NOTICE OF MEETING LOCATION

REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

To: Representative Assembly Members of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate

From: Davis Division of the Academic Senate Office

Re: Notice of Meeting Location

The November 1, 2012 Representative Assembly meeting will be held at the Memorial Union, MU II.

Directions to the room can be found at the following website: http://campusmap.ucdavis.edu/?b=104.

MU II is located on the second floor.

The meeting is scheduled to begin at 2:10pm.
MEETING CALL
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Thursday, November 1, 2012
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Memorial Union, MU II

1. Transcript of the June 8, 2012 Meeting
2. Announcements by the President – None
3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents – None
4. Announcements by the Chancellor – None
5. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – None
6. Special Orders
   a. Remarks by the Divisional Chair – Bruno Nachtergaele
   b. Remarks by ASUCD President – Rebecca Sterling
   c. Remarks by GSA Chair – Ethan Evans
   e. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel: Appellate Committee – TBD

Annual Reports on Consent Calendar:

f. *Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
   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 Faculty Research Lecture Award Committee
   o. *Annual Report of the Committee on Faculty Welfare
   p. *Annual Report of the Grade Changes Committee
   q. *Annual Report of the Graduate Council
   r. *Annual Report of the Committee on Information Technology
   s. *Annual Report of the Committee on International Education
   t. *Annual Report of the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel
   u. *Annual Report of the Library Committee
   v. *Annual Report of the Committee on Planning and Budget
   w. *Annual Report of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure
   x. *Annual Report of the Committee on Public Service
   y. *Annual Report of the Committee on Research

*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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z. *Annual Report of the Undergraduate Council
   i. Annual Report of the Subcommittee on General Education 225
   ii. Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Preparatory Education (not submitted) 231
   iii. Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Special Academic Programs (not submitted) 234
   iv. Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review
aa. *Annual Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes (not submitted) 234

7. Reports of standing committees
8. Petitions of Students
9. Unfinished Business
10. University and Faculty Welfare
11. New Business
   a. Academic Senate Administrative Oversight Committee Update – André Knoesen
12. Informational Item
   a. Updated Response to the UC Davis Academic Senate’s Executive Council Request for an Action Plan (October 1, 2012 – REVISED) 236
   b. Academic Senate Special Committee on Freedom of Expression charge 267
   c. Academic Senate Administrative Oversight Special Committee charge 269

Abigail Thompson, Secretary
Representative Assembly of the
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

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

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.
MEETING CALL
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Friday, June 8, 2012
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Memorial Union, MU II

1. Summary of the April 17, 2012 Meeting - Unanimously 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 Divisional Chair – Linda Bisson
      - Chair Bisson met with state legislators to discuss UCD.
      - The Senate Chair has been meeting with the Chancellor to discuss the budget of UCD.
      - The Athletics director will be chosen soon.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION OF THANKS: Presented by Joe Kiskis

The Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate thanks Chair Linda Bisson for the boundless dedication with which she has responded to the demands of her office in a year of extraordinary challenges.

Motion seconded; no discussion.

ACTION: Unanimously approved

b. Remarks by the Academic Federation Vice Chair – Ellen Bonnel
   Incoming Federation Chair Ellen Bonnel gave an overview of Academic Federation and acknowledged outgoing Academic Federation Chair Dan Wilson and other committee members for the energy and time in serving the Academic Federation organization.

c. Remarks by the Staff Assembly Vice Chair – James Cubbage –
   Incoming Staff Assembly Chair James Cubbage gave an overview of the Staff Assembly and stated that a joint voice is important. There are concerns over the Shared Services Center, especially shared IT Service Center and the ability to meet the needs of all the campus departments in a timely manner.

Reports of standing committees

d. Committee on Committees – Pablo Ortiz
   i. Confirmation of 2012-2013 standing committee appointments

*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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e. Committee on Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction – G.J. Mattey
   i. Bylaw Changes
      1. DDB 28: General Committee Provisions
         Motion to approve the amendment to DDB 28 was made and seconded.
         Vote: 55 - 0
         ACTION: Motion Passed

      2. DDB 31: Special Committees
         Motion to approve the amendment to DDB 31 was made and seconded.
         Vote: 52 - 0
         ACTION: Motion Passed

      3. DDB 80: Graduate Council
         Motion to approve the amendment to DDB 80 was made and seconded.
         Vote: 51 - 0
         ACTION: Motion Passed

      4. DDB 88: Public Service Committee
         Motion to approve the amendment to DDB 88 was made and seconded.
         Vote: 52 - 0
         ACTION: Motion Passed

      5. DDR 528: Credit by Examination
         Motion to approve the amendment to DDR 528 was made and seconded.
         Vote: 55 - 1
         ACTION: Motion Passed

      6. DDR 538(H): Final Examinations
         Motion to approve the amendment to DDR 538(H) was made and seconded.
         Vote: 54 - 0
         ACTION: Motion Passed

      7. DDR A540: Grades
         Motion to approve the amendment to DDR 540 was made and seconded.
         Vote: 53 - 0
         ACTION: Motion Passed

*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.
c. Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CAFR) - Adela De La Torre

“Egregious Academic Freedom Violation”

The following resolutions are based on the report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility to the Representative Assembly on June 8, 2012.

**Resolution, specific to Professor Wilkes.**

*Resolved*, That the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate affirms the right of academic freedom of Professor Michael Wilkes and all other faculty to publish scholarly articles and professional expert commentaries that address ethics and societally relevant critiques.

*Resolved*, That the Representative Assembly calls upon the Dean, Executive Associate Dean, and the Health System Counsel of the School of Medicine of the University of California, Davis, all to:

1. Accept promptly and publicly responsibility for serious errors in judgment;
2. Write individual letters of apology to Professor Wilkes;
3. Rescind in writing all disciplinary actions that have been stated, proposed, or taken against Professor Wilkes.

**Resolution, potential legal actions**

*Resolved*, That the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate expresses severe disapproval of the notion that the University of California may take legal action against professors whose scholarly publications or professional expert commentaries may be perceived by University administrators to be injurious to University interests.

**Resolution,**

*Resolved*, That the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate calls upon the Chancellor of the University of California, Davis, within six months to:

*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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1. Take concrete steps to prevent future violations of rights of academic freedom and report to the Davis Division the steps that have been taken to this end.
2. Have the Dean of the School of Medicine take appropriate training to prevent academic freedom violations.

VOTE: 52 – 0
ACTION: Approved

Resolution added by the Assembly:
Resolved, That the Representative Assembly condemns Health System and Campus Legal Counsels for drafting inappropriate and apparently threatening letters that violated a faculty member’s right to academic freedom.

VOTE: 50 – 0
ACTION: Approved

7. Reports of special committees

Professor Jeannie Darby (Chair of STAPP) indicated that Davis’ system is one of the most complex. Much discussion has taken place in the past but no positive developments have come from those discussions. The committee has developed three sets of recommendations for simplifying the personnel process. Next steps – decide what can be adopted and fine tune the program in the fall.

8. Petitions of Students - None
9. Unfinished Business - None
10. University and Faculty Welfare
11. New Business - None

Ines Hernandez-Avila, Secretary
Representative Assembly of the
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

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

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.
The Committee of Academic Personnel – Oversight Committee (CAP) advises the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs on matters that affect the personnel process. These include promotions, appointments, terminations, multiyear accelerations within rank that involve skipping a step, high-level merit actions, third-year deferrals, five year reviews, and appraisals. CAP also recommends membership on ad hoc committees, and these are then appointed by the Vice Provost. The committee appoints and directs the Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) that advise the Deans on redelegated personnel actions (Appendix D). Appendix E provides a list of CAP’s principal tasks.

**Faculty Advancement Criteria:** CAP evaluates the files of candidates according to guidelines established in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM-210). CAP’s mandate is to assure fair and equitable treatment of all faculty while ensuring that high standards of scholarship are maintained across the campus. Its goal is to apply fair, objective, and uniform standards of evaluation across the disciplines, recognizing the variability of measures of accomplishment and success from one discipline to another.

CAP bases its judgments on documents provided in the formal personnel evaluation process, including documents contained in each candidate’s dossier, evaluations by departmental faculty and the chair, commentaries from the dean, and when appropriate, assessments from external evaluators. The committee may also get input from a three-person ad hoc committee appointed by the Vice Provost--Academic Affairs following CAP’s recommendations.

