MEETING SUMMARY
(Draft until approved)
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

1. Summary of the February 24, 2011 Meeting
   **ACTION:** Motion to approve Summary of the February 24, 2001 Meeting. Motion seconded; no discussion. Motion passed by acclamation.

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
      Academic Federation (AF) Chair outlined activities of the year and emphasized the unique resource offered by the AF.
   b. Remarks by the Divisional Chair – Bob Powell
      Chair Powell announced he has accepted the position of Vice Chair of the systemwide Academic Senate for 2011-2012; he will then fill the systemwide Chair position the following year.

      Chair Powell also highlighted the following topics (talking points attached):
      * The importance of the Senate in championing departments and department chairs;
      * One outcome of last year’s forum regarding furloughs was the idea of increasing the number of out-of-state students whose higher tuition will off-set some budget cuts;
      * A strong relationship has been forged with the Chancellor and new Provost;
      * Faculty need to work to change the current culture of mistrust because it’s a threat to academic excellence. Mistrust is evident in the course approval process and in the academic personnel process. Faculty need to feel supported. A task force will be proposed to review personnel processes.

7. Reports of standing committees
   a. Committee on Committees
      i. Confirmation of 2011-2012 standing committee appointments
      **ACTION:** Motion to recognize and appreciate Academic Senate service by Robert Powell and John Oakley. Motion seconded; no discussion. Approved unanimously.

*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.
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ACTION: Motion to confirm the 2011-2012 committee appointments. Motion seconded. Approved by acclamation.  
Discussion: It was noted that Professor Linda Bisson has agreed to Chair the Senate for one year and Professor Bruno Nachtergaele has agreed to the position of Vice Chair. It was further noted that the handout reflects additional changes that were made to committee appointments after the agenda was sent out to members.

b. Committee on Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction  
i. Legislation Changes  
   1. DDB71: Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction –  
      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).

ACTION: Motion to accept the change. Motion seconded; no discussion.  
Vote: 40 – 0. Approved

2. DDB 80: Graduate Council  
The proposed amendment provides Graduate Council authority to approve or recommend to the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment and discontinuance of graduate programs and UC courses of study. Additionally, wording will better reflect current practices of Graduate Council.

ACTION: Motion to accept the change. Motion seconded; no discussion.  
Vote: 40 – 0. Approved.

3. DDB 99: Committee on Research  
The amendment would restructure Committee on Research to consolidate the two subcommittees.

ACTION: Motion to accept the change. Motion seconded. Upon discussion a Motion was made by Professor Samaniego for a friendly revision to the amendment:

*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.
I move the approval of amendment of Bylaw 99, effective immediately upon adoption, with the exception that for the 2011-2012 academic year only, the membership of the committee be no more than 21, the initial 21 members being those who have been approved in this meeting for membership on the committee, and whose terms of service are to be determined by the Committee on Committees.

**Motion seconded. Vote: 41 - 0. Approved**

4. **DDR 522: General Education**
   
The proposed revisions are the result of plans for the implementation of the General Education requirement in Fall, 2011. The handout (attached) has an updated version of the background and rationale for the proposed amendment.

**ACTION: Motion to accept the change. Motion seconded; no discussion. Vote: 41 – 0. Approved.**

5. **DDR A540: Grades**
   
The proposed revision allows graduate students repetition of up to three courses, rather than up to nine units.

**ACTION: Motion to accept the change. Motion seconded; no discussion. Vote: 41 – 0. Approved.**

   c. **Committee on Admissions & Enrollment**
      
      i. **Proposal for a UC Davis Freshman Admission Process Based on Holistic Review**

**ACTION: Motion to accept the proposal. Motion seconded; discussion ensured. Vote: 36 – 0, 2 abstentions. Approved.**

8. Petitions of Students
9. Unfinished Business
10. University and Faculty Welfare
11. New Business -

12. Information Item
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a. Davis Division Committee on Academic Personnel Appeal and
   Reconsideration Process

Chair Powell suggested the following:
   “Specifically, I am asking that the RA form a Task Force that would investigate:
   1. Provide a process to alleviate 50% of the faculty and staff time involved in merit
      actions for academic personnel
   2. The first reform should be particularly aimed at eliminating FPCs
   3. Eliminate CAP-Appellate
   4. Develop a specific proposal for the resources needed to allow CAP members to fully
      engage with the work of the Committee.

