individualized human read of their application. This group represents 25-30% of the entire applicant pool. It is recognized, however, that as admission to UC Davis becomes increasingly more selective, individualized evaluation involving a human read of all applications will be necessary in order to fairly delineate between even the most competitive applicants, in accordance with the Regents Resolution. It is recognized also that such delineation is facilitated by evaluation of each applicant's achievement within the context of available opportunities, accounting for how fully the applicant has taken advantage of opportunities and resources, also in accordance with the Regents Resolution and the guiding principles of comprehensive review outlined in Section II of Appendix B.

This proposal outlines the guiding principles and design of a new freshman admissions process at UC Davis based on single-score holistic review. The proposal also describes how UC Davis will collaborate with other UC campuses employing similar holistic-review processes (such as UCLA) to reduce the local workload and cost of holistic review and thereby contribute toward an increase in the efficiency of holistic review system-wide. A comparison of the single-score holistic-review processes employed at UCLA and UC Berkeley, upon which the proposed process is based, with the two-stage, multiple-score implementation of comprehensive review currently employed at UC Davis is given in Appendix C.

Assumptions and Constraints

It is assumed that UC Davis will make use of holistic-review (HR) score information provided by other campuses for applicants we share in common with those campuses. In many cases, UC Davis will not re-read these shared applications. However, UC Davis will have to develop and maintain the ability

to read and score applicant files locally, both to accommodate applicants for whom we have no HR score from another campus, and for other reasons. Specifically, in-common applications will be read at UC Davis if they fall within a particular score range, based on the HR score from the other campus. Also, a modest number of in-common applications from across the entire score range will be read locally, in order to establish the correspondence between locally-generated scores and those from the other campus. These features of the proposed process are described more fully below.

Although HR scores from a number of other campuses may eventually be available to UC Davis, it is assumed that, for the Fall 2012 cycle at least, UCLA scores are likely to be the only scores available. Therefore, the balance of this document refers to “UCLA” and “UCLA scores” with the understanding that, eventually, other campuses may be added to the list of score sources used by UC Davis. The process described below is designed to incorporate scores from other sources as they become available.

It is explicitly assumed that the relative assessment and weighting of the various factors in the UC Davis HR process will be very similar to those of the UCLA process. This assumption implies that, although the UC Davis and UCLA applicant pools may differ in some respects, the processes of the two campuses would result in a very similar ordering of UC Davis applicants.

It is further assumed that UC Davis knows in advance which applications are shared in common with UCLA, but that UC Davis has no control over, nor influence on, the timing of the receipt of score information for the common files. The campus is nonetheless obliged to complete all admit/deny actions by the mid-March deadline.

Guiding Principles

This proposal was designed with the following principles, goals, and objectives in mind:

1. Admit/deny decisions should be based, to the greatest extent possible within the bounds of practicality and resource constraints, on holistic evaluation of each applicant's file. This means, in part, that the process should resort to an algorithmic mechanism for distinguishing between applicants for admit/deny purposes in only a small number of cases. This “tie-breaking” process should be limited to cases where holistic evaluation cannot reasonably distinguish the level of merit among these cases. This principle carries implications regarding the design of the HR scoring rubric.

2. The process should aspire to a high degree of fairness and uniformity in the way applicants are treated, regardless of where, in addition to UC Davis, they may have applied.

3. Although the new HR-based process is certain to be somewhat more labor-intensive than the current UC Davis CR process, it should nonetheless exhibit the highest level of efficiency and economy possible, consistent with the other principles stated herein.

4. In keeping with longstanding practice at UC Davis, the new process should accommodate variability in the admission rate across different majors.

5. The holistic read process should be designed in such a manner that the lessons learned and procedures developed by other campuses should be utilized to the greatest extent possible, in pursuit of the principles enumerated herein.

6. The read process should be designed so that a high degree of reliability and high reader morale are likely to be maintained. This means, in part, that readers should not be asked to partition files into an excessively large number of ranks.

Process Design

The basic structure of the proposed process is as follows. At the beginning of the application-processing period, applications that are not shared in common with UCLA are scheduled for local

reading. Two reads of all such applications are performed, much like in the UCLA process. In addition to the non-shared files, some of the in-common files (i.e. those shared by UCLA) are scheduled for reading as well. This “local re-read” pool consists of (a) applications from students with UCLA HR scores that are potentially not well differentiated at UCLA (e.g., those receiving a score of 4 or 4.25 from UCLA) but who are expected to be still competitive for admission at UC Davis, together with (b) a modest number of files from across the UCLA score range. The files in category (b) will be used for calibrating the UCLA and UC Davis scores to a common scale. Because UCLA scores will not all be available before reading of the local-re-read pool must commence, a statistical model of the UCLA scoring process will be used to determine a preliminary composition of this pool. The great majority of the local-re-read pool will consist of files associated with category (a). These files are expected to constitute as many as 15-20% of all UCD applications.

An important element of the proposed process is that admit-deny decisions will be made by establishing a single score cut-off, determined irrespectively of where the file was read. This element is particularly motivated by principle 2 above, but it also is consistent with a number of the other principles as well. Specifically, it facilitates the assignment of different cut-offs to different majors.

The details of the proposed process are as follows.

1. Davis readers are to be trained using the same principles and strategies of evaluation as are UCLA readers. As with the UCLA process, readers have 7 score levels to select from in scoring files. However, the “bin sizes” – i.e. the approximate proportions of the applicant pool that should fall within each score level – are not the same as at UCLA. Instead, they are set to fit UC Davis's circumstances of selectivity. Specifically, the percentage of applicants within the top and bottom bins should be a multiple of 5 (e.g. the top 25% or the bottom 30%), with the other five bins of approximately equal size in between. The size of the top bin should be such that its lowest HR score is higher than the HR-score cut-off for the most selective major on campus, to accommodate admission of all applicants within the top bin. The size of the bottom bin should be such that its highest HR score is lower than that of all students accepted into the least selective major on campus, to accommodate potential denial of all applications within the bottom bin.
2. Consistent with UCLA's process, two independent, blind reads of each Davis-only file should be carried out, in which local and UC Davis context information is used. In cases where the two scores are neighboring or identical, the final score for the file is the average of the two read scores. The reported scores can thus take one of 13 values. In cases where the two scores are not neighboring (i.e. they differ by more than one), a third read is undertaken by a senior reader, whose score stands as the final reported score. This procedure is identical to the UCLA procedure.
3. Again consistent with UCLA's process, readers may recommend files for Supplemental review. The criteria and procedures governing Supplemental Review should be the same as in the UCLA process.
4. Applications in common with UCLA are subjected to an automated prediction of their eventual UCLA HR score using a multiple-linear-regression statistical model. The predictive model is necessarily calibrated on the previous year's UCLA applicant pool. The predictor variables in the model consist of the range of quantitative indicators from the UCLA read sheet. The model predictions are not used to influence the admit/deny decision for any student. Instead, they are used only to estimate which of the in-common files are likely to receive a UCLA HR score in the range selected for re-evaluation (e.g., 4 or 4.25). These files constitute the bulk of the in-common files that are to be re-read locally. Were UC Davis to wait until the actual scores arrived from UCLA, insufficient time might remain to read them all locally, prior to the decision-release

deadline. By predicting UCLA score outcomes at the beginning of the reading period, UC Davis can get a head start on reading the in-common files that will, in all likelihood, have to be read. Should this prediction-driven process fail to mark for local reading a file whose actual score turns out to be in the range selected for re-evaluation (e.g, 4 or 4.25), then that file must be read locally as soon as is practical. The predictive model is also used to randomly select a modest number of files for calibration (e.g., on the order of 1000) whose scores are likely to uniformly cover the UCLA score range.

5. Because in-common files receiving a score from UCLA in the range selected for re-evaluation have already been read twice, these files should receive only a single local read. The “calibration” files (taken from throughout the score range), however, receive two local reads, in order to maximize the resolution of the calibration process.
6. All applicants, including those with UCLA-averaged scores and those with UC Davis-averaged scores, are ranked on a common scale. The UCLA-to-common-scale conversion is calibrated using the local read outcomes for the 1000 “calibration files.” The conversion also facilitates the assignment of a single common-scale score to each application with “mixed” HR scores (e.g., a 4 or 4.25 from UCLA and a separate, independent single read score from UC Davis).
7. At the end of the reading period, the integration of all applicant HR scores (whether derived at UCLA or UC Davis) into a common-scale is achieved using a fast, entirely algorithmic procedure. Recommended-admit cut-offs are then established on the common scale for each major. Applicants who fall near the cut-off on the common scale will be subject to an automated tie-breaking process. The tie-breaking process should not involve any additional reading by a human reader; instead, it should algorithmically combine multiple criteria to render a quantitative result.

Office of the President

TO MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY:

ACTION ITEM

For Meeting of January 19, 2011

**RESOLUTION REGARDING INDIVIDUALIZED REVIEW AND HOLISTIC
EVALUATION IN UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

RECOMMENDATION

The President recommends that the Committee on Educational Policy recommend to the Regents that the following resolution be adopted:

WHEREAS, the University of California is committed to achieving excellence and inclusiveness in its undergraduate student body; and

WHEREAS, in May 1988, the Regents adopted a Policy on Undergraduate Admissions that states in part that “Mindful of its mission as a public institution, the University of California...seeks to enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent and that encompasses the broad diversity of...backgrounds characteristic of California;” and

WHEREAS, in 2002, the University, acting on the recommendation of the Academic Senate, implemented an application evaluation procedure that calls for campuses to utilize a broad range of criteria to assess each applicant’s academic and personal achievement in the context of opportunities; and

WHEREAS, proper evaluation of applicants’ achievements in the context of opportunity requires that information about their schools and community be available in a uniform manner, and several campuses have made considerable progress in accomplishing this through the use of extensive school-based information; and

WHEREAS, evaluation of applicants’ achievement in the context of opportunities and challenges requires that a trained reader examine the entire application in considering personal achievements, challenges, leadership, and contributions to applicants’ communities alongside context information; and

WHEREAS, a form of Comprehensive Review in which the reader produces a single holistic score based on all information in the applicant's file has been shown to thoroughly evaluate each applicant's achievement in relation to opportunities and challenges; and

WHEREAS, the Regents expect the Office of the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate and local admissions committees, to exercise leadership in the realization of best practices in undergraduate admissions;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate and campus admissions professionals, to ensure that all applicants receive an individualized review that ensures trained readers examine applicants' full files to evaluate their accomplishments in the context of opportunity;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate and campus admissions professionals, to continue to research and develop a database to be used with the human read of every application that provides background on the available opportunities and challenges faced by the applicant within his or her school and community;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate, to affirm that single-score holistic evaluation is the expected implementation of Comprehensive Review, while allowing flexibility for campuses that can demonstrate that alternate approaches employed by their campuses are equally effective in achieving campus and University goals;

BE IT RESOLVED that University of California campuses must remain committed to recruiting students from the full range of California high schools and regions in order to achieve the potential of the University's admission policy for California's students;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President to annually report to the Board on the progress of these initiatives on each campus.

BACKGROUND

At the July 14, 2010, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Chair Sylvia Hurtado presented the BOARS report on *Comprehensive Review in Freshman Admissions at the University of California, 2003 - 2009*. Educational Policy Chair Regent Island requested an update on the progress of the recommendations in the report.

This resolution establishes the Regents' expectations of the President, faculty and campuses with respect to the admissions process.

Following the adoption of the resolution, annual reports will be presented to the Committee on Educational Policy, starting in May 2011. The purpose of these reports is to highlight specific efforts towards achieving the University's comprehensive review objectives.

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF UNIVERSITY POLICY ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

I. OVERVIEW

On May 20, 1988, The Regents of the University of California adopted a University of California Policy on Undergraduate Admissions. The Policy states in part that:

"Mindful of its mission as a public institution, the University of California...seeks to enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that, beyond meeting the University's eligibility requirements, demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic, and socio-economic backgrounds characteristic of California."

In December 1995, following passage the previous July of Regents Resolution SP-1, a task force convened by the President of the University reviewed existing *Guidelines for the Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions* and recommended substantive changes. The revised *Guidelines* were issued in July 1996 and revised in May 2000 to reflect the University's newly adopted Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) policy.

In May 2001, The Regents adopted Resolution RE-28, which rescinded Resolution SP-1 and reaffirmed the goals of the 1988 Policy as follows:

"the University shall seek out and enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California."

Following the passage of RE-28, the President asked the Academic Senate to consider the adoption of evaluation procedures that would look at applicants in a comprehensive manner and would utilize a variety of measures of achievement.

The present revision of the *Guidelines* follows extensive deliberation on the part of the Academic Senate, its Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), and its individual campus divisions and faculty admissions committees undertaken during the summer of 2001. The work of the Academic Senate built on themes already developed by the 1995 Task Force. For example, the report of the Task Force commented on the "need for a comprehensive review of the methods used for assessing academic performance, beyond utilizing criteria such as GPA and standardized test scores" and suggested that "the selection process could be altered in the future to include a more comprehensive approach to reviewing students' academic accomplishments and personal backgrounds." The work of the Academic Senate should be considered as yet another step in the continuing evolution of undergraduate admissions practices and policies.

Effective with applicants seeking admission for the fall 2002 term and thereafter, the following revised guidelines and procedures shall be followed for implementation of the 1988 University of California Policy on Undergraduate Admissions and RE-28, adopted in May 2001.

These selection guidelines apply to campuses that have to select from a pool of eligible applicants, and to students who have met the established UC eligibility requirements for admission. These eligibility requirements are established by the University in conformance with the specifications outlined in the California Master Plan for Higher Education, which specifies that the top one-eighth of the State's public high school graduates, as well as those community college transfer students who have successfully completed specified college work, be eligible for admission to the University of California.

These guidelines provide the framework within which campuses shall establish specific criteria and procedures for the selection of undergraduate applicants to be admitted when the number of eligible applicants exceeds the places

available.

II. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

Campus admissions procedures should involve a comprehensive review of applications. BOARS defines comprehensive review as:

The process by which students applying to UC campuses are evaluated for admission using multiple measures of achievement and promise while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated academic accomplishment.

In designing campus procedures, campus admissions committees should adhere to the following guiding principles:

1. The admissions process honors academic achievement and accords priority to students of high academic accomplishment. At the same time, merit should be assessed in terms of the full range of an applicant's academic and personal achievements and likely contribution to the campus community, viewed in the context of the opportunities and challenges that the applicant has faced.
2. Campus admissions procedures should involve a comprehensive review of applications using a broad variety of factors to select an entering class.
3. No fixed proportion of applicants should be admitted based solely on a narrow set of criteria.
4. Campus policies should reflect continued commitment to the goal of enrolling classes that exhibit academic excellence as well as diversity of talents and abilities, personal experience, and backgrounds.
5. Faculty on individual campuses should be given flexibility to create admission policies and practices that, while consistent with Universitywide criteria and policies, are also sensitive to local campus values and academic priorities.
6. The admission process should select students of whom the campus will be proud, and who give evidence that they will use their education to make contributions to the intellectual, cultural, social, and political life of the State and the Nation.
7. The admissions process should select those students who demonstrate a strong likelihood that they will persist to graduation.
8. Campus selection policies should ensure that no applicant will be denied admission without a comprehensive review of his or her file.

Faculty takes their responsibilities for admission and selection very seriously. BOARS anticipates that campuses will act autonomously in designing campus-specific policies and processes that are consistent with Universitywide policies and guidelines. BOARS will continue to monitor campus policies and work with faculty to continuously improve the processes and outcomes.

III. SELECTION CRITERIA

Campuses receiving applications in excess of the number required to achieve their enrollment target for a specific term shall select students for admission as follows:

A. Freshman Applicants

The following criteria provide a comprehensive list of factors campuses may use to select their admitted class. Based on campus-specific institutional goals and needs, admissions decisions will be based on a broad variety of factors to ensure attainment of the goals set forth in the 1988 University of California Policy on Undergraduate Admissions and

RE-28.

1. Academic Grade Point Average (GPA) calculated on all academic courses completed in the subject areas specified by the University's eligibility requirements (the a-f subjects), including additional points for completion of University certified honors courses (see 4, below). It is recommended that the maximum value allowed for the GPA shall be 4.0.
2. Scores on the following tests: the Scholastic Assessment Test I or the American College Test, and the College Board Scholastic Assessment Test II: Subject Tests.
3. The number, content of, and performance in courses completed in academic subjects beyond the minimum specified by the University's eligibility requirements.
4. The number of and performance in University approved honors courses, College Board Advanced Placement courses, International Baccalaureate courses, and transferable college courses completed. It is recommended that caution be exercised in order not to assign excessive weight to these courses, especially if considerable weight already has been given in the context of 1, above. Additionally, in recognition of existing differences in availability of these courses among high schools, it is recommended that reviewers assess completion of this coursework against the availability of these courses at the candidate's secondary school.
5. Being identified as eligible in the local context, by being ranked in the top 4% of the class at the end of the junior year, as determined by academic criteria established by the University of California.
6. The quality of the senior year program, as measured by type and number of academic courses (see 3 and 4, above) in progress or planned.
7. The quality of academic performance relative to the educational opportunities available in the applicant's secondary school.
8. Outstanding performance in one or more specific academic subject areas.
9. Outstanding work in one or more special projects in any academic field of study.
10. Recent, marked improvement in academic performance, as demonstrated by academic grade point average and quality of coursework (see 3 and 4, above) completed and in progress, with particular attention being given to the last two years of high school.
11. Special talents, achievements, and awards in a particular field, such as in the visual and performing arts, in communication, or in athletic endeavors; special skills, such as demonstrated written and oral proficiency in other languages; special interests, such as intensive study and exploration of other cultures; or experiences that demonstrate unusual promise for leadership, such as significant community service or significant participation in student government; or other significant experiences or achievements that demonstrate the applicant's promise for contributing to the intellectual vitality of a campus.
12. Completion of special projects undertaken either in the context of the high school curriculum or in conjunction with special school events, projects or programs co-sponsored by the school, community organizations, postsecondary educational institutions, other agencies, or private firms, that offer significant evidence of an applicant's special effort and determination or that may indicate special suitability to an academic program on a specific campus.
13. Academic accomplishments in light of the applicant's life experiences and special circumstances. These experiences and circumstances may include, but are not limited to, disabilities, low family income, first generation to attend college, need to work, disadvantaged social or educational environment, difficult personal and family situations or circumstances, refugee status, or veteran status.
14. Location of the applicant's secondary school and residence. These factors shall be considered in order to provide for geographic diversity in the student population and also to account for the wide variety of educational environments

existing in California.

B. Advanced Standing Applicants

Advanced standing applicants shall be selected by each campus using the criteria listed below as well as criteria 11-14 listed above. Priority consideration for admission of advanced standing applicants shall be given to upper division junior transfers from California Community Colleges.

Criteria to Select Advanced Standing Applicants

1. Completion of a specified pattern or number of courses that meet breadth or general education requirements.
2. Completion of a specified pattern or number of courses that provide continuity with upper division courses in the major.
3. Grade point average in all transferable courses, and, in particular, grade point average in lower division courses required for the applicant's intended major.
4. Participation in academically selective honors courses or programs.

(Refer to items 2 through 6 in Section A above for additional criteria to consider.)

IV. APPLICATION PROCEDURES

A common filing period for submission of applications shall be established by the Office of the President in consultation with the campuses. These dates shall be observed by all campuses and may be extended only if a campus determines that additional applications are required to meet enrollment targets. All applications submitted during the prescribed dates shall receive equal consideration for admission.

Applicants shall file one application on which they shall indicate all the campuses where they wish to be considered for admission.

Campuses shall observe and publish a common notification period for notifying applicants of their admission status.

V. ACCOMMODATION OF UC ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

UC eligible resident applicants, who have not been admitted at any of the campuses of their choice shall be offered a space at other UC campuses where space is available. This process, called referral, reaffirms the long-standing University commitment to provide a place for every eligible California applicant who wishes to enroll.

In addition to the referral process, campuses may choose to offer other enrollment alternatives to UC eligible applicants. Examples of such alternatives may include:

1. Fall term admission to a different major,
2. Deferred admission to another term; or,
3. Enrollment at a community college with provision for admission at a later time, if a stated level of academic achievement is maintained (for freshman applicants only).

Last updated February 15, 2002.

Single Score Holistic Review Processes

UC Berkeley had been using comprehensive “holistic” review since 2001, and has refined the process over the intervening years. In 2006, **UC Los Angeles** became the second UC campus to implement a holistic evaluation process, basing its model on Berkeley’s process but also incorporating some locally developed measures regarding school context. UCLA trains readers to review files and assign a single score to candidates on the basis of a review of the entire application. No single attribute or characteristic guarantees the admission of any applicant. The review is based on a wide range of both academic and non-academic achievements, which are considered in the context of the available high school and life opportunities, and how fully the student has taken advantage of those opportunities and resources. UCLA considers all Comprehensive Review factors except for location of the applicant’s secondary school and residence (#14). Both Berkeley and UCLA devote a significant amount of time to norming student ratings and crosschecking the ratings of readers (see section on reader training). At UCLA, at least two readers review each file; whereas at Berkeley, students with the highest read score (less than 5% of applicants) and the lowest read scores are read once. Additional reads are used in the case of discrepant scores or if readers flag the student’s file for additional attention (called “augmented” review at UCB and “supplemental” review at UCLA). These third reviews sometimes require obtaining additional information from the student to clarify their case. Third reads can also “break ties” on cases where there are similar ratings and fewer places for students in score ranges that are near the boundary of normally admissible ratings. Details about the process and criteria are clearly described on campus websites.²⁰ Finally, all UCLA and UCB applicants receive a review regardless of eligibility, which allows both campuses to make use of admissions by exception for unusual cases.

At the end of the process, several post-decision reviews determine if any decisions need to be reconsidered before admission offers are extended. This includes a By High School review, in which senior readers view an array of quantifiable academic data from applicants from the same high school to either validate decisions or identify apparent anomalies. Berkeley also undertakes a Weighted Index review that takes into account academic measures, socio-economic factors, and contextual factors weighted more heavily based on a scale of predicted outcomes derived from regression analyses of previous admissions cycles. This prompts a further review by the Director of Undergraduate Admissions for a final decision based upon criteria specified by the faculty admissions committee. At Berkeley, the faculty admissions committee also reviews the 100 admits with the lowest scores on the eligibility index to confirm the decisions.

Single score holistic processes, based on the judgments of trained readers, also undergo many cross checks based on quantifiable information on each file and indices. For example, in 2005-06, Berkeley also introduced a High Index Review as quality control that selects for further review applicants who have high test scores and/or grade point averages but received low reader

While local practices differ, all campuses incorporate both academic and contextual factors into the comprehensive review assessment to judge student talent and potential.

²⁰ <http://students.berkeley.edu/admissions/freshmen.asp?id=56&navid=N>;
http://www.admissions.ucla.edu/Prospect/Adm_fr/FrSel.htm

ratings. Senior readers look for any evidence that the original decision to deny admission should be reversed. Consequently, considerable deference is still given to “traditional” measures of achievement at the same time that they place great value on the expert judgments of readers to take into account multiple criteria in their ratings of applicants.

Assessment of Single Score Holistic Processes

The Berkeley and UCLA processes are distinctive for the single rating that is based on the large range of indicators that readers review. This includes approximately 28 school profile characteristics (Appendix G); a student’s ranking in terms of GPA (weighted and unweighted); and coursework and test scores relative to other applicants within the school, the pool of applicants to the campus, and the school’s applicants in the entire UC applicant pool. There is also a high degree of individualized student review to determine the merits of each case. Readers are instructed to review the student’s coursework and consider the strength of the senior year load, identify improvement in performance, and other indicators of striving for excellence that include honors and awards for academic accomplishments. Readers also consider extracurricular activities that demonstrate sustained involvement, awards, and commitment to service as evidence of potential contributions to the vitality of the campus, as well as life challenges and employment that might restrict engagement in activities. Readers are provided with a training manual to help identify significant student organizations, activities, awards, and seasonal sports. Finally, readers are provided copies of the Regents May 2001 resolution, the campus philosophy to guide selection developed by faculty, and instructions that they “may not under any circumstances use any information regarding race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin that may be surmised from a reading of the application” in accordance with Proposition 209.

While the single score holistic method has many good features, the process has several limitations that one needs to bear in mind. First, it is extremely labor intensive and expensive because it relies on oversight and expertise of an experienced staff and external readers. Some may consider individualized attention to each file inefficient and less cost effective in the context of increasing applications and the short time frame for review. At the same time, it assures quality by using substantial information to make fine distinctions among applicants in a very competitive pool. Second, the single holistic score does not allow the campus to identify and provide additional consideration for students with extraordinary talents, leadership, and achievements outside of the academic criteria. Most private selective universities that employ an extensive individualized student review have a dual scoring system to favor the selection of “well rounded” students, or a small number of students with extraordinary personal accomplishments and more moderate academic scores. Considerable weight is given to “traditional” academic indicators in single score holistic processes. This was confirmed by the Hout Study²¹ of Berkeley’s holistic process in 2005, identifying grades were the most important determinant of readers’ scores. Third, this method is less transparent because students cannot know which criteria are valued most, nor calculate their own scores to assess the probability of admission. One can also reason, however, that this prevents students from “gaming” the system by focusing on only those areas that give them the most points and neglect other areas of excellence. The issue of transparency is addressed in a separate section (III-3).

²¹ http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/committees/pdf_docs consolidate/Hout_Report.pdf.

Two Stage or Multiple Score Processes

Two-Stage or Multiple Score methods are also “holistic” in the sense that they consider many factors and employ the use of human reviewers to make judgments about non-quantitative information taken from the file that must be scored. Together, the multiple scores obtained through an individualized review constitute a comprehensive view of a students’ background and accomplishments. The main distinction from the Berkeley and UCLA processes is the assignment of specific points and weights to academic and personal accomplishment criteria based on principles and values as determined by faculty committees on the campus. Readers are then trained to read files and assign values in scoring in a way that is consistent with this philosophy. Otherwise, the read process is similar to the individualized student review used at Berkeley and UCLA.

UC Davis employs a two stage process that combines an electronic evaluation (87.7% of the final score) and a reader evaluation (12.3% of the final score) of academic and personal accomplishment criteria to determine an applicant’s final score. While the electronic evaluation score is generated from data based mainly on traditional academic indicators (criteria #1-3), it also incorporates ELC status (#5), EOP qualification, non-traditional student status, first generation college status, veteran status, (#13), individual initiative (#12), and evidence of marked improvement (#10). Although maximum weight is given to HS-GPA and the Sum of Standardized Tests, additional weight is given to ELC status in the point system—roughly equivalent to the maximum for the number of a-g courses (1000 points). The first score places the greatest weight on academic criteria, achievement in the local context, and also student background characteristics that influence achievement (12,500 point maximum). Thus, the first score gives somewhat more weight to students who have achieved in spite of disparities of circumstance. Using a sophisticated algorithm based on previous admissions results, students with the highest scores will be admitted without a second score based on a reviewer’s read. ELC students are actively recruited and also now receive a “fast track” pathway in admissions at Davis.

For all other Davis applicants, a second score (1,750 point maximum) is based on the reader evaluation that considers factors such as leadership promise and special talents/skills (criteria #11), participation in academic preparation programs, and evidence of educational perseverance in the face of difficult circumstances or disability (#13). Davis also implemented an Augmented Review process in November 2007 in order to conduct a more contextual review for certain unusual cases. The campus anticipates that as it becomes more selective, however, reader evaluations based on an individualized student review will be more necessary to make finer distinctions among all applicants.

At **UC Santa Barbara**, the Senate Committee on Admissions, Enrollment and Relations with Schools (CAERS) annually sets criteria that will enable the campus to achieve its goals of improving the quality and diversity of the incoming class and achieving specified enrollment targets. After assigning each applicant an academic index score called the Admissions Decision Model (ADM) based on high school GPA and test scores, the Comprehensive Review consists of an Academic Preparation Review (APR) and an Academic Promise Review (PPR). Applicants receive an APR score based on the academic factors comprising the ADM. The PPR score is based on a socio-economic status assessment and a read of the applicant’s personal statement,

Davis Division Committee on Academic Personnel Appeal and Reconsideration Process