CAP’s evaluation is guided by the wording of the APM, according to which the “indispensable qualification” for advancement at all levels is “superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement.” CAP typically recommends advancement of a faculty member after the normal period at rank and step on the basis of a record of balanced accomplishment in research and/or creative activity, teaching, and service. Alternatively, CAP might make a favorable recommendation when it judges the performance to be well above expectations in one category although it was below expectations in another, as appropriate to rank and step. Time spent on an activity is not considered to be a substitute for accomplishment. Except for deferrals, CAP does not use time in service or health or personal issues in judging merit advancements.

CAP’s evaluation of research reported in peer-reviewed publications (and in other venues) and of creative work presented in many forms and venues is based principally on the originality, creativity, and impact of the work as
judged by peers. The primary criteria for the evaluation of teaching are effectiveness and impact, as well as the candidate's command of his or her subject, scholarly growth, and presentation of material in ways that help students to think critically, independently, and creatively. Advising and mentoring activities as well as student evaluations are given substantial weight in judging teaching performance. CAP is also influenced by the amount, variety, and difficulty of teaching. In evaluating service, CAP assesses the effort, impact, and outcome.

**Academic Personnel Actions:** During the 2011-12 academic year (September through August), CAP met 42 times out of 52 weeks and considered 583 agenda items, of which 493 were academic personnel actions. The committee provided advice on numerous issues related to academic personnel. These include 13 ‘Change-of-Title’ actions, 9 Endowed Chair actions, 5 Third-Year Deferrals, 19 Five-Year Reviews, 7 Emeritus Status actions, and 3 reappointments as Department Chair. CAP also reviewed files for Chancellor's Fellows recommendations, evaluated 16 Initial Continuing Appointments for Lecturers, and assessed 16 faculty for satisfactory performance for the October 2011 merit-based salary increase. Of the 403 academic personnel actions that did not include appraisals, assessments, or TOE screenings, the Vice Provost—Academic Affairs disagreed with CAP 41 times (about 10%). For 21 of these, the Vice Provost approved cases on which CAP voted negatively. For three cases on which CAP voted positively and two on which CAP voted negatively, the Vice Provost’s decisions were different from the proposed actions. The Vice Provost also approved 14 out of 15 cases for which CAP had a split vote.

Overall, CAP and the FPCs together made negative recommendations in less than 13% of the cases. This reflects the high-quality research and teaching done by the vast majority of the faculty at UC Davis.

The agenda for CAP actions is determined by a priority list that treats appointments and tenure cases as high priorities and other actions variously less so (e.g., accelerations in the Above Scale ranks). Once an item is placed on the CAP agenda, the normal completion time was two weeks. Appendix A provides a summary of CAP’s deliberations by category for the past academic year. Eight actions were referred to ad hoc committees.

**Promotions:** For promotions to Associate Professor (77) and Professor (54), CAP recommended promotion in 98 of 131 cases. Overall, 17 cases were modified recommendations from what had been proposed. These included the following: eight merits to an overlapping step, one lateral promotion, two normal promotions instead of accelerated ones, two accelerated promotions, and two retroactive promotions. Four cases had a split CAP vote. Thus, CAP recommended no advancement in only 11 cases.
Accelerated Actions: Appendix B lists the cases for accelerations that came to CAP (accelerations involving a promotion, a merit increase to Professor, Step VI, and to Above Scale or within Above Scale, a merit increase for an FPC member, department chair or administrator, as well as all accelerations that entailed skipping a step at any level).

Faculty who received favorable recommendations for a multi-year acceleration generally had received some major recognition nationally or internationally, had superior scholarly achievements, and were excellent teachers and had meritorious service. At the upper levels of the professoriate the expectation of excellence in all areas grows with each step. In many cases where CAP did not recommend the full proposed acceleration, CAP instead recommended a smaller acceleration (e.g., a one-year retroactive acceleration instead of a two-year acceleration). CAP understands that pressure for multi-year accelerations is increasing, in part, due to pay cuts, furloughs and the absence of normal pay raises for several years. Salary and retention are beyond the current charge of CAP.

Advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV: Requests for advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV have been seen by CAP because for faculty promoted to Associate Professor, Step I, such a merit would typically involve more than six years at rank. In addition, even if a faculty member has spent six years at rank, a merit advance rather than promotion may be appropriate if, for example, a submitted book manuscript only requires minor revision before it would be considered “in press.” These advancements to an overlapping step are unusual in the Associate ranks.

As a collaboration between the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and CAP, 2012-13 will be the first year of a 2-year pilot program in which “regular” merits to Associate Professor, Step IV and V will be redelegated and therefore considered by the FPC’s and not CAP. To be redelegated as a “regular” merit under this pilot program, a proposed action must meet the following criteria: (1) the faculty member has been at rank for 4 years or less, (2) the faculty member moved into rank at Associate Professor, Step II or above, and (3) the faculty member has not had any deferrals in the Associate rank.

Retroactive Merit Actions: Retroactive merit actions may be requested by Deans and/or Faculty Personnel Committees. When a retroactive action is considered, the review period ends the year before the proposed merit date (e.g., for an action retroactive to July 1, 2011, the creative work/research publications are counted to December 31, 2010, and teaching/service until June 30, 2010). Thus, retroactive recommendations should specifically discuss the record for this review period and explain in detail why it supports the retroactive merit. CAP reviewed 4 retroactive requests and made favorable recommendations on 3.
Career Equity Reviews: Career Equity Reviews occur coincident with a merit or promotion action and only faculty who (1) have held an eligible title, and (2) have not been reviewed by CAP during the previous four academic years, can be considered for a career equity review. The purpose of career equity reviews is to address potential inequities at the point of hire and/or during a faculty member’s advancement. Career equity reviews consider the entire career record of the individual to determine if the current placement on the academic ladder is consistent with faculty at equal and higher rank and step. In 2011-12, CAP conducted two career equity reviews that were initiated at a lower level of review but did not support either of them. CAP also conducts such a career review whenever it reviews a file, i.e., for every major advancement.

Five-Year Reviews: CAP conducted 19 five-year reviews, recommending “no advancement, performance satisfactory” in 13 cases and recommending “no advancement, performance unsatisfactory” in 5 cases, with one split vote.

Assessment of Faculty for Acceptable Performance for Merit-Based Salary Increase: In order to determine eligibility for the 3% merit-based salary increase in October, 2011, Vice Provost Horwitz requested that CAP assess 16 faculty members who had been denied merit advancements in the past four years to determine whether their performance was satisfactory for their current levels (i.e., rank/step). CAP judged 12 faculty as having satisfactory performance and four as unsatisfactory.

TOE Screenings: CAP considered 7 cases for TOE screenings and approved five of them. For one of the negative cases, the appointment was approved by the Administration without a normal appointment dossier, i.e., with no extramural letters or teaching evaluations.

Initial Continuing Appointments for Lecturers: CAP reviewed and made recommendations on 16 initial continuing non-Senate appointments in 2011-12. Except for one split vote, all received favorable recommendations. Teaching excellence is the overriding requirement for a continuing appointment.

Accelerated Merits for Continuing Lecturers: CAP considers accelerated merit requests for Continuing Lecturers, whereas normal merit advancements are redelegated to the deans. In recommending accelerations (one or two steps beyond the normal two-step advancement), CAP looks for evidence of teaching accomplishments that go beyond teaching excellence, which is the minimum standard for normal advancement. Such evidence may come in the form of prestigious teaching awards or publication of books (and other creative works) that have substantial pedagogical impact. In 2011-12, CAP considered 4 such
requests and made a positive recommendation in one case and recommended normal merits for three cases.

**Ad Hoc Committees:** Review by an ad hoc committee may be required in cases of major advancements (promotions to the Associate Professor and full Professor rank, and merit advancements to Professor, Step VI and Above Scale) and for appointments with tenure. CAP’s membership reflects the variety of disciplines represented on campus and is guided by external reviewers’ evaluations, but the committee looks to campus ad hoc committees for highly specialized expertise. CAP proposed ad hoc committees in eight cases and thanks the faculty members who served on these committees for giving so generously of their time and for the high quality and objectivity of their evaluations and reports.