   This last point requires that the administration agrees with this initiative. I ask that you authorize
   the formation of this Task Force contingent upon an agreement by the administration that they
   will provide necessary release time and, as appropriate, salary, for an expanded CAP. There is
   no need to move forward otherwise.”

Motion: Resolution to form a task force in response to Chair Powell’s request:

The Representative Assembly wishes to form a task force to determine the feasibility of potential
simplifications of the academic personnel process that will result in reducing the amount of staff and
faculty time invested in that process. This Task Force will report back to this Assembly one year
hence.

Motion was seconded.
ACTION: Approved by a vote of 36 for, 0 against, and 0 abstentions.

Meeting Adjourned.

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.
Comments to the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate

Robert Powell

June 3, 2011

This is my last Representative Assembly Meeting as Chair of the Davis Division. I am resigning a year early from my second two year term. On Sept. 1 I become Vice Chair of the Systemwide Senate. The following year, I assume the Systemwide Chair position. I am looking forward to lots of great things: the all cuts budget, differential tuition by campus, revisiting post-employment benefits... Perhaps since I’ll be in Oakland, I should start checking in with Harold Camping.

Let’s not waste your time by what I think has been accomplished during my three years as Chair. What I believe to be the most important things would likely be seen by my predecessors as, “not Senate stuff”.

I’ve championed the role of Departments and Department Chairs. Clark Kerr considered these the “natural” unit of attachment for faculty and the “supreme organizational units of the
research university”. That’s good enough for me and for my spending a lot of my effort on this front.

With your support, I’ve opened up discussions of new revenue sources. In a Senate Forum almost exactly two years ago UC Davis faculty supported the idea of offsetting our budget cuts with additional enrollment of nonresident undergraduates. Today, this model has been embraced by the administration. For Fall 2011, the number of admitted nonresidents is up by 47% from 2,820 to 4,160. Enrollment is expected to increase to 600-700 up from 350 last year. Small numbers, perhaps, but let’s be clear, 350-400 nonresident students offset $10 million in budget cuts.

Lastly, I have worked with all of you to develop a strong working relationship with our new Chancellor and much more recently, our Provost and VCR. They have risen to the severe challenges posed by the state budget crisis and posited entirely new ways of handling these. Most importantly they are fostering a culture of transparency and trust like nothing I’ve seen in my 27 years here. I’d like to use my remaining time discussing this.
It’s probably not a surprise to many of you that there is systemic mistrust that pervades our UC Davis academic culture. It consumes our processes and thereby it consumes us. Why? Well there are some good reasons.

This first example isn’t a joke although it may start out sounding that way. Two deans are talking. One recounts work with faculty in the other dean’s unit. The latter dean asks which faculty are involved. The first dean is taken aback, but the second dean persists. That dean not only wants to know which faculty are involved but wants to be told about all future interactions. This dean wants to act as the validator of individual faculty and the gatekeeper to the unit.

On a different note, there is very consistent rhetoric among many administrators that the Senate is slow, it inhibits progress on the campus and it’s costly. Someone very prominent in the Senate was recently told in a meeting that “Shared governance costs a lot of money”.

What are people thinking? I personally believe that if anyone doesn’t want to operate according to the Standing Orders of
the Regents and the Academic Personnel Manual they should leave the UC.

It is up to us to stipulate that we will not allow ourselves to be guided by this culture of mistrust. We need to face our future assuming that we, as faculty, are pursuing our scholarship and fulfilling our duties according to the highest academic standards. We need to assert that we must have academic and administrative leaders whose statements do not violate our academic freedoms. We must have staff who fully support the goals of academic excellence.

But we need to set the tone. Let me give you two examples of where I think that distrust has gotten in our way and where this body can help make progress.

Course approvals. The first slide shows the current process for approving an undergraduate course. Just look at the number of steps and the number of opportunities for more and more hands to touch this process. Dozens of faculty and several staff are involved before it is all over. It treats all courses the same – new courses, changes in prerequisites, change in course
number. Why? We have a Task Force working on this. We will bring a proposal to you for change next year.

The process most based on mistrust is the academic personnel process. We just sent out this description of the appeals process (slide). It took well over a month to get all of the parties to agree on this. There are two CAPs, Deans, VP AA and FPCs mentioned. It gets even worse. Here’s a process diagram that essentially describes how a promotion package is put together. We must ask what is essential here? How is it that every other campus gets away without a CAP Appellate? Without FPCs? What has driven us to provide so much redundancy? In Engineering, we use redundancy when the reliability of the system is poor. Just how unreliable is it? We have about 40 Appeals each year. Of these, about a third get changed – that’s 13 out of over 600 cases per year. Yet we have this enormous complexity which in and of itself chews up faculty and staff time. Indeed, one of the biggest time sinks has been developing more and more complex by-laws and procedures governing CAP- Appellate to ensure that it is not abused. That has been one of the biggest threats to academic excellence that I have seen.
Over a year ago, CAP proposed a major restructuring of the personnel process that would have been a step towards simplification and workload reduction. That proposal was considered to be too complicated to implement. It wasn’t. It was a matter of changing processes at a very fundamental level. What finally resulted was a failure as a result of the lack of leadership in units outside the direct purview of the Senate.

Yet, we continue to be blamed for “costing a lot of money”. So today, I am asking you to endorse the formation of a Task Force that would start with CAP’s proposal from last year. It would entail sweeping changes in the personnel process. Specifically, I am asking that the RA form a Task Force that would:

1. Provide a process to alleviate, on average, 50% of the faculty and staff time involved in merit actions for academic personnel
2. The first reform should be particularly aimed at eliminating FPCs
3. Eliminate CAP-Appellate
4. Develop a specific proposal for the resources needed to allow CAP members to fully engage with the work of the Committee.
This last point requires that the administration agrees with this initiative. I ask that you authorize the formation of this Task Force contingent upon an agreement by the administration that they will provide necessary release time and, as appropriate, salary, for an expanded CAP. There is no need to move forward otherwise. This will be our point of demarcation for building trust from our end. We cannot set our faculty to task on a fools’ errand if we are only to be undermined.

This Task Force will report back to this Assembly one year hence.

As you will see, the CoC has found someone to complete my term and provide outstanding leadership. I actually think you will find with this individual is a true Senate leader.

For me it has been about you, the faculty, the environment in which you undertake scholarship, the future of the campus and a strong and positive relationship with the administration. I just want it to work. And as an engineer, I fully subscribe to adage that the enemy of good is best.
Before ending I must thank the staff. If any of you have had the good fortune with working with Senate staff, you know the level of professionalism coupled with the subtle personal touch that makes it truly outstanding. I may miss someone, but let me call out those present.

Finally, my decision to go to Oakland has been an agonizing one. But once I made it, I was reminded by my friend and colleague, Pablo Ortiz, of the quote in Frank Rich’s last op-ed piece in the NYT. In his making a decision to end his career at the NYT, Rich quotes Stephan Sondheim’s lyrics from Sunday in the Afternoon in the Park with George, “Stop Worrying Where Your Going. Move on”.
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1. Academic Senate Review of Courses of Instruction
2. Committee on Academic Personnel Appeal and Reconsideration Process
3. Sample of an Academic Personnel Process Map (College of Engineering)
4. Updated Committee on Committees Standing Committee Appointment Roster
5. DDR 522 (Revised Rationale)
Davis Division of the Academic Senate Review of Courses of Instruction – Undergraduate (1-199 courses)

**KEY**
- Boxes = Process
- Diamond = Decision
- COCI = Committee on Courses of Instruction

1.0 – Identify the need to submit a New, New Version or Discontinue course request

Should course proposal be submitted?

2.0 – Department Chair Review

Can send back for revisions if College or Senate has rejected the request

3.0 – College Review

4.0 – COCI Analyst Reviews for policy consistency & completeness

Manages course proposal prioritization

5.0 – COCI Reviews

End

Registrar

COCI Reviewers

COCI Analyst

College

Department or Equivalent

Initiator

Start
Davis Division Committee on Academic Personnel
Appeal and Reconsideration Process

**Appeal**
The faculty member who wishes to appeal should provide evidence of the personnel committee's failure to apply established standards of merit or failure to follow established procedure.

- Candidate
  - Department Chair
    - Dean
      - Vice Provost — Academic Affairs

**Reconsideration**
A reconsideration is when new information is supplied that is not the result of a personnel committee's failure to apply established standards of merit or failure to follow established procedure.

- Faculty member should consult with a Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Adviser

- Non-Redelegated Actions
  - Reconsideration
  - Possible Appeal
    - Committee on Academic Personnel Appellate Subcommittee
      - Recommendation
        - Non-Redelegated
          - Vice Provost — Academic Affairs
            - Final Decision
              - Candidate
          - Redelegated Actions
            - Dean
              - Final Decision
                - Dept. Chair

- Redegated Actions
  - Original Review Committee: Committee on Academic Personnel — Oversight/Faculty Personnel Committee
    - Recommendation
      - Non-Redelegated
        - Vice Provost — Academic Affairs
          - Final Decision
            - Candidate
      - Redelegated Actions
        - Dean
          - Final Decision
            - Dept. Chair

New information should be indicated as such by the candidate, or in supporting letters by the Dean or Dept. Chair. Such information needs to fall in the review period (per UCD-220-IV.F.9); e.g., by 12/31 of the year of consideration, and would be:

1. New publications or other creative works
2. Awards
3. New teaching evaluations
4. New grants
5. Original requested extramural letters that arrived late
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Committee on Committees
Standing Committee Appointment Report
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Divisional Officers –2011-2012
Chair: Linda Bisson (one-year term 2011-2012)
Vice Chair: Bruno Nachtergaele
Secretary: Ines Hernandez-Avila
Parliamentarian: G.J. Mattey

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 Divisional Representative: Ralph Aldredge

Affirmative Action and Diversity
Susan Rivera, Chair, Kyu Kim, Tina Jeoh, Courtney Joslin, Francis Lu, Cynthia
Pickett, Monica Vazirani
UCAAD 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. Mattey, Chair, James Fadel, Mark Grismer
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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
Randy Dahlgren, Chair, Bruce Gates, Qizhi Gong, Alan Hastings, Charles Langley

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 Fyhrle, 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: Vacant

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
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(A/F) Administrative Series Personnel Committee
Howard Schutz

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
Kathryn 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: Kathryn Olmsted
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Undergraduate Council
Jon Rossini, Chair, Colin Carter, Christiana Drake, Gregory Dobbins, Patrick Farrell, Susan Keen, Maggie Morgan, Janet Roser, Diana Strazdes, Matthew Traxler, Carl Whithaus, Jeffrey Williams
UCPE 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
UCPE Divisional Representative: Christiana Drake

UGC – Special Academic Programs
Diana Strazdes, Chair, Cynthia Ching, Thomas Lee, Keith Watenpaugh, Gina Werfel

UGC – Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review
Carl Whithaus, Chair, Tim Lewis, Stephen Wheeler

Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes
Rajiv Singh, Chair, Hussain Al-Asaad, Lawrence Bogad, Patricia Boeshaar, R. Holland Cheng, Ian Falloona, John Gates, Joanna Groza, Bruce Haynes, Carlos Jackson, Matthias Koepppe, 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

Submitted for Representative Assembly Confirmation on June 3, 2011
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. The third revision would allow the Committee on Courses of Instruction to 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. It would also allow delegation of authority to be rescinded. The current Regulation allows the delegation of this authority to the deans for courses taken previous to matriculation by transfer students but is silent on courses taken by matriculated students. The current Regulation does not contain any provision for the rescission of previous delegation.

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 allows the Committee on Courses of Instruction to 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. However, if the Committee on Courses of Instruction were to find that the determinations made by the deans are unsuitable, it should have the authority to rescind the delegation, including those which have been made by the Committee in the past.

**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)