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

Friday, February 3, 2006
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Memorial Union, MU II

In accordance with DDBL 160 the agenda has been reordered by the Academic Senate Chair with the approval of the Secretary.

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

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.

TRANSCRIPT **(Draft)**
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Tuesday, November 1, 2005
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Memorial Union, MU II

1. Transcript from the June 9, 2005 meeting -

Action: Approved

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 Graduate Student Association President - Jonathan Karpel
    b. Remarks by the Associated Students of UC Davis President - Caliph Assagai
    c. Remarks by the Divisional Chair - Daniel L. Simmons

    Chair Simmons outlined current priorities for the Davis Division as follows:
    - Graduate Student Fees/Non-Resident Tuition
    - Salary Inversion (faculty salary scales vs. off scale salaries)
    - Budgetary Advise to the Administration
    - General Education and the potential revision of the General Education requirements including the possible addition of an international education component. The General Education Committee, in collaboration with the Committee on International Studies and Exchanges and campus administration, will work on proposed revisions.
    - Course Approval System and Process improvement: Chair Simmons noted that improvements have been implemented that have helped to reduce the committee workload. Chair Simmons extended his appreciation to the Committee on Courses of Instruction for pursuing these changes.
    - Degree Approval Taskforce: The Davis Division is working to simplify the degree approval process in the Policies and Procedures.
    - Transition of the Division of Biological Sciences to the College of Biological Sciences
    - Creation of special committee or task force to tackle important campus issues such as: program review and approval, organized research units; transition to Division I athletics.
    - Executive Council priorities for 2005-06
        - Description of newly formulated council structure: Executive Council and two subcommittees consisting of the Council of College/Professional School Faculty Chairs; and, the Academic Senate Personnel Issues Task Force
        - An orderly conversation with the Chancellor and Provost will be regularly scheduled, separate from the Executive Council meetings, to allow standing committee chairs to participate.

    (The demonstration of MySenate was tabled to the February meeting due to campus network malfunctions.)

TRANSCRIPT **(Draft)**
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Tuesday, November 1, 2005
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Memorial Union, MU II

Action: Except as noted, all reports were approved by the Representative Assembly.

d. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
e. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel
    i. Appellate Committee – **removed for further discussion**
    A member raised a concern that former Committee on Academic Personnel members are serving and have previously served on the Appellate Committee, impacting the number of successful appeals. The member thought that procedure mandated the appointment only of members who have not previously served.

Action: The Committee on Committees has been asked to review the procedures and report back to the Assembly during the February 3, 2005 Representative Assembly meeting.

Action: Unanimous approval of the report followed the discussion.

    ii. Oversight Committee
f. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review
g. Annual Report of the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment
h. Annual Report of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
i. Annual Report of the Committee on Committees
j. Annual Report of the Committee on Courses of Instruction
k. Annual Report of the Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards
l. Annual Report of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction
m. Annual Report of the Emeriti Committee
n. Annual Report of the Executive Council
o. Annual Report of the Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisers
p. Annual Report of the Committee on Faculty Welfare
q. Annual Report of the Grade Changes Committee
r. Annual Report of the Graduate Council
s. Annual Report of the Committee on International Studies and Exchanges
t. Annual Report of the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee
u. Annual Report of the Library Committee
v. Annual Report of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure – Meeting Handout **- removed for further discussion**
    Members expressed concern about the Administration's disregard of the recommendations from the Investigative Subcommittee. The Committee on Privilege and Tenure will report back to the Assembly with a list of fundamental problems and recommended actions, including appointment of a special committee if necessary.

Action: The report was approved following the discussion, with one opposing vote.

w. Annual Report of the Committee on Public Service
x. Annual Report of the Committee on Research
y. Annual Report of the Committee on Student-Faculty Relationships

TRANSCRIPT **(Draft)**
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Tuesday, November 1, 2005
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Memorial Union, MU II

z. Annual Report of the Committee on Transportation and Parking – Meeting Handout

aa. Annual Report of the Undergraduate Council – **removed for further discussion**

The 2004 Chair of the Undergraduate Council was asked to provide a report on the progress of the Special Committee on Academic Probation, Disqualification, Dismissal, and Minimum Progress. Former Undergraduate Council Chair Matthew Farrens reported that the special committee, in collaboration with the Undergraduate Council and a joint administration/senate committee, co-chaired by Professor Farrens and Interim Vice Provost-Undergraduate Studies Fred Wood, overhauled the minimum progress calculation, notified students and staff concerning the new calculation method, and passed an amendment to Davis Division Regulation A552 reflecting the new calculation method. The amended language of A552 includes the requirement for Colleges Faculty Executive Committees to develop an annual report in order for the Davis Division to verify compliance.

Action: The report was unanimously approved following the discussion.

i. Annual Report of the Committee on General Education
ii. Annual Report of the Committee on Preparatory Education
iii. Annual Report of the Committee on Special Academic Programs
iv. Annual Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review

bb. Annual Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes – **removed from the consent calendar** – not available; will be distributed at February Representative Assembly meeting

7. Reports of standing committees
   a. CERJ: Proposal to create DDBL 153 to create the faculty of the newly created College of Biological Sciences-CBS

Action: Unanimously approved the creation of DDBL 153; and by a separate vote unanimously approved immediate implementation of the newly approved DDBL 153.

8. Petitions of Students
9. Unfinished Business
10. University and Faculty Welfare
11. New Business
    a. Graduate Student Funding Task Force: *Graduate Fees and Tuition: Academic Senate Resolution*

    Graduate Council Chair, Professor Andrew Waterhouse, proposed amending the final paragraph of the resolution following discussion by the Graduate Council. Many, members were in favor of simply stating that the Academic Senate is resolved in seeking elimination of the current policy. The proposed amendment was not accepted, with one vote in favor and the rest opposed.

TRANSCRIPT **(Draft)**
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Tuesday, November 1, 2005
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Memorial Union, MU II

After making two minor wording changes, the Assembly discussed the original resolution. The final resolution is attached, is posted on MySenate as a News Item, and on the Academic Senate web sit at http://www.mrak.ucdavis.edu/senate/index.htm

Action: The Resolution was passed following the discussion, with two opposing votes.

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

UC Davis: School of Veterinary Medicine
Office of the Dean
ph: 752-1360
fax: 752-2801

December 9, 2005

DANIEL SIMMONS
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

In June 2005, the faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine approved the following Bylaw Change to change the membership and expand the charge to the Continuing Education and Extended Learning Committee, a standing committee of the School.