**Faculty Personnel Committees:** Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) of the colleges and schools advise deans on personnel actions redelegated to them (except, in most cases, first actions after a promotion or appointment). In 2011-2012, these actions included appointment of Assistant Professor, Steps I-III; most normal and accelerated merit actions that do not skip a step (up to and including Professor, Step IX, with the exception of merit increases to Professor, Step VI and Above Scale); most normal merit actions for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment; and Unit 18 actions (including appointments and reappointments of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers without Security of Employment). Information on FPC actions is reported in Appendix C.

CAP appoints the nine Faculty Personnel Committees of the Colleges and Schools based upon recommendations from Faculty Executive Committees. At the end of the academic year, CAP also performs post-factum audits of FPC actions and writes memos to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs summarizing those actions. CAP appreciates the dedicated effort and hard work of all FPC members.

**Other CAP Agenda Items:** CAP also gave opinions on 17 Requests for Consultation from the Academic Senate and six sets of voting procedures from departments or programs.

**Clarification of Appeals versus Reconsiderations:** There is information clarifying appeals versus reconsideration in the form of a flow chart, available at: [http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/documents/Senate-Chair-letter-and-flowchart-RE-CERJ-Advice-Merit-Appeal.pdf](http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/documents/Senate-Chair-letter-and-flowchart-RE-CERJ-Advice-Merit-Appeal.pdf). As described in the chart, appeals are applicable when the faculty member who wishes to appeal provides evidence of a personnel committee’s failure to apply established standards of merit or failure to follow established procedure. Reconsiderations are applicable when new information is supplied that is not the result of a
personnel committee’s failure to apply established standards of merit or procedure.

Consideration of Academic Collegiality in the Merit and Promotion Process: The Academic Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) has examined the question of whether an individual’s collegiality, or lack thereof, may be considered in merit and promotion actions. If collegiality becomes an issue in a personnel action, P&T asserted that the record forwarded should be particularly clear and factually well-supported. To that end, P&T recommended the following:

- “If non-collegiality is raised as an issue at the department level, the chair’s letter to the dean must be specific about the nature of the allegations and should document examples of non-collegiality so that the individual under review can understand the allegations and respond accordingly. Specificity and substantiation in the chair’s letter will help [reviewers] judge the merits of the allegation.

- If the departmental letter raises the issue of non-collegiality, the dean should fully explore and comment upon the allegations in [his/her] letter.” “Academic collegiality (or academic “citizenship” as it is sometimes called) is not a separate or additional area of performance for which the individual is to be evaluated but rather, falls within the context of the individual’s record of teaching, research, professional competence and activity, and University and public service.

Criteria of Scholarship: In 2002, CAP solicited criteria of scholarship documents from campus departments. The intent of these documents was to provide disciplinary context CAP could utilize during review of cases from the department. Thus the criteria can enhance the context already provided in the departmental letter. CAP received documents from some departments, but CAP does not approve such documents. They are viewed as a departmental document, and thus not within the jurisdiction of CAP. Departments are welcome to provide new or revised criteria of scholarship documents as they deem appropriate.

To ensure criteria of scholarship are considered at all levels during review, we suggest the following:

- Criteria of Scholarship are not a substitute for the APM and do not substitute for the peer review process. The criteria will be used to provide context to the review.
- The Criteria should be attached to the dossier, or at least referred to in the Department Chair letter. Doing so will call attention to their
appropriate use during review by the Faculty Personnel Committee, Dean’s Office and/or CAP.

- Departments that use a criteria of scholarship document should periodically review and (if appropriate) update them.

**University Committee On Academic Personnel (UCAP):**

Kyaw Tha Paw U served as CAP’s representative to the University Committee on Academic Personnel, which held several meetings throughout the academic year. The Office of the President, UCAP members, or other UC Academic Senate committees and officers bring issues to the attention of UCAP. A primary function of this systemwide committee is to facilitate the exchange of information among campuses. Accordingly, CAP was regularly informed of UCAP discussions and through its representative provided input into such discussions, when appropriate.

Particular items that were discussed this year by UCAP were proposed revisions to: APMs 010, 015, and 016, regarding freedom of speech on administrative issues for faculty, APM 210’s sections on credit given for diversity, and APM668, on negotiated salary plans. UCAP also discussed the UC Affirmative Action and Diversity Committee Equity Report, which presented information on substantial differences in faculty salaries when gender was taken into account, and the Faculty Salaries Task Force document on adjusting UC faculty salaries to reflect the compensation found at other comparable institutions. Issues about open access policies for UC faculty publications and publication venues, especially for ‘book’ disciplines where there has been a marked decrease in the ability to publish books related to a restructuring of traditional presses, were also considered. Finally, reports for each campus’s CAPs were compared and discussed.
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## APPENDIX A: CAP ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommended Positive</th>
<th>Modified Actions@</th>
<th>Recommended Negative</th>
<th>Split (4:4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments (84)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor (7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (11)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor (24)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Change in Title (13)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Continuing Non-Senate (16)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Chair Appointment/Reappointment (9)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair Reappointment (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Appointment (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotions (131)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (77)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor (53)*</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retroactive Promotion Professor (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merit Increases (170)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (35)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Step V to VI (41)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Step IX to Above Scale (20)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Above Scale (14)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Retroactive Actions (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Above Scale (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Merits (55)</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Actions (108)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Reviews (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus (7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOE Screenings (7)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisals (52)</td>
<td>27+</td>
<td>17~</td>
<td>7—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Reviews (19)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-Year Deferrals (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Assessed (16)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total = 493</strong></td>
<td>347</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One withdrew; **merit increases for FPC members, Deans, Assoc. Deans, and Dept. Chairs; +positive; ~guarded; -negative; ++advancement recommended; @modified actions are those CAP recommendations that differed from what was proposed, i.e., instead of a promotion a merit increase was recommended.
### APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF ACCELERATED ACTIONS
(not including retroactive merits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceleration Proposed</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Split</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-yr (55)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-yr (19)*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-yr (13)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-yr (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 was withdrawn

### APPENDIX C: REDELEGATED MERIT ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Div/School</th>
<th>FPC Recommendation</th>
<th>Dean’s Decision</th>
<th>Actions w/o FPC Input*</th>
<th>Accelerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HArCS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>309</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>288</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes first actions after promotion and redelegated cases reviewed by CAP.

** FPC recommended 1-yr acceleration instead of the 2-yr acceleration proposed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE OF AG. &amp; ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rachael Goodhue (A&amp;RE) - Chair</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Burger (Plant Sciences)</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Oteiza (Nutrition)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Adams (Animal Science)</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Silk (LAWR)</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khaled Abdel-Ghaffar (Elec. &amp; Computer Eng) - Chair</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Giles (Biol. &amp; Ag Eng)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieter Stroeve (Chem Eng &amp; Materials Sci)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhaojun Bai (Computer Sci)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Marcu (Biomedical Eng)</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Ginn (Civil &amp; Environ Eng)</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rida Farouki (Mechanical &amp; Aerospace Eng)</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE OF LETTERS &amp; SCIENCE</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanities, Arts &amp; Cultural Studies - HArCS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Shershow (English) - Chair</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Bauer (Music)</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Kaiser (Women’s Studies; Textile &amp; Clothing)</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Isbell (Anthropology)</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giulia Galli (Chemistry)</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Social Sciences - SS</strong></th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaoquim Silvestre (Economics) - Chair</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Isbell (Anthropology)</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeev Maoz (Political Science)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Kaiser (Women’s Studies; Textile &amp; Clothing)</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiangdong Zhu (Physics)</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mathematical & Physical Sciences - MPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motohico Mulase</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiangdong Zhu</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giulia Galli</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Bauer</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeev Maoz</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of Biological Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Chapman</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Burgess</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Dehesh</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Singer</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Grosberg</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate School of Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martine Quinzii</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chih-Ling Tsai</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Woodruff</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School of Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gail Goodman</td>
<td>2008-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Kurtz</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel Mendez</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Joo</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryken Grattet</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School of Medicine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Diercks</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Rocke</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kermit Carraway</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Cohen</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Luckhart</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal Fleming</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Pugh</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna Park</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Wolinsky</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF VETERINARY MEDICINE</td>
<td>TERM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruno Pypendop - Surgical &amp; Radiological Sci., Chair</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Stott - Pathology, Microbiology &amp; Immunology</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Anderson - CAHFS/PMI</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birgit Puschner - Molecular Biosciences</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Cowgill (Medicine &amp; Epidemiology)</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keith Widaman (Psychology) - Chair</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Gonzalez (Education)</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Timar (Education)</td>
<td>2007-2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E:

PRINCIPAL TASKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL – OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

1. Reviewing cases to ensure equity in the application of criteria for appointments, merits, and promotion actions.

2. Nominating faculty to serve on ad hoc committees which make recommendations for promotions, appointments, and upper level merit increases.