Approved Wording

Continuing Education and Extended Learning. *This committee shall consist of three faculty members. It shall be the duty of this committee to consider and make recommendations concerning the participation of the School in continuing education and extended learning. The Committee will be responsible for reviewing the Center for Continuing Professional Education's mission, goals, structure, and policies, and advising the Center on professional continuing education programs for DVMs and RVT/Vet Assistant programs.*

This was the only change to the School's Bylaws and Regulations during the 2004-05 academic year.

Philip H. Kass
Chair of the Faculty
School of Veterinary Medicine

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COLLEGE OF LETTERS AND SCIENCE
2004-2005

TO: Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate

The following amendments were made in the Bylaws and Regulations of the Faculty of the College of Letters and Science during academic year 2004-2005.

Regulations:

Regulation 51 has been amended to place credit for Music performance courses on the same footing as courses in Physical Education that provide credit for training and performance in Intercollegiate Athletics. The analogy of preparing for and performing in an orchestra, for example, and preparing for and playing in an athletic competition is convincing.

51. Unit Requirements

(A) No change

(B) No change

(C) At most, a combined total of 6 units in Physical Education 1, 6 and similar courses transferred from other institutions, a combined total of 19 units from a list of courses in Music performance designated by the Department of Music and approved by the Executive Committee, and subject to 51(D), a combined total of no more than 9 units in courses in the 300 and 400 series and professional courses offered by professional schools or programs may be counted toward the degree. (Am. 2/6/79; 5/19/94; Eff. 9/95; Am. 6/1/05)

(D) No change

(E) No change

(F) No change

David Webb, Chair
Faculty of the College
of Letters and Science
2005-2006

UC DAVIS - SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
752-3198
752-0844

October 10, 2005

Daniel Simmons, Chair
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

RE: School of Education Bylaws Changes

Dear Professor Simmons:

There have been no changes to the School of Education bylaws during academic year 2004-2005.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Sandoval,
Professor

To: Representative Assembly
From: L. Jay Helms, Chair
Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction
Date: December 5, 2005

The Committee on Elections, Rules, and Jurisdiction hereby reports that the following Legislative Ruling was issued on November 14, 2005.

Legislative Ruling 11.05

Student Petitions to the Division. All student petitions to the Davis Division are received by the Secretary, who may refer each petition to an appropriate committee in accordance with Davis Division Bylaw 13(E) and consistent with Academic Senate Bylaw 315(G).

The Representative Assembly has the authority to accept, reject, or modify the committee's actions (in accordance with Systemwide Legislative Ruling 8.95B). However, the Assembly is not required to consider or take any action on any given student petition, and a petitioner has no right to review by the Representative Assembly.

The Representative Assembly need not include a student petition on its agenda or meeting call except upon direct referral of the petition by the Secretary, by report of the committee to which it was referred, or by action of the Assembly itself.

Background and Rationale

This Ruling was issued on the basis of a request by Divisional Chair Dan Simmons to clarify the authority and obligations of the Representative Assembly with respect to Student Petitions. There are two matters at hand: what authority the Representative Assembly has with respect to student petitions, and how that authority may be exercised.

(1) Is the Representative Assembly empowered to rule on student petitions?

CERJ has reviewed this question several times over the past five years, providing detailed but informal advice to the Divisional Chair on October 1, 2001 and on February 12, 2004.

Legislative Ruling 8.95B of the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction says in part:

> Under SBL 40C each committee of the Academic Senate, including Divisional committees, is responsible to the agency establishing it... The establishing agency retains the right to supercede, amend, or set aside the actions or recommendations of any of its committees.

The establishing agency for standing committees is the Division itself, and the will of the Division is expressed in the Representative Assembly (or by mail ballot). We therefore reaffirm our previous conclusion that the Representative Assembly has the authority to accept, reject, or modify the judgment of any committee with respect to the subject of a student petition.

(2) What is the proper procedure for handing student petitions presented to the Division?

On May 12, 2004, the Assembly of the Academic Senate clarified the procedures for student petitions by adopting the following Systemwide Bylaw:

> Academic Senate Bylaw 315(G) Unless divisional bylaws specify otherwise, the Division Chair receives petitions of students or other material for presentation to the Division and may refer them to an appropriate committee.

Their stated purpose was to

> ...clarify that petitions of students must be delivered to the relevant chair (Assembly or divisional), who alone has the authority to refer them to a committee or the assembly. Because of that explicit clarification, we retained the item "Petitions of Students" in the agenda for Senate meetings.
>
> This amendment clarifies how student petitions are handled at the divisional level. Unless otherwise specified in divisional bylaws, the division chair is authorized to receive such petitions (or other material intended for submission to the division) and to determine whether such materials should be referred to an appropriate committee. [May 12, 2004 Assembly Meeting Call, pages 36 and 39.]

This revision clarifies that a specific student's petition need not be placed on the RA agenda as a matter of right under Systemwide Bylaws. Instead, the petition may be referred to an appropriate committee.

There is a closely-related Divisional Bylaw:

> Davis Division Bylaw 13(E) The Secretary of the Davis Division is authorized to refer directly to the appropriate standing committee any or all questions placed in his or her hands for presentation to the Davis Division, including petitions of students.

The phrase "in his or her hands" is figurative, and the Bylaw simply says that, at Davis, the Secretary plays the role assigned to the Chair under the default Academic Senate Bylaw 315(G). And, at Davis, the Student Petitions Subcommittee of the Executive Council would be a natural destination of student appeals, although this decision rests with the Secretary alone.

Proposal: Revision to Davis Division: Academic Senate Bylaws
Amend DDBL 76(A)
Submitted by: Committee on Committees.
Deletions are indicated by ~~strikeout type~~; additions are in **bold type**.

Rationale: This would allow the Committee on Committees to appoint members of the Faculty Research Lecture Committee, which is responsible for naming the current year's recipient. Under the current Bylaw only past recipients serve on the committee.

Staffing the committee has proved problematic in recent years. The purpose of the revision is to assure active committee membership by allowing some members to be other than previous recipients. The committee chair would also be appointed by the Committee on Committees, as is the case for all other committees under DDBL 40(E).

76. Faculty Research Lecture

A. This committee shall consist of ~~the most recent previous faculty research lecturers, up to a maximum number of five,~~ **five members, at least two of whom shall be previous Faculty Research Lecturers** who are still connected with the Davis Division. ~~In each academic year the committee shall elect its chairperson for the following year.~~

B. This committee shall hold office from April 1 through the following March 31.

C. This committee shall nominate for election by the Representative Assembly a member of the faculty or staff at Davis, who is not a member of the committee and who has made a distinguished record in research, to deliver a lecture upon a topic of his or her choice. The nomination shall be made at the first meeting of the Representative Assembly in the fall quarter and the lecture shall be delivered during Charter Week of the following spring. (Am. 10/19/71, effective 12/21/71)

Proposed Legislation for the University of California Entry Level Writing (formerly Subject A) Requirement at UC Davis

Students entering the University of California, Davis, must satisfy the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement (SR 636).

A. *Prior to enrolling at the University of California*, each student may satisfy the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement **either**:

1. by attaining a score approved by the University Committee on Preparatory Education on one of the following examinations:
   a. the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam (formerly Subject A Examination)
   b. the SAT II Writing Test
   c. the Advanced Placement English Language and Composition Examination
   d. the Advanced Placement English Literature and Composition Examination
   e. the International Baccalaureate Higher Level Examination in English (Language A only)

or

2. by earning at least 3 semester credits or 4 quarter units of transferable college credit in English composition with a letter grade not below C.

B. *A student who has not satisfied the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement prior to enrolling at the University of California, Davis,* must satisfy the requirement **either** by passing the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam administered systemwide or on the Davis campus, **or** by enrolling in Workload 57, offered by Sacramento City College, and passing the course with a C or better. The final exam for Workload 57 will be the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam, which shall be evaluated by writing faculty from both UC Davis and Sacramento City College. The final exam should count for 25% of the total grade.

Students must enroll in Workload 57 as early as possible in their first year in residence. A student who has not satisfied the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement after three quarters of enrollment will not be eligible to enroll for a fourth quarter. Exceptions will be made for students placed into Linguistics 21, 22 and/or 23 coursework: these students will have three quarters plus one quarter for each required linguistic course to meet the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement.

Senate Regulation 636 states that "only after satisfaction of the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement can students take for transfer credit a course in English composition *after* enrollment at UC.

Report of the Subject A Review Committee
Spring 2004

Executive Summary

The status of Subject A on the Davis campus has been a matter of some debate since 1993, when the campus leadership cancelled English A and entered into an agreement with Sacramento City College to offer their English 57 (sometimes referred to as "Workload 57") to Davis students held for the Subject A requirement. At the time of the changeover, the means whereby the Subject A requirement could be satisfied was substantially and hastily redefined: whereas passing English A with a grade of "C" or better was once the way students satisfied the requirement, beginning in 1993 students have had to enroll in English 57 at Sacramento City College **and** pass a stand-alone Subject A exam at the end of the course. This policy was instituted to keep control over the Subject A standard firmly within the university, which alone sets the bar for passing the requirement. The course, in effect, does not "count" toward satisfying the Subject A requirement. The consequences of this change are profound. Whereas ninety (90) per cent of all students passed English A after one quarter of instruction, now substantial numbers of students are required to re-take English 57, some three times.

To illustrate the magnitude of the problem, consider the statistics for the academic year 2003-2004: Sixty (60) per cent of the students who passed English 57 **failed** the subsequent Subject A exam; seventy-eight (78) per cent of students identified as second-language students **failed** the subsequent Subject A exam.[1] To mitigate partially the effect of such a dramatic failure rate on the "final" Subject A exam, over time the Subject A program administration has offered a range of alternative means by which students can satisfy the requirement after having failed to do so through the exam process—they may re-take the exam at the beginning of the following quarter, or, under certain carefully defined circumstances, they may request a Portfolio Review of their work in English 57. Even given these alternatives, a substantial percentage of students must repeat English 57, for which they receive no graduation credit, and which delays their enrollment in freshman English and GE writing courses. In short, in the name of maintaining a high standard for writing for entering freshmen, a goal this review committee fully supports, campus policy and practice are significantly and unnecessarily delaying students' academic progress.

In 1998, an Administrative Review Committee was appointed to review both English 57 and the Math 55 program, then in effect. After an extensive, detailed review of the Subject A program, that committee concluded that "the Subject A Program *as a whole* is not fulfilling its mission in an acceptable way." They further concluded that "to require *all* students who do not 'pass' the Subject A exam the first time they take it prior to beginning work at UC Davis to take English 57 for no graduation credit and to require about a fourth

[1] Subject A Annual Report for 2002-2003, p. 3. See Appendix L.

of these students to take this no-credit course at least one additional time is unacceptable."[2] **The current Review Committee wholly concurs with these findings**. We do so knowing that there are those who insist that it is the purpose of the Subject A requirement to serve in a gate-keeper capacity, and who will say that any attempt to change the requirement as it has evolved is to lower our standards for writing on the campus. This committee insists that there are ways to uphold high writing standards for our students while simultaneously offering a more educationally sound means by which students can satisfy the Subject A requirement. In the recommendations that follow, we are motivated both by a commitment to high writing standards and a sense of fairness to our students. We would maintain the standards for entry university-level writing by moving mastery of the craft of writing to the course itself, and not to an exam that is designed first and foremost as a placement exam, not as a barrier to advancement. Finally, we urge that the campus make critical changes to the Subject A policy because we believe the current practice to be seriously flawed.

Summary of our major recommendations:

1) Continuing our partnership with Sacramento City College is a viable alternative only if we make significant changes to the content of the course and the relationship of the final exam to the course as a whole.

2) English 57, as revised by the criteria below, should in itself satisfy the Subject A requirement, providing the student earn a grade of "C" or higher in the course.[3]

3) The final exam for the course (called the Subject A exam) should be folded into the course in determining whether or not a student has passed the course. The exam should count for a minimum of 15% and a maximum of 25% of the student's grade for the course.

4) The amount of in-class writing assigned in the course, including the final exam, should account for approximately 40% of the course as a whole when determining a student's grade.

[2] Report of the Administrative Review Committee for the English 57 and Math 55 Programs, chaired by Wendell H. Potter, p. 1-2. See Appendix A.
[3] Per Senate Regulation 636. See Appendix B.

Background

The Subject A Requirement was established by the Academic Senate of the University of California in 1898 to ensure that every undergraduate student demonstrate a mastery of university-level skills in written communication early in his or her academic career.[4] SR 636 states:

> Subject A is a reading and writing proficiency requirement. Each Student must be able to understand and to respond adequately to written material typical of reading assignments in freshman courses. This ability must be demonstrated in student writing that communicates effectively to University faculty.

The faculty and the campus have consistently reaffirmed the importance of the ability to analyze written materials critically and to communicate clearly one's ideas in written form as foundational intellectual skills. The central mission of the campus, as articulated in the UC Davis Vision statement, includes the following statement:

> Through a distinctive tradition of core-discipline excellence, interdisciplinary collaborations and productive partnerships, UC Davis teaches students to think critically, objectively and creatively and to be lifelong learners, engaged thinkers and productive citizens.

To accomplish that mission, our students must be able to engage actively and respond effectively to a wide variety of informational or persuasive written materials. The goal of the Subject A requirement is to prepare students to succeed in university-level writing courses, to convey to the students the importance of their being able to write clearly, and to initiate, if necessary, the refinement of the associated skills.

Students may fulfill the requirement prior to coming to campus via several routes outlined in Senate Regulation 636. [Appendix B] In addition, they may pass a community college freshman composition course with a C or better prior to enrolling in Davis, an option that not only allows them to fulfill the Subject A requirement but also fulfills the freshman writing requirement. Unfortunately, students who fail the May statewide Subject A exam do not receive their scores until mid-July, which is not soon enough for them to know that they would be well served to take advantage of such a community college course the summer before they enroll at UC Davis. Another Subject A exam is offered on campus during the Fall quarter's Orientation week to those students who did not take the May exam.

Since 1993, the Davis campus has required all students who fail to meet the Subject A requirement prior to enrolling in the university to take a non-credit course, English 57, at Sacramento City College. At the completion of the course, students **must** pass a Subject A exam, called the final exam in the course, in order to fulfill the Subject A requirement.

---

[4] The Subject A requirement has just been renamed the UC Entry Level Writing Requirement. In order to avoid confusion, we continue to use the familiar name.

The exam is graded by writing instructors from both UC Davis and Sacramento City College, but Davis alone sets the passing standard for the exam. Requiring students to pass a Subject A exam after they complete a preparatory course began in 1993, with the decision to "outsource" the preparatory course to Sacramento City College. Prior to that time, when the course was taught at Davis, students had only to pass English A with a grade of "C" or better to fulfill the requirement. As with all other courses on the campus, the final exam was but one measure of the student's success.

Also in the years since 1993, the campus has offered several alternatives to students who pass the course but fail the exam. After they take the course a second time, but again fail the final exam, and if they have earned a "B" or better in the course, they may request a Portfolio Review of their writing in the course; this review is conducted solely by UC Davis instructors. Such a review is also an option for students after failing the final exam only once if they have earned an "A" or "A-" in the course. A third such option is available to ESL students who have earned a "B" average in both Linguistics 23 and English 57. Finally, students who fail the final exam, no matter their course grade, are eligible to re-take the Subject A exam in the subsequent "O Week" offering of the exam (eg., at the beginning of the Winter quarter for those who fail the final exam at the end of the Fall quarter).

Since 1998, the time of the last Administrative Review, the number of students who enroll in English 57 per year ranged from 1,604 to 2054.[5] While these particular numbers do not reveal how many students are enrolling in the class more than once, because of the way the numbers are aggregated, overall English 57 enrollments represent a significant percentage of each year's incoming freshmen class. The annual reports from the Subject A office estimate the percentage of entering freshmen taking English 57 ranges from a low of 39% to a high of 44%. As the reports explain, these estimates include students who are repeating the course, and therefore the numbers are slightly inflated. Nonetheless, the overall figures are high. Cynthia Bates, the Subject A coordinator, estimated in our conversation with her that roughly one-third of incoming freshmen need to enroll in English 57.

On the Davis campus, non-native speakers of English have the option of being placed within the Linguistics 21, 22, and 23 series before enrolling in English 57 depending upon their English proficiency. Currently, non-native speakers do not have these linguistics courses counted against the current three-quarter limit to fulfill the Subject A requirement. Once they have completed the linguistics series, they therefore may, like other students, take English 57 up to three times before facing disenrollment. A significant number of these students are required to take English 57 more than once.

The Subject A Office, under the direction of Cynthia Bates, Coordinator of Subject A, has been charged with the administrative responsibility for implementing the requirement on the Davis Campus. This is an enormous challenge, one that those affiliated with the Subject A Office take very seriously. Indeed, the individuals are uniformly passionate about the importance of developing the writing skills of new students to the campus and

[5] Annual Reports on Subject A, Appendix L.

have invested a great deal of energy over the years in attempting to ensure that the quality of students' writing meets faculty expectations. Further, since 1993, they have worked in close cooperation with the administrative staff of Sacramento City College, under the direction of John Ruden. The partnership is one characterized by mutual trust and respect, with all concerned working in a highly professional manner.

Nonetheless, the current review committee, as with the 1998 reviewing body, strongly believes that in spite of the best efforts of the program administrators, there are serious problems inherent in the way the Subject A requirement is currently implemented on the Davis campus. While recommending that we continue our partnership with Sacramento City College, we believe it is imperative that the campus make significant changes in the way we ask our students to fulfill the requirement. In the pages that follow, we identify the problems we see with the current practices, and we recommend specific changes that we believe will be fairer to the students, that are educationally sound, and that continue to set a high standard for student performance.

Status of the Davis Subject A Program

The last administrative review of the Subject A program occurred in 1998. At that time, the Administrative Review Committee issued a report that recommended major changes in the Subject A program overall based upon the strong consensus of committee members that the Subject A program *as a whole* was not fulfilling its mission in an acceptable way.[6] At the heart of this criticism was concern that students who had failed the Subject A exam upon arriving on the Davis campus were enrolling in English 57, sometimes repeatedly, without ever receiving any graduation credit or advancing in a timely manner to freshman English on campus. After taking the required English 57 course, large numbers of students were nevertheless failing a subsequent Subject A exam in the form of the final exam for English 57. These students were then required to repeat the course, in some instances more than once, and also required to repeat the Subject A exam. **Our 2004 review of the status of the program indicates that in spite of the strength of the previous committee's recommendations, the situation remains virtually unchanged.** In addition, the 2004 review raised related questions regarding the program's effectiveness in terms of helping students meet the requirement and, ultimately, in terms of cost.

Major Concerns of the Committee

The 2004 review committee members note with concern the wide discrepancy between students successfully passing English 57 but subsequently failing the final Subject A exam, and hence failing to fulfill the Subject A requirement. While pass rates have been uniformly high for the course, hovering in the 90 per cent range most quarters, the subsequent Subject A final exam rates have been dramatically lower. For example, for students enrolled in regular sections of English 57, that is, those enrolled in courses dominated by native-speakers of English, the pass rate for the Subject A final exam, and

[6] Report of the Administrative Review Committee, Appendix A. Italics in the original report.

hence the requirement, ranged from a high of 67% at the end of the Winter 2000 quarter to a low of 20% at the end of the Spring 2003 quarter. Both the low pass rate and the fluctuation in the pass rate call into question the educational soundness of divorcing the course from the exam, and of privileging students' performance on the exam above all else.

While the discrepancy raises questions about the effectiveness of the program for all students, the timed format of the exam poses a particular challenge for non-native speakers. Here the discrepancies between the course pass rates for English 57, which again hovered in the high 90% range, and the Subject A exam pass rates, which ranged from a to a high of 39% during the Winter 2002 quarter to a low of 5% during the Winter 1999 quarter, were even greater. According to information provided by the campus linguistics program, more than half the ESL students who first completed the linguistics series characteristically had to take English 57 more than once to satisfy the Subject A requirement either by passing the Subject A final exam or by means of a portfolio review. 2001 and 2002 data supplied by Mary Lowry, Coordinator of the Davis ESL program, showed that out of an original total of 276 students, 106 students who ultimately passed the Subject A requirement needed to repeat English 57 not because they failed the course but because they failed to pass the timed Subject A exam at the end of the course.[7]

Certainly these discrepancies may be interpreted in at least two ways. One interpretation is that these students who fail the Subject A timed exam after taking English 57 are truly weak writers and therefore should take English 57 again to improve their existing skills. Supporters of this interpretation like the gatekeeper role played by the exam. Supporters of the current system defend the emphasis placed upon the Subject A exam because it is graded by UC Davis lecturers whose oversight role is meant to guarantee that students completing remedial work elsewhere do indeed have the necessary skills to undertake a Davis undergraduate education.

Another interpretation, *one shared by members of this committee*, questions whether the extraordinary importance placed upon a timed two-hour exam is an accurate determinant of a student's ability to succeed as a Davis undergraduate. Those objecting to using the exam in this way dispute the notion that a final exam, whatever its nature, should override all other work in a course. Most fundamentally, students who have failed to meet the Subject A requirement prior to arriving on campus are told they must take English 57 because doing well in English 57 will increase their chances of passing the Subject A exam. After much investigation, members found the data less than convincing on that point.

Despite these contrary assessments, much common ground exists. Across the board, everyone values effective and clear writing. Across the board, everyone agrees that in an ideal world in which cost were no object, the Subject A program would return to the campus and students would be awarded graduation credit for passing the course and thereby fulfilling the Subject A requirement.

[7] Report from Mary Lowry to the Preparatory Education Committee, Appendix K.

Origins of the Present System

The present system was a hasty response to a financial crisis of the early 1990s when the English Composition program endured budget cuts of 35%. Although the plan to outsource the course for students who had failed to meet the Subject A exam produced strong faculty opposition, the Senate was essentially presented with a fait accompli. As the then-Senate Committee on Preparatory Education noted in a 1993 memo, "We acquiesce to the current plan only because we feel we have no choice." The committee further recommended reinstatement of English A classes at the earliest possible time.[8]

Since that time, members of the Senate Committee on Preparatory Education have continued to express concern about the negative repercussions for ESL students in particular of shifting the function of the Subject A exam. Similar concerns have been expressed by the Committee on Educational Policy in 2002, and by the Kinkead Report in 2000, which examined communication skills and writing requirements at UC Davis. While prior to 1993 the Subject A essay was a diagnostic exam that helped place incoming students in the appropriate composition courses, afterward it also became a means of effectively **barring** students from enrolling in English writing courses as well as GE courses with a writing emphasis. On the one hand, the 1993 Committee on Preparatory Education endorsed the notion that English 57 would not *of itself* satisfy the Subject A requirement. On the other hand, the committee recommended additional mechanisms through which students might meet the requirement. These included establishing an English A class on campus for those students who had failed English 57, offering a Linguistics class equivalent to English A for ESL students, and establishing a review panel for exceptional cases.[9] None of these additional protective measures was ever instituted, although a current Linguistics 24 proposal certainly matches the spirit of one suggestion.[10] The result is that since 1993 the importance placed upon the timed two-hour Subject A exam as a means of assessing students' preparation for a Davis education has increased significantly without any companion assessment of the exam's value in this regard.

Additional Concerns with the Administration of the Subject A Requirement

The 1998 Administrative Review report concluded that the English 57 course overall appeared to be preparing students to write as well as the English A course it replaced. The current committee's assessment is less generous. The current committee identifies the following problems with the course, with the exam, and with the use of the exam as the final barrier to satisfying the Subject A requirement:

- Instructors do not hold office hours, and thus are not available to offer students individual assistance on their papers.

[8] Memo to Daniel Simmons from R. L. Merson, Appendix E.
[9] See Appendix E.
[10] Appendix G. It is our understanding that the ESL faculty at UC Santa Barbara are developing a similar course.

- Information provided in our interviews suggests that instructors are uneven in the kind and quality of the comments they provide on individual papers.

- There are no guarantee that teachers in ESL sections of English 57 are linguistic-trained faculty, although such faculty members are apparently available at Sacramento City College.

- According to ESL instructors on our campus, some instructors of English 57 were resistant to adopting curricular changes that could make them more effective teachers of non-native students.

- The list of instructors provided to the committee also suggests that there is a significant turn-over in the instructional staff for English 57.

- The course emphasizes out-of-class writing and revision, totally appropriate for preparing students for university-level course work, but not necessarily an emphasis that matches the overarching necessity for students to pass a timed, in-class, final essay.

- Since 1993, students have been asked to respond to an essay prompt for the final exam that they are seeing for the first time. This is a significant difference from pre-1993, when students were given several different reading prompts in advance, one of which would be the basis for the actual test. The earlier practice approximated much more closely the scenario students ordinarily encounter in college-level courses in which they are usually tested on familiar material.

The committee believes that the cumulative effect of these problems is to make passing the exam much more difficult for students at the precise time that the importance of the exam itself as a means of fulfilling the requirement has become greatly magnified. The addition and expansion of the Portfolio Review option since 1994 suggests a recognition of this problem on the part of the Subject A administrators. For the year ending in 2003, of the students taking the course for the second time (or more) approximately 200 students satisfied the Subject A requirement through the Portfolio Review process, compared with 100 who satisfied the requirement by passing the exam. (Of those who failed both, approximately 35 went on to pass the exam when it was offered in the subsequent "O" week administration of the exam.) Overall, the pass rate for the Portfolio Review for 2002-2003 was 86%. Furthermore, these numbers clearly suggest that when all the students' work for the quarter is assessed, students demonstrate appropriate skill-levels for entering freshmen writing courses. While the committee recognizes that for many faculty the Subject A requirement has been a "gold standard" intended to guarantee a minimum level of writing and reading competency, committee members also believe that the Subject A requirement as it is presently implemented and administered unnecessarily delays students' entry into university-level and university-credit composition courses, and their enrollment in GE writing courses.

Findings and Recommendations

The following findings and recommendations detail the committee's conclusions as to how best to address the problems we have identified with the current campus model for determining satisfaction of the Subject A requirement following matriculation. We strongly believe that these changes are necessary to preserve both the intent of the Subject A requirement and the integrity of our local instruction and assessment process. If the campus is **unwilling** to take appropriate action, responsibility for teaching the English 57 course should be returned to the campus.

English 57

Finding 1. Given the overall high failure rate for students taking the Subject A exam as their final exam in English 57, and therefore failing to satisfy the Subject A requirement on the Davis campus, we find that **at best** the current arrangement with Sacramento City College can be described as only partially successful.

Finding 2. Continuing our partnership with Sacramento City College is a viable alternative, but only if we make significant changes to the content of the course and the relationship of the final exam to the course as a whole.

Recommendation 1. The final exam (called the Subject A exam) should be folded into the course when determining whether or not a student has passed the course. The exam should count for a minimum of 15% and a maximum of 25% of the grade for the course.

Recommendation 2. The total in-class writing for the course, including the final exam, should account for approximately 40-50% of the course as a whole when determining the student's grade for the course; such a division of in-class and out-of-class writing (and revision) represents a more appropriate balance between the kinds of writing that will be required of students in their university-level course work.

Recommendation 3. A student passing the course with a "C" or better (under the conditions specified above) should be determined to have fulfilled the Subject A requirement.

The Final Subject A Exam

The discrepancy between the pass rate for the course (English 57) and the pass rate for the exam suggests to us that 1) the exam is not working correctly, 2) the exam is being used inappropriately, 3) the course is not serving our students well, 4) or all three. In any event, we believe that the campus should make changes in the way we currently implement the system-wide Subject A requirement.

The fact that a significant number of students pass the Subject A exam without any further instruction, having failed it at the end of their course, and with only a month or less intervening between their re-take and their previous failing of the exam, suggests that the exam, per se, is not a wholly reliable measure when used for purposes other than those for which it was designed.

Finding 3. We find no educationally sound reason to require students to pass a Subject A exam at the end of English 57, and to have that exam alone determine whether or not a student is ready to progress to university-level writing courses. Even with the options available to students after they fail the final Subject A exam, we do not find the current practice appropriate.

Finding 4. It is our finding that overall the Davis campus places undue reliance on the Subject A exam as administered as a must-pass exam.

Recommendation 4. To maintain University of California standards, it does seem appropriate for English 57 to continue to culminate with a Subject A-like exam, graded jointly by UC instructors and the teachers of English 57, but only if weighted as recommended above.

Recommendation 5. The committee recommends that UC Davis instructors who regularly teach freshman-level writing courses should represent a substantial portion of the UC faculty involved in grading the exams and evaluating portfolios. Currently the UC representatives grading the exam teach almost exclusively at the upper division.

Recommendation 6. The committee recommends that students should receive a copy of the reading passage that will be part of their exam in advance of taking the final, just as they did before the course was moved to the community college. Such practice would much more clearly mirror the experiences students will face in their university-level course work.

English as a Second Language Students

The problems with the current way we require our students to satisfy the Subject A requirement fall disproportionately on non-native speakers and writers of English. On average, they are held back longer from progressing to university-level writing courses and GE writing courses.

Finding 5. We find the current arrangement for ESL students especially problematic and strongly recommend that it be addressed and corrected.

Recommendation 7. Every effort should be made by Sacramento City College to assign instructors with ESL/linguistic expertise to courses enrolling significant numbers of ESL students.

Recommendation 8. Davis should develop its own ESL-level Subject A course, which should be staffed by ESL/linguistic writing specialists. Such a course, English 24, has been proposed by the Linguistics program and has been endorsed by the Preparatory Education Committee.[11] We urge its adoption.

Costs Associated with Outsourcing English 57 to Sacramento City College

In the best of all possible worlds, the committee would wish to see the course returned to the campus, but we recognize this may not be fiscally feasible.

Finding 6. The current contract with SCC is a cost-effective way to deliver needed instruction, but the arrangement is not as satisfactory as it should be. To continue to pay for a remedial course, but not have the course itself satisfy the Subject A requirement, seems to us to be a poor investment of campus resources.

Recommendation 9a. If we redefine the role the Subject A exam plays in determining if a student passes or fails, and we believe this is imperative, we could afford to buy down the class size even further for regular sections of English 57 (to 25-27) because there would be fewer students repeating the course. A reduced class size should in turn improve the pass rate of the students enrolled in the courses. Such a reduced class size is highly desirable.

Recommendation 9b. Alternatively, we could use some of the cost savings to fund office hours for those teaching English 57. We think this would also improve instruction and hence the pass rate.

The Campus Preparatory Education Committee

Senate Regulation 636, governing the Subject A requirement, clearly gives authority to each campus to designate **a course or an approved program of study** to satisfy the requirement (636 D). Nothing in the regulation says that the course must be a transferable course, as it is ordinarily understood, or that a student must ultimately pass a Subject A **exam**.

Recommendation 10. We urge the Preparatory Education Committee to approve English 57, as modified above, as the program of study that will satisfy the Subject A requirement.

A careful search of the Senate minutes reveals that there is **no** record of any Senate regulations governing how we fulfill the Subject A requirement on this campus, including the role of the Subject A final exam in determining if a student passes or fails the requirement.

[11] See Appendix G.

Recommendation 11. The Preparatory Education Committee should immediately propose appropriate regulations for our campus. We urge that the committee write those regulations to reflect the recommendations of this report, rather than simply going back to fill an apparent legislative void.

Data Collection and Reporting

Despite the best efforts of many individuals and offices, our committee sometimes found it difficult to obtain basic data necessary to evaluate adequately the effectiveness of the current implementation of the Subject A Requirement on the Davis campus. Regular, systematic data collection and **enhanced reporting** are essential to ongoing assessment by the Academic Senate and administration.

Recommendation 12. The Subject A Office should annually report statistics indicating, at a minimum, the number of students enrolled in the course for the first time, second time, and third time, with data on the number of students within each of those categories satisfying the requirement via the course, by separate exam, or through portfolio review. Parallel data should be reported for ESL students and non-ESL students enrolled in English 57. This report should be sent to the Chair of the Committee on Preparatory Education and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies.

Undergraduate Admissions

Recommendation 13. Whatever the disposition of our other recommendations, our committee recommends that the Academic Senate Committee on Admissions and Enrollment re-evaluate our admissions policies and practices regarding students at the extreme low end of the distribution of SAT scores. We may indeed currently be admitting students who have little or no chance to succeed at Davis, given their verbal (and, especially, writing) skills and abilities.

Documents Consulted by the Subject A Administrative Review Committee

Appendix A	1998 Report of the Administrative Review Committee for the English 57 and Math 55 programs, November 23, 1998
Appendix B	Senate Regulation 636
Appendix C	Response to 1998 Review Committee, February 4, 1999
Appendix D	Academic Senate response to 1998 Review Committee with Charles Nash and Cynthia Bates rebuttal
Appendix E	Committee on Preparatory Education response to canceling English A at UC Davis, 1993
Appendix F	Annual Reports of the Committee on Preparatory Education
Appendix G	Proposal to create a new course, Linguistics 24
Appendix H	Systemwide Subject A Report, 2002
Appendix I	Committee on Educational Policy response to Systemwide Subject A
Appendix J	Correspondence from Charlie Nash to Lorena Oropeza
Appendix K	ESL/Subject A Data, 2001-2002, Mary Lowry
Appendix L	Annual Reports on Subject A 1995-96 through 2002-03
Appendix M	English 57 Enrollment Statistics 1997–2003 (Subject A Office)
Appendix N	Subject A Enrollments, 1997-2003, (Office of Resource Management and Planning)
Appendix O	Subject A Appropriations and Expenses (Subject A Office)
Appendix P	Subject A Appropriations and Expenditures (Office of Resource Management and Planning)
Appendix Q	Summary of payments to Los Rios (Office of Resource Management and Planning)
Appendix R	Cost per student (Office of Resource Management and Planning)
Appendix S	Memo to students: Subject A requirement
Appendix T	Memo to students: Portfolio Review
Appendix U	Memo to students: Grading Guidelines
Appendix V	Memo from John Ruden to English 100 students
Appendix W	93-03839V Agreement between University of California, Davis and Los Rios Community College District.
Appendix X	Amendment to Los Rios Agreement
Appendix Y	English 57 Grades 1998 through 2003
Appendix Z	Fall 2003 Subject A Examination
Appendix AA	Subject A Scoring Guide
Appendix BB	Subject A Examiners Fall 2002 through Winter 2004
Appendix CC	Sample Final Exam Responses
Appendix DD	English 57 Final Exam Statistics Fall 1996 through Fall 2003
Appendix EE	Subject A Portfolio Review Statistics 1998-99 through Fall 2003
Appendix FF	Projection of costs if the campus did not contract with Los Rios to provide instruction 1997-98 through 2002-03 (Office of Resource Management and Planning)
Appendix GG	Status & Academic Standing at end of year 5

636. University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement (Am 19 Feb 2004)

1. University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement is a reading and writing proficiency requirement. Each student must be able to understand to respond adequately to written material typical of reading assignments in freshman courses. This ability must be demonstrated in student writing that communicates effectively to University faculty.(Am 30 Nov 83; Am 23 May 96; Am 19 Feb 2004)

2. Prior to enrollment at the University of California, each student may satisfy the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement either (Am 19 Feb 2004):

1. by attaining a score approved by the University Committee on Preparatory Education on one of the following examinations:

1. the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam [formerly called the Subject A Examination] (Am 19 Feb 2004)
2. the SAT II Writing Test
3. the Advanced Placement English Language and Composition Examination
4. the Advanced Placement English Literature and Composition Examination,
5. the International Baccalaureate Higher Level Examination in English (Language A only); or

2. by earning at least 3 semester credits or 4 quarter units of transferable college credit in English composition with a letter grade not below C. (Am 6 Mar 74; Am 28 May 80; Am 26 May 82; Am 30 Nov 83; Am 4 May 86; Am 23 May 1996)

3. (1) A student who has not satisfied the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement prior to enrollment in the University of California must satisfy the requirement by passing an examination or successfully completing a course in English composition or another course or program of study. Any such course or program of study or examination must be approved for this purpose by an appropriate agency of the Academic Senate Division of the student's campus. To satisfy the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement by successfully completing a course or program of study, a student must enroll for a letter grade and earn a grade of C or above. A student who receives a final grade of C- or below may repeat the course. (Am 19 Feb 2004)

(2) A student must satisfy the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement as early as possible during the first year in residence. A student who has not done so after three quarters or two semesters of enrollment will not be eligible to enroll for a fourth quarter or third semester. Exceptions to this requirement may be made by an appropriate agency of the Academic Senate Division of the student's campus. (Am 26 May 82; Am 23 May 96; Am 19 Feb 2004)

4. Students may satisfy the requirement by passing an examination or by successful completion of a one-quarter or one-semester University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement course in English composition or other approved course or program of study. The examination satisfying the requirement must meet the standards established by the University Committee on Preparatory Education. The University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement course must be taken for a letter grade and passed with a grade of C or higher. Students receiving a final grade of C- or below may repeat the course. (Am 28 80; Am 26 May 82; Am 19 Feb 2004)

5. Any award of baccalaureate credit for University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement course(s) must be consonant with SR 761. (En 30 Nov 83) [See Legislative Ruling 2.85] (Am 19 Feb 2004)

6. Students who, prior to initial enrollment at UC, have earned at least four quarter units of transferable college credit in English composition with a grade not lower than C have satisfied the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement. (Am 30 Nov 83; Am 6 May 86; Am 19 Feb 2004)

7. Any student who has not satisfied the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement prior to enrollment at UC must satisfy it by passing an approved course or other program prescribed by the student's UC campus of residence for satisfying the requirement. Only after satisfaction of the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement can students take for transfer credit a course in English composition after enrollment at UC. (Effective for students enrolling at UC in Fall 1986 or thereafter.) (En 4 Mar 86; Am 19 Feb 2004)

Proposed Revisions to Davis Division Regulation 542 (b)

Current Regulation	Proposed Revisions
542. Posthumous Recognition of Undergraduate Achievements Posthumous recognition of students' undergraduate achievements shall be awarded under the following conditions:.	No change.
(A) A student with a cumulative grade point average of 2.00 or higher who had completed all requirements for the Bachelor's Degree, or was within 15 quarter units of having done so, shall be awarded the Bachelor's Degree.	No change.
(B) A student with a cumulative grade point average of 2.99 or higher who had completed 84.0 or more quarter units, but who would not have been eligible for the award of the Bachelor's Degree under the provisions of Paragraph (A) above, shall be posthumously awarded a certificate recognizing the student's upper division standing. (En. 2/02/90)	(B) A student with a cumulate grade point average of ~~2.99~~ ***2.00*** or higher…

Proposed Changes/Rationale:

The Undergraduate Council was asked by Assistant Dean Dann Trask, College of Letters & Science, to discuss the possibility of changing the current regulation to reflect the same minimum GPA in all cases of Posthumous Recognition of Undergraduate Achievements. The current regulation requires a higher minimum GPA (2.99 rather than 2.00) for posthumous award of a certificate of upper division standing than is required for posthumous award of a Bachelor's Degree. The members of the Undergraduate Council could find no justification for this difference. It was noted that posthumous awards of recognition carry tremendous significance and value for the deceased students' families and there should be no unnecessary restrictions on the granting of such awards. The Undergraduate Council voted unanimously for this amendment at its meeting January 28, 2005.

Proposal: Revision to Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Establish DDBL 16.5
Submitted by: The Executive Council Special Committee on Shared Governance Bylaw Revisions
Deletions are indicated by strikeout, additions are in **bold type**.

Rationale: Establishes a process by which a committee chair or committee member may be dismissed for good cause. While such a procedure would almost never be necessary, there have been instances in the past where its existence might have provided a mechanism to replace committee members who failed to participate in the work of the assigned committee.

16.5 Removal From Office

Any officer, divisional representative to the Assembly of the Academic Senate, committee chair, or member of a committee of the Davis Division may be dismissed for good cause by a two-thirds vote of the Representative Assembly on the recommendation of the Committee on Committees. Good cause includes the failure to perform the duties of the office or other actions that undermine the effectiveness of a committee or the Division. No one shall be dismissed unless he or she is afforded the opportunity to lay evidence before the Committee on Committees and to answer any charges before the Representative Assembly.

Proposal: Revision to Davis Division: Academic Senate Bylaws
Amend DDBL 31 & Establish DDBL 32
Submitted by: The Executive Council Special Committee on Shared Governance
Deletions are indicated by strikeout, additions are in **bold type**.

Rationale: This proposal evolves from recommendations in the *Mending the Wall* Report: ***3.8 Special Committees and Taskforce.*** The Special Committee on Shared Governance is impressed that much of the best work of the Division (for example, the recent reform of the academic personnel process) has been conducted through *ad hoc* committees with a narrow charge and a limited lifespan. The current chair of the Division, with approval of the Executive Council, has established a number of special committees and joint Senate-Administrative task forces to address issues that cross the jurisdictional boundaries of existing standing committees. Examples include task forces to develop a baseline for assessment of the intercollegiate athletics program, to recommend revision of campus policies and procedures for approving academic unit revisions and degree programs, and to recommend policies and procedures for the establishment of organized research units. This proposal regularizes and clarifies that process. Under Divisional bylaws special committees will not usurp the authority of a standing committee. Representatives appointed to joint administrative committees speak as representatives of their respective standing committees, but do not have the authority to confirm action on behalf of a standing committee. The use of special committees in a manner consistent with the bylaws is an effective means of moving business through the Senate more efficiently. Special committees should be constructed by drawing – at least in part – on the membership of the relevant standing committees and should be designed, not to usurp the authority of standing committees – but to promote efficient, effective, and coordinated action among them.

31. Special Committees

A. Special committees of the Davis Division may be established by the Representative Assembly**;** by the Executive Council**; or by the Chair of the Division, subject to confirmation by the Executive Council**. Special committees ~~established by the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division~~ shall be appointed or elected in the manner ~~designated~~ **established**, at the time of their creation. ~~If no,~~ **unless a** different method of election or appointment ~~were~~ **is** indicated, the Committee on Committees shall appoint such committees and designate their chairperson **chair**s. ~~Special committees established by the Executive Council of the Davis Division shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees.~~ Appointments to special committees by the Committee on Committees shall be reported to the Representative Assembly but shall not require confirmation. (Am. 10/19/71, effective 12/21/71; Am. 11/17/75)

B. A special committee may be established by the Division: (i) for a particular purpose; or (ii) when an issue engages the duties of more than one divisional standing committee, for the purpose of coordinating activities among those committees; or (iii) when an issue engages the duties of one or more standing committees and a non-Senate agency, for the purpose of coordinating activities between the Division and the non-Senate agency, and may, within the limitations of Academic Senate Bylaw 35.C and Davis Division Bylaw 28.C, include non-Senate representatives.

C. Each special committee shall have such powers and perform such duties as shall be designated in the resolution calling for its appointment **or, if established by the Chair of the Division, in the Chair's written charge to the committee**. No special committee, however, shall be appointed or elected to perform any duties assigned to a standing committee.

D. Wherever appropriate and feasible, members shall be drawn from the standing committees most relevant to the charge of the **special committee.** Members of ~~taskforces~~ **special committees** shall report regularly to the standing committees~~, which~~ **that** they represent~~; or, if they are not charged to represent a standing committee, to the Executive Council~~.

E. A special committee of the Davis Division shall have tenure only until the regular meeting of the Representative Assembly of the ensuing fall term unless (1) a definite term is specified in the authorizing motion; (2) its authorization occurs after April 1, in which case it shall continue for one year beyond the normal expiration date; or (3) it is continued by action of the Representative Assembly. (Am. 10/19/71; 12/21/71)

F. The final reports of special committees shall constitute a special order for the first regular meeting of the Representative Assembly each academic year. (Am. 10/19/71; effective 12/21/71)

32. Non-Senate Committees

A The Division shall be regarded as officially represented on committees established by non-Senate agencies being only by those members of the committee who are appointed by the Chair of the Division with notice to the Executive Council, or as provided by Divisional bylaws. Wherever appropriate and feasible, members shall be drawn from the standing committees most relevant to the charge of the non-Senate committee. On nomination to a non-Senate committee, Senate members shall receive a charge naming the standing committees to which they shall report regularly with respect to the activities of the non-Senate committee. Where no other

committee is named, they shall report to the Executive Council.