3. Reviewing the reports of ad hoc committees and independently evaluating the dossiers of the candidate under consideration.

4. Reviewing proposed skip-step accelerated merit increases, terminations, reconsiderations, third-year deferrals, five-year reviews, Chancellor Fellow and Endowed Chair appointments, and reappointments of department chairs.

5. Reviewing appraisals for mid-career assistant professors.

6. Reviewing merit actions for department chairs, program chairs, associate deans, members of Faculty Personnel Committees (and their near relatives) and other individuals for whom such action has not been redelegated to deans.

7. Appointing faculty to serve on Faculty Personnel Committees.

8. Reviewing policy matters referred by the administration and by the chair or committee of the Academic Senate, as well as initiating new policies and changes in existing policies when appropriate.

9. Conducting annual post-factum audits of the recommendations from the Faculty Personnel Committees.

10. Approving departmental voting procedures.

11. Reviewing requests for Target of Excellence and Partner Opportunity Program positions.

12. Conducting career equity reviews when requested by faculty or Deans.

13. Reviewing first continuing appointments for Unit 18 Lecturers and accelerated merits for continuing lecturers.
Committee on Academic Personnel, Appellate Subcommittee (CAPAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 7</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: upon receipt of appeal(s)</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: 2-3 hours per committee member per appeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total appeals reviewed: 32</td>
<td>Total of reviewed appeals deferred from the previous year: 10</td>
<td>Total appeals deferred to the coming academic year: 2 (not included in this report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None.

Issues considered by the committee: None.

**Committee’s narrative:**

The 2011-12 Committee on Academic Personnel, Appellate Subcommittee (CAPAC) received 32 actions on appeal during the academic year (Table 1) in response to requests from the Office of the Vice Provost – Academic Personnel (Table 2) and individual Dean’s offices (Table 3).

CAPAC recommended granting 15 of 30 appeals reviewed. Table 4 shows the Vice-Provost’s or Dean’s decisions on these appeals, in relation to CAPAC’s recommendations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Origin of Appeals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>College/School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agricultural &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Letters and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: CAPAC Recommendations to the Vice Provost – Academic Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decelerated Merit Advancement (1, 2, 3, 4 Yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merit (1, 2, 3, 4 Yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotion (1, 2, 3, 4 Yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Merit, Above Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merit, Above Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CER Appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment by Change in Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Year Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decelerated Merit Advancement (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merit (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotion (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Merit, Above Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Non-Senate Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two actions were returned to the previous review committee for reconsideration. Both actions did not come back to CAPAC on appeal. One action was a non-redelegated regular merit above scale that was denied after reconsideration. The other action was a non-redelegated accelerated merit above scale that was granted after reconsideration. CAPAC therefore reviewed 30 of the 32 actions that it received for review.

Respectfully submitted,

Bryce Falk, Chair
Jeannie Darby, Leslie Kurtz, Dean Simonton and Dennis Styne,
Bryan Rodman (Analyst, Academic Senate Office)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Non-Redel &amp; Redel</th>
<th>CAPAC Recommendation</th>
<th>FINAL DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># CASES</td>
<td>GRANT</td>
<td>DENY</td>
<td>GRANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decelerated Merit Advancement (1, 2, 3, 4 Yr)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merit (1, 2, 3, 4 Yr)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotion (1, 2, 3, 4 Yr)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Merit, Above Scale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merit, Above Scale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CER Appeals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment by Change in Series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Year Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Non-Senate Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Total Meetings – 3 in person meetings plus numerous email discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Reviewed - 17 (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)</th>
<th>Total of reviews deferred from the previous year - 0</th>
<th>Total deferred to the coming academic year - 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Listing of Bylaw changes proposed: None

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None

Issues considered by the committee

1) Prof. Michael Wilkes’ Academic Freedom Grievance
2) Proposed amendments to APM 010, 015, and 016 (twice)
3) Proposed boating safety PPM addition (twice)
4) Survey of Graduate Student understanding of academic freedom at UC Davis
5) Faculty concern over privacy of faculty emails
6) Proposed open access policy for UC research documents
7) Systemwide Review of the UC Observatories
8) Proposal to Disestablish the Department of Applied Science
9) Departmental Merger Proposal: Textiles/Clothing and Biological/Agricultural Engineering
10) PPM 200-45: Time Reporting System
11) Proposed Revision to Student Conduct Policies
12) UC Davis Athletics Strategic Audit 2011
13) Proposals to Establish New Minors: Biomedical Eng. and Computational Biology and Bioinformatics
14) Proposed Minor: Materials Science
15) Merger Proposal: Human & Community Development and Environmental Design
16) Systemwide Review: Area "d" Requirement
17) Proposed Revision: UCD APM 275 and 220I

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: 0

Committee’s narrative:
The committee met three times during the 2011-2012 academic year to conduct its investigation of the Prof. Wilkes grievance and otherwise conducted all business through email. Email was very effective for enabling us to address issues fast and with input from all members. The committee reviewed 17 different issues (two of those were reviewed twice). A comprehensive report about the Prof. Wilkes grievance was submitted to the Chair of the Academic Senate and acted upon by the representative assembly.

Gregory Pasternack, Chair
Members: Moradewun Adejunmobi, James Beaumont, Adela de la Torre, Jane-Ling Wang,
Eric Nelson - Graduate Student Representative
Solomon Bekele, Committee Analyst
### Committee on Admissions & Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 18</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: biweekly, 4-5 meetings per quarter</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: 2 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Listing of committee policies established or revised:
- New UC Davis holistic-review policy

### Issues considered by the committee:
- Holistic Review
- Non-Resident Admissions
- Admission by Exception

### Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
- Continued development of UC Davis holistic-review practices
Committee’s Charge

The Committee on Admissions & Enrollment (CAE) is a standing committee of the Academic Senate and its charge is the stewardship of the admissions process that includes selection of undergraduate students. The Academic Senate has authority (delegated to it by the Regents) to determine the conditions for undergraduate admission, what the degree requirements are, and what the curriculum should be.

Committee Narrative (2011-12)

CAE met 18 times during the 2011-12 academic year and considered issues pertinent to undergraduate admissions. The major focus of the committee during the year was holistic review, nonresident admission and admission by exception. Summaries of committee activities and new policies and procedures approved are provided on the ASIS CAE webserver for review.

Holistic Review:

CAE worked in conjunction with the office of Undergraduate Admissions (UA) to implement the new UC Davis holistic-review admissions policy that was adopted by the Davis Division of the Academic Senate on 6/3/11 [attached] – the HR Policy. Implementation of the HR Policy required the development and adoption of ancillary policies and procedures, in consultation with UA. These are described in detail in the attached meeting summaries and HR quantitative-assessment reports.

Non-Resident Admission

Because the University and the State of California face an era of severe budget constraints, increases in the enrollment of international and domestic non-resident students may become a partial solution to UC’s fiscal crisis, and discussions about appropriate levels of non-resident enrollment will likely continue in the context of a broader discussion about how to return the University to a sound fiscal basis. UC must seek a balance between fiscal concerns, its goal of enrolling a broad range of undergraduates, and its commitment to serving California residents, particularly its role as an engine of social mobility to lift the state economy and serve underrepresented populations who continue to grow in number and who desire and deserve access to UC. CAE discussed these issues and anticipates an increase in the enrollment of undergraduate non-residents who compare favorably with California residents admitted to UC Davis, in accordance with the Principles of Non-resident Enrollment authored by the UC Board of Admissions & Relations
with Schools (BOARS) and approved by the Academic Council of the Academic Senate of the University of California
(http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/RMA_MGYreBOARSresolutiononevalofresidents_non-residents_FINAL.pdf).

Admission by Exception

Considerable discussion about the policy and procedures for admission by exception (ABE), for student-athletes in particular, occurred. Guidance and feedback regarding ABE was provided to UA, the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and an academic-senate Special Committee on Athletics. The Davis division of the academic senate later endorsed the following recommendations concerning ABE that were proposed by the Special Committee.

1. At the end of each calendar quarter, UA will prepare a report on the cases of all ABE applicants (ICA and non-ICA) that have been evaluated by UA and accepted for admission (with redactions necessary for privacy). This will be sent to the Academic Senate for informational purposes and routed to the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment and the Undergraduate Council. The report should include identifiers of the source of the ABE the requests.

2. Policy and processes on the admissions of prospective student athletes who are likely UC eligible and "sponsored" by ICA should be established. The decisions to admit those applicants rest with UA, and those applicants should be held to the standards for admission, as assessed through holistic review, that are used for the general applicant pool.

3. In consideration of NCAA National Letter of Intent signing dates and accepting that some recruitment of student athletes falls outside of the fall term, appropriate measures of flexibility on the timing of UA evaluation of ICA sponsored applicants should be identified and approved by the Academic Senate (through its representative committees) after consultation with ICA and UA.

Respectfully submitted,

Ralph C. Aldredge, Chair
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment  
Friday, Sept 16, 2011  
1:00 pm – 3:00 pm

Present: R. Aldredge (Chair), O. Orgun, J. Sorensen, C. Bates,  
G. Butler, D. Hunter, W. Robinson

Not Present: N. Pan (sabbatical), L. J. Bossio, P. Burman

Introductions and Welcome: Chair Aldredge opened A&E’s first meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves. The new Director of Undergraduate Admissions, Walter Robinson, was in attendance at this meeting. It was indicated that A&E will meet with an average frequency of every two weeks and that the ASIS web server will be used extensively for communication, scheduling meetings and dissemination of materials (on the white board).

Meeting Agenda: The meeting agenda consisted of the items (a) through (f) listed on the welcome letter sent by Chair R. Aldredge to A&E members before the meeting. Discussions and actions pertaining to these items are summarized below.

   a. **Calibration Process:** for applicants with an HR score from another UC campus (e.g., UCLA), the translation of this HR score into an equivalent UCD HR score

   Simulations of a calibration process based on the bin-filling approach and one of the calibration ideas proposed by O. Orgun is underway. The simulation by UA-contracted analysts Elias Lopez and Donalynn Owfook will involve the translation of the UCLA HR scores of last-year’s UCD applicants into one of seven bins, each associated with a distinct range of UCD CR2 scores. The goal of the simulation is to demonstrate the implementation of a robust computational algorithm that can be later used with the actual calibration process, when UCD HR scores are known and would then replace the CR2-score ranges used in the simulation. The results of the simulation will be discussed as early as September 30, at our next A&E meeting.

   b. **Tie-breaking Process:** to be used in selecting applicants for admission once HR scores have been assigned

   Work on the design of the tie-breaking process for final selection of applicants will resume at an upcoming A&E meeting, with the expected assistance of simulation results demonstrating the outcomes associated with proposed tie-break evaluation criteria.

   c. **Number of Reads of Applications with UCLA HR Scores:** Two reads of applications from students whose HR scores from UCLA are expected to be 4
or 4.25 (instead of only one read): The concern is that UCD admission decisions might need to be delayed if we wait to receive each and every actual HR score from UCLA, to be later translated to a UCD HR score and averaged with the score from a single UCD HR read.

This proposal was approved by unanimous consent, with the understanding that the additional UCD HR reviews (as many as 7,500) would not overburden the UA staff and thereby diminish the overall quality and integrity of the HR review process.

d. Special Use of the Predicted Value (PV) Tool: for applicants with a predicted UCLA HR score that is not 4 or 4.25, it is proposed to use the translated HR score instead of reading the application to determine a UCD HR score when the actual UCLA HR score is later found to be either 4 or 4.25. The concern is that UCD admission decisions might otherwise be delayed due to the possible necessity of reading a large number of such applications toward the end of the admissions evaluation cycle.

This proposal was not approved. It was decided that UA should read as many of the applications as possible having actual UCLA HR scores of 4 or 4.25, until such a time as when continuing to do so would make it impossible to complete the HR evaluation and selection process on schedule.

After reviewing results of the UCB PV tool, it was decided also that the range of predicted UCLA HR Scores dictating additional HR evaluation at UC Davis will likely need to be adjusted/expanded (e.g., to 3.5-4.25) in order to reduce the number of applications with falsely predicted HR scores that must be later read (those with actual UCLA HR scores of 4 and 4.25).

e. Focused Supplemental Review (SR): Use focused supplemental-review (SR) questions, specifically requesting applicants to discuss challenges (e.g., disability), academic preparation, special talents, and leadership experiences rather than the more generic questions currently asked of students during UCLA’s SR evaluation. UA believes that this would insure the receipt of more useful information that could provide added value in evaluating applicants selected for supplemental review at UC Davis.

The SR questionnaire sent by UCLA to its applicants was distributed. A proposed personal-challenge questionnaire based on that used at UC Berkeley during their augmented-review process was also distributed, and the benefits and disadvantages of each were discussed. The UCB-based personal-challenge questionnaire was approved by the committee for use at UC Davis.

f. Use of the SR Score: As an outcome of the SR evaluation of an applicant, a new HR score should be determined by UC Davis HR Team Leaders that
would replace the applicant’s original HR score. A point for discussion regarding this suggestion by UA is the extent, if any, to which the original HR score should be used in determining the new SR-derived HR score.

No consensus was reached on this matter, which will therefore be further discussed at the next A&E meeting. The benefits of maintaining a record of an applicant’s original HR score assigned prior to supplemental review were pointed out: this would facilitate assessment of (i) the effect of SR on the likelihood of admission and (ii) the effectiveness of SR (based on subsequent academic performance at UC Davis) in identifying atypical, well qualified applicants who might have otherwise been denied admission.

There was discussion also about whether admission or denial of applicants having undergone supplemental review should be based on a ranking of these students (i) with all other applicants (both SR and non-SR) on the same common scale or (ii) with other SR applicants only. It was pointed out that separate, independent selection processes are used at UC Berkeley for their AR (augmented review) and non-AR applicant pools. There is sensitivity at UC Berkeley to the potential perception that the likelihood of admission might be greater for applicants having received AR, in comparison with those who had not. This perception might arise due to the fact that the original HR scores of AR-referred applicants are generally lower on average than those of the non-AR applicant pool, while the acceptance rates within the two separate applicant pools are similar.

There was brief discussion also about the extent, if any, to which the SR-derived score should be based on the results of the original HR reviews by readers prior to SR; or whether the SR-derived score should be based entirely on an independent review, perhaps emphasizing a set of selection criteria different from that upon which the original HR score was derived. Related to this issue is the question of whether or not there should be a limit on the extent of increase of the HR score as a result of supplemental review.

A&E’s next meeting is September 30, 2011.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment
Friday, Sept 30, 2011
1:00 pm – 3:00 pm


Not Present: N. Pan (sabbatical)

Overview: R. Aldredge asked for introductions for the benefit of the new members who were in attendance, Professor Prabir Burman and graduate-student James Addona. Chair Aldredge gave an overview about the charge of A&E and the adoption of holistic review (HR) at UC Davis. He highlighted the authority of the Academic Senate to determine the conditions for admission under Regent’s Standing Order 105.2(a) and A&E’s divisional role in advising on undergraduate admissions and enrollment. It was indicated that A&E will meet with an average frequency of every two weeks and that the ASIS web server will be used extensively for communication, scheduling meetings and dissemination of materials (on the white board).

Holistic review is a time-intensive process and collaboration among the UC campuses will be beneficial. Although the HR process at a given UC campus will generate HR scores peculiar to that campus, sharing of HR scores among campuses is encouraged by BOARS and is expected to reduce the overall HR workload. Currently, UCLA HR scores are used at both UCI and UCSD to reduce HR workload. At UC Davis, we plan also to use HR scores from UCLA, as well as HR scores from other campuses as they become available. However, we will calibrate scores received from other campuses with those assigned through our own HR process to ensure the most accurate interpretation of the scores received from a given partnering UC campus.

Meeting Summary: Discussions and actions pertaining to the agenda items (1) through (4) are summarized below.

1) **Calibration Process**: for applicants with an HR score from another UC campus (e.g., UCLA), the translation of this HR score into an equivalent UCD HR score

   Preliminary simulations of the calibration of UCLA HR scores, with fictitious UCD HR scores, have been completed. R. Aldredge and O. Orgun, with the assistance of Elias Lopez, will work toward finalizing the design and validation of the numerical algorithms that will be ultimately used to translate each UCLA HR score into an appropriate UCD HR score for a given

---

1 Regent’s Standing Order 105.2(a)

[http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/bylaws/so1052.html](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/bylaws/so1052.html)
applicant. Simulation results employing these algorithms will be presented at the next A&E meeting.

2) **Tie-breaking Process**: to be used in selecting applicants for admission once HR scores have been assigned

   Work on the design of the tie-breaking process for final selection of applicants will resume at an upcoming A&E meeting, with the expected assistance of simulation results demonstrating the outcomes associated with proposed tie-break evaluation criteria.

3) **Use of the SR Score**: As an outcome of the SR evaluation of an applicant, a new HR score should be determined by UC Davis HR Team Leaders that would be used in place of the applicant’s original HR score in determining admission or denial. Points of discussion included the following:

   a. Whether a record of the original HR score should be kept

      The benefits of maintaining a record of an applicant’s original HR score assigned prior to supplemental review were pointed out: this would facilitate assessment of (i) the effect of SR on the likelihood of admission and (ii) the effectiveness of SR (based on subsequent academic performance at UC Davis) in identifying atypical, well qualified applicants who might have otherwise been denied admission.

      *It was decided by unanimous consent of the faculty that a record will be kept of the original HR scores of all applicants receiving supplemental review.*

   b. The extent to which the supplemental-review (SR) evaluation should be either independent or based on the results of the original HR review

      There was discussion about the extent, if any, to which the SR-derived score should be based on the results of the original HR reviews by readers prior to SR; or whether the SR-derived score should be based entirely on an independent review, perhaps emphasizing a set of selection criteria different from that upon which the original HR score was derived. Related to this issue is the question of whether or not there should be a limit on the extent of increase of the HR score as a result of supplemental review.

      *It was decided by unanimous consent of the faculty that the SR-derived HR score will be based on an independent review of the applicant considering any requested supplemental information received from the applicant; with the understanding that the SR-derived score will convey an overall competitiveness of the applicant that is judged to be*
comparable with that of a student having the same HR score who did not receive supplemental review.

c. Whether admission or denial of applicants having received SR should be based a ranking of these students (i) with all other applicants (both SR and non-SR) on the same common scale or (ii) with other SR applicants only

It was pointed out that separate, independent selection processes are used at UC Berkeley for their AR (augmented review) and non-AR applicant pools. There is sensitivity at UC Berkeley to the potential perception that the likelihood of admission might be greater for applicants having received AR, in comparison with those who had not. This perception might arise due to the fact that the original HR scores of AR-referred applicants are generally lower on average than those of the non-AR applicant pool, while the acceptance rates within the two separate applicant pools are similar. Vigorous discussion highlighted uncertainty about the effect on diversity possibly associated with selection of all applicants on a common scale. The possibility that separate selection processes could contribute to disparity in the quality of the SR and non-SR admitted pools was also acknowledged.

It was decided by unanimous consent of the faculty that admission or denial of applicants having received SR will be based a ranking of these students with all other applicants (both SR and non-SR) on the same common scale. The SR-derived score will be used for ranking only if it is better than the original HR score received prior to supplemental review.

4) Non-resident Admissions:

R. Aldredge briefly shared results of a recent UCOP SAIR study of the extent to which undergraduate-admissions practices at UC campuses are consistent with BOARS’ revised principle regarding non-resident admissions: that “Non-resident domestic and international students admitted to a campus should compare favorably to California residents admitted at that campus.” Although admissions outcomes at UC Davis are consistent with the former BOARS principle regarding non-resident admissions, data presented in the UCOP report suggest that in recent years undergraduate-admissions outcomes at UC Davis have not been consistent with the new, revised BOARS principle that will take effect with the next admissions cycle, in evaluating applicants for fall 2012.

2 Former BOARS principle regarding non-resident admissions: Non-resident domestic and international students should demonstrate stronger admissions credentials than California resident students by generally being in the “upper half of those ordinarily eligible” as stated in the Master Plan.
Analyses and conclusions presented in the UCOP SAIR report will be discussed further at the next A&E meeting.

A&E’s next meeting is at 2:15 pm on October 21, 2011 at the Registrar Office Studio.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment  
Friday, October 21, 2011  
2:15 pm – 4:15 pm  

Members Present: R. Aldredge (Chair), P. Burman, O. Orgun, J. Sorensen, J. Addona (GSA Rep.), W. Robinson (Ex-Officio)  


Consultants Present: Brian Alexander, L. J. Bossio, Gillian Butler, Dar Hunter, Miguel Robinson  

Introductions & Updates  

Two consultants invited to attend the meeting were introduced. These were Brian Alexander, a program director in the Student Affairs Office of Technology, and Miguel Robinson, who is beginning his new appointment as a senior analyst with UA on 10/24/11.  

Dar Hunter summarized progress made by UA toward implementation of holistic review at UC Davis. Selection and hiring of external readers is underway, with reader training scheduled for Nov. 29 and 30 and the reading of actual applicant files beginning immediately thereafter.  

R. Aldredge summarized the essence of HR at UC Davis and its nuances in relation to versions implemented recently at UCI and UCSD. In particular, UCLA HR scores are used at UCI and UCSD to reduce HR workload. While UCD plans to also use HR scores from UCLA, and those from other campuses as they become available, we will calibrate scores received with those assigned through our own HR process to ensure the most accurate interpretation of scores received from partnering UC campuses.  

Meeting Summary  

1) Calibration: determination of the specific range of adjacent UCD score bins appropriate for possible assignment of applicants with a given UCLA HR score  

Simulations of the calibration of UCLA HR scores with UCD CR1 & CR2 score bins (serving as fictitious UCD HR scores) were completed independently by R. Aldredge and O. Orgun with 2011 admissions data provided by Elias Lopez and Donna Owfook. The simulation results presented (Tables 2A & 2B of the Appendix) demonstrate the self-consistent translation of UCLA HR scores to UCD score bins; that is, determination of the range of adjacent UCD bins appropriate for possible assignment of an applicant with a UCLA HR score, while preserving that applicant’s rank upon assignment relative to other applicants whose UCLA HR scores are also translated. Self-consistent translation was possible for only about 50% of applicants with UCLA HR scores...
scores when the entire pool (26,609) of these applicants was considered. It is believed that the rate of self-consistent translation will be higher when translating UCLA HR scores to actual UCD HR scores (when available), instead of CR1 or CR2 score bins, due to the similarity between the UCD and UCLA HR processes (which should rank applicants in a qualitatively similar manner). A calibration of the UCLA HR scores of applicants with their UCB HR scores (for applicants with both) can be performed to test this hypothesis.

O. Orgun investigated the effect of the calibration sample size, the number of applicants having both a UCLA HR score and either a UCD CR1 or CR2 score (the fictitious UCD HR score) that were considered, on the rate of self-consistent translation. Based on the results of his simulations, it is believed that a calibration sample size of 1,000 will be sufficiently large for reproducible mapping of UCLA HR scores onto UCD HR score bins, for different randomly selected sample groups.

2) Bin Filling (aka mini-tiebreaking): determination of the specific UCD score bin to which a given applicant’s UCLA HR score corresponds, among the range of allowable adjacent UCD score bins determined during calibration to ensure self-consistent translation. Note that the bin-filling process occurs after essentially all of the applicants without external HR scores to be translated have been evaluated by UCD readers and assigned to UCD HR score bins.

O. Orgun completed simulations of the bin-filling process using an algorithm that he developed. This algorithm ascribes a quantitative measure of incompatibility (aka “badness”) to each allowable potential UCD bin assignment for a specific applicant (A) with a given UCLA HR score. To determine the amount of incompatibility, each applicant (B) without a UCLA HR score who is already in one of the allowable assignment bins (as result of UCD HR) is first ranked relative to all other type-B applicants in the allowable potential assignment bins. The metric used for ranking could be, for example, a CR1 score or predicted UCLA HR score derived for each applicant B. Next, the rank of applicant A relative to all type-B applicants is determined using the same metric. The amount of incompatibility associated with the assignment of applicant A to a particular potential UCD bin (F) is then defined as the sum of (a) the total number of type-B applicants in all allowable assignment bins below bin F who rank higher than applicant A and (b) the total number of type-B applicants in all allowable assignment bins above bin F who rank lower than applicant A. The most appropriate UCD bin assignment for applicant A is the one resulting in the smallest amount of incompatibility, as defined above.

Results of the bin-filling simulations show non-uniformity in the distribution of applicants with UCLA HR scores among the UCD bins to which they are assigned (c.f., Table 2C of the Appendix). Specifically,
substantially more applicants are assigned to the lowest and highest UCD score bins than to the middle of the allowable range of assignment bins. This non-uniformity is consistent with the lack of a strong correlation between UCLA HR scores with either CR1 or CR2 scores, resulting in wide ranges of CR1 and CR2 scores for applicants within any given UCLA HR score bin (as exhibited in Table 2A). Since the bin-filling process forces all applicants with a given UCLA HR score into a narrow range of allowable UCD bins, it is then natural that most of the applicants originally in UCD bins outside of the allowable bin range will be forced into the lowest and highest allowable UCD bins, which are closer to the original bin locations than are the middle allowable bins.

It is believed that the distribution of applicants with UCLA HR scores among the UCD bins to which they are assigned will be more uniform when translating UCLA HR scores to actual UCD HR scores (when available), instead of CR1 or CR2 score bins, due to the similarity between the UCD and UCLA HR processes (which should rank applicants in a qualitatively similar manner). To test of this hypothesis, a calibration of the UCLA HR scores of applicants with their UCB HR scores (for applicants with both) can be performed, followed by a bin-filling simulation in which these applicants are assigned to bins originally containing either (a) applicants having UCLA HR scores but not UCB HR scores or (b) applicants having UCB HR scores but not UCLA HR scores.

3) **Tie-breaking Process**: to be used in selecting applicants for admission once HR scores have been assigned

Work on the design of the tie-breaking process for final selection of applicants will resume at an upcoming A&E meeting, with the expected assistance of simulation results demonstrating the outcomes associated with proposed tie-break evaluation criteria.

4) **Quality Control**

The specification and elaboration of “quality control” procedures at the end of the UCD HR process was suggested. These might include a “by-high-school” review, in which senior readers view an array of quantifiable academic data from applicants from the same high school to either validate decisions or identify apparent anomalies, as well as considerations to ensure complete review of applications from members of approved Native-American tribal affiliations.

Dar Hunter will present the details of components proposed for our quality-review process as well as a description of our supplemental review process at the next A&E meeting.
5) **Non-resident Admissions:**

At the A&E meeting on 9/30/11, R. Aldredge briefly shared results of a recent UCOP SAIR study of the extent to which undergraduate-admissions practices at UC campuses are consistent with BOARS’ revised principle regarding non-resident admissions: that “Non-resident domestic and international students admitted to a campus should compare favorably to California residents admitted at that campus.” Although admissions outcomes at UC Davis are consistent with the former BOARS principle regarding non-resident admissions\(^1\), data presented in the UCOP report suggest that in recent years undergraduate-admissions outcomes at UC Davis have not been consistent with the new, revised BOARS principle that will take effect with the next admissions cycle, in evaluating applicants for fall 2012.

This agenda item was not addressed at the meeting on 10/21/11. Analyses and conclusions presented in the UCOP SAIR report will be discussed further at the next A&E meeting, on 10/28/11.

A&E’s next meeting is at 2:15 pm on October 28 in 410 Mrak Hall.

---

\(^1\) Former BOARS principle regarding non-resident admissions: *Non-resident domestic and international students should demonstrate stronger admissions credentials than California resident students by generally being in the “upper half of those ordinarily eligible” as stated in the Master Plan.*
APPENDIX

Calibration & Bin-filling Results: Translating 26,609 UCLA HR scores into Equivalent UCD CR2 score bins, initially containing 19,206 applicants Without UCLA HR scores (tie-breaking via CR1-score ranking)
### TABLE 2A: All Applicants with both UCD CR2 and UCLA HR Scores (26,609)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin No.</th>
<th>UCLA HR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5.5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6.5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>UCLA Dist</th>
<th>Cum Dist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>2% 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>2% 4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>5% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>5% 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2135</td>
<td>8% 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>7% 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2734</td>
<td>10% 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>2744</td>
<td>10% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>4737</td>
<td>18% 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>2940</td>
<td>11% 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>3384</td>
<td>13% 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td>4% 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>1094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total in UCD Bins**: 2997 1671 1029 1653 1340 1320 1298 1312 1326 1336 1343 3000 6984 26609

**UCD Bin Dist**: 11% 6% 3.9% 6% 5.0% 4.9% 4.9% 5% 11% 22% 5% 11% 100%

**Cum Dist**: 11% 18% 21% 28% 33% 38% 42% 47% 52% 62% 74% 100%

### TABLE 2B: Calibration of all UCLA HR Scores (26,609) -- Mapping onto UCD CR2 Bins (48% conversion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin No.</th>
<th>UCLA HR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5.5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6.5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>UCLA Dist</th>
<th>Cum Dist % Calib</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Calibrated Distribution**: 2483 358 180 536 200 430 257 243 445 257 644 1560 5285 12878

**Cum Dist**: 19% 3% 1.4% 4% 1.6% 3% 2.0% 1.9% 3% 2.0% 5% 12% 41% 100%

**% Calib by CR2 Bin**: 83% 21% 17% 32% 15% 33% 20% 19% 34% 19% 48% 52% 76% 48%
TABLE 2C: UCLA (26,609) filling CR2 Bins initially with UCD only applicants (19,206) via Tiebreaking with CR1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin No.</th>
<th>UCLA HR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5.5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6.5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Cum Dist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2135</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2734</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2744</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4737</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2579</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3384</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Mapped: 5083
Mapping Dist: 19%
Cum Dist: 19%

Original UCD Only: 2112
Original Dist: 11%
Cum Dist: 11%

UCD Only + UCLA Mapped: 7195
Mapped Percent of Total: 77%
Score Dist after Mapping: 16%
Cum Dist after Mapping: 16%
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Committee on Admissions and Enrollment
Friday, October 28, 2011
2:15 pm – 4:15 pm


Members Not Present:  N. Pan (sabbatical), W. Robinson (Ex-Officio)

Consultants Present:  Gillian Butler, Dar Hunter, Miguel Robinson

Overview

At the meeting we discussed the calibration and bin-filling components of the process to convert each UCLA and UCI HR score into an appropriate UCD HR score, to allow the fairest comparison of applications receiving HR review at UCD with those receiving HR at another campus and not reviewed at UCD. We also discussed our need for an HR predictive-value (PV) tool for predicting UCLA HR scores, so that it can be decided when an application is received if it is likely to receive an HR score of 4 or 4.25 from UCLA or UCI and should therefore receive HR at UCD. Other topics discussed at the meeting include the tie-breaking process to be used in selecting applicants for admission and comparability of resident and non-resident applicants. Details are provided below.

Meeting Details

1) Calibration & Bin-filling:

Please refer to the attachment for a detailed discussion by R. Aldredge and O. Orgun of the results of calibration and bin-filling simulations performed to demonstrate the implementation and usefulness of these components of the new UCD HR process.

2) Tie-breaking Process: to be used in selecting applicants for admission once HR scores have been assigned

There was brief discussion of the tie-breaking component of the selection process. R. Aldredge indicated that socio-economic factors are used at UCI and UCSD for tie-breaking, each applied separately and in a hierarchical manner to distinguish applicants deemed acceptable for admission from others with the same HR score (without further reading of application files). The tie-breaking process at UC Davis will also be algorithmic and not involve any further reading of application files. However, our process should involve a combination of multiple criteria (possibly including ELC status and other socio-economic factors, as yet to be determined), which were not heavily considered during prior review.
Work on the design of our tie-breaking process for final selection of applicants will resume at an upcoming A&E meeting, with the expected assistance of simulation results demonstrating the outcomes associated with proposed tie-break evaluation criteria.

3) Predictive Value (PV) Tool

There was discussion about use of an algorithm expected from UCOP for predicting the UCLA HR score of each applicant to UC Davis who has also applied to UCLA. The predicted UCLA HR score would determine whether or not the applicant’s file is read at UC Davis or whether the applicant’s score is converted into a UCD HR score through our algorithmic calibration and bin-filling process, in cases where the UCLA HR score is not known at the time that the application is received by UC Davis. We have decided to read all applications with UCLA HR scores of 4 and 4.25 and to convert the UCLA HR scores into a UCD HR score in all other cases.

Earlier, R. Aldredge and Dar Hunter discussed development of the PV tool with Tongshen Chang at UCOP. Dr. Chang indicated that he would provide us with a PV formula employing applicant data available at UC Davis. Three versions of the PV formula will be provided (for CA residents, domestic non-residents and international applicants), each one developed as the best fit of actual UCLA HR scores with a collection of applicant attributes pertinent to HR review. Once it is obtained from UCOP, UA analysts will use the PV formula to compare predicted and actual UCLA HR scores of all of last-year’s applicants to UC Davis as, as a verification test, before implementing it for use during the current admissions cycle.

4) Quality Control

There wasn’t sufficient time to discuss this topic. Dar Hunter will present the details of components proposed for our quality-review process as well as a description of our supplemental review process at the next A&E meeting.

5) Non-resident Admissions:

R. Aldredge shared results of a recent UCOP SAIR study of the extent to which undergraduate-admissions practices at UC campuses are consistent with BOARS’ revised principle regarding non-resident admissions: that “Non-resident domestic and international students admitted to a campus should compare favorably to California residents admitted at that campus.” Although admissions outcomes at UC Davis may have been consistent with the former BOARS principle regarding non-resident admissions¹, data presented in the

¹ Former BOARS principle regarding non-resident admissions: Non-resident domestic and international students should demonstrate stronger admissions credentials than California resident
UCOP report suggest that in recent years undergraduate-admissions outcomes at UC Davis have not been consistent with the new, revised BOARS principle that takes effect with the current admissions cycle, in evaluating applicants for fall 2012.

Data in the UCOP report suggests that lower standards for admission were used to select non-residents than those used for selection of residents. This possibility is consistent with the fact during the past admissions cycle, non-residents were compared only with other non-resident applicants and others receiving augmented review in determining admissibility, rather than with the larger pool including the vast majority of CA residents. This practice will be precluded during the current admissions cycle by the requirement of the new UCD HR policy that all applicants, both resident and non-resident, be compared together on the same ranking scale in selecting for admission.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment
Friday, November 18, 2011
2:15 pm – 4:15 pm


Members Not Present: P. Burman, N. Pan (sabbatical), J. Sorensen,

Consultants Present: Gillian Butler, Dar Hunter, Miguel Robinson

Overview

At the meeting we received an update on the planning of HR-training activities and discussed a proposal for a new transfer-student selection process developed by BOARS for comment as well as the results of computational simulations of the algorithmic conversion of UCLA HR scores. Details are provided below.

Meeting Details

HR Training Update:

The admissions office is making good progress and has prepared a manual for readers, which is ready to go to print. Training of readers is scheduled for November 29 and 30. Each reader will be given feedback on their reviews of five files, given basic reviewing and scoring guidelines, then an additional ten applications to read for further training. Norming is planned for December 6th. At this time, there are 68 external readers and 44 staff readers (26.5 FTE). The cost of reading one application is estimated to be $2.75. Evaluation and scoring of applicants by readers will be performed remotely and transmitted electronically using software developed at UC Davis, from December 12 through January 31. About 53,000 applications are expected.

BOARS Transfer Admissions Proposal:

The committee discussed a proposal for a new transfer-admissions policy developed by BOARS for comment. A description of the new policy was made available on the whiteboard for review and comments were solicited from A&E by November 21. A summary of the comments and opinions regarding the proposal is provided as an attachment to these minutes. It was submitted to the Executive Council by the deadline stipulated.

Computational Simulation of Calibration & Bin-filling:

Please refer to the attachment for a detailed discussion by R. Aldredge and O. Orgun of the results of calibration and bin-filling simulations performed to demonstrate the implementation and usefulness of these components of the new UCD HR process.
Here is a summary of the comments and concerns about the transfer proposal expressed at the A&E meeting on Friday, November 18.

1. Selecting students most likely to graduate in two years would seem to represent a new objective of the transfer admissions process.

2. Although the proposal states that no applicant would be guaranteed admission under the new policy, it seems that applicants would be given the impression of a strong likelihood of admission if major-preparation requirements are met and that there would therefore be an implied guarantee of admission for some.

3. The proposal offers the potential of bridging the resource gap between 4-year institutions and CCs. This is a positive attribute of the proposal.

4. There is concern about whether faculty involvement would be sufficient for development of the UC Transfer Curricula

5. Emphasis on major prep may be problematic with declining course availability at CCs (resulting potentially in fewer who are deemed qualified to transfer)
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment
Friday, December 2, 2011
2:15 pm – 4:15 pm

Members Present: R. Aldredge (Chair), O. Orgun, J. Sorensen, J. Addona (GSA Rep.), W. Robinson (Ex-Officio)


Consultants Present: Lora Jo Bossio, Dar Hunter, Miguel Robinson

At the meeting we received updates on (a) the HR-training activities currently underway, (b) the numbers of applications received so far and (c) the operational implementation of HR algorithms for predicting UCLA HR scores and converting actual UCLA HR scores into UCD HR scores. R. Aldredge presented the draft of a new BOARS resolution regarding comparability of CA-resident and non-resident admits for discussion and feedback. We also discussed ideas for the tie-breaking process to be used for final selection of applicants for admission.

HR Training Update

Dar Hunter provided an update on HR training activities currently underway. Two separate reader-orientation sessions were held on campus earlier in the week, on November 29 and 30. There were many individuals from a variety of geographical, professional and ethnic backgrounds who all seemed passionate about their potential roles as readers in our HR process. As training continues, each prospective reader will have to meet norming targets to demonstrate adequate proficiency before designation as an official reader. Actual applications will be read beginning on December 12. Dar was commended at the meeting on her excellent work in structuring and organizing an excellent reader training program.

Applications for Admission

Walter Robinson shared preliminary data regarding the number of applications received for freshman and transfer admission, indicating a slight increase in the number of CA-resident applicants and substantial increases in both domestic-resident and international applicants for freshman admission over last year. There appears to have been a slight decrease in the overall number of transfer applicants over last year. Walter emphasized that the data is preliminary at this point and is subject to revision.

Operational Implementation of HR Algorithms

R. Aldredge provided an update on progress toward operational implementation of HR algorithms that have been developed. These include (a) formulas for predicting UCLA HR scores developed by Tongshan Chang and Erika Jackson at UCOP using multi-variable regression analysis of all UCLA HR scores assigned last
year and (b) algorithms and software codes developed by R. Aldredge and O. Orhan for converting UCLA HR scores into UCD HR scores.

**Predicting UCLA HR scores**

Consistent with UCD HR policy, all applications with actual UCLA HR scores of either 4 or 4.25 will be read this year, regardless of when the actual UCLA HR score becomes known. Accurate prediction of UCLA HR scores is necessary to ensure that the number of applications with UCLA HR scores that are read locally is not substantially greater than the number of applications with actual UCLA HR scores of 4 or 4.25, and thereby minimize reader workload. This will also minimize the fraction of applications with UCLA HR scores that need to be read toward or after the end of the scheduled reading time frame, as the actual UCLA HR scores become available. The attached document prepared by R. Aldredge summarizes progress made toward implementation of formulas provided recently by UCOP for predicting UCLA HR scores, including analysis to determine the range of UCLA predictive-value (PV) scores that should trigger local evaluation at UC Davis, consistent with local HR policy.

Three separate PV formulas were provided by UCOP, one for each of the following three groups of applicants who applied to UCLA last year: (i) CA residents, (ii) domestic residents and (iii) international applicants. It is expected that these formulas will be operationally implemented by Brian Alexander of UA on the same software platform (Cold Fusion) used for managing and processing applications, as they are received. In this way, the PV score of an applicant to UC Davis who also applied to UCLA can be determined immediately upon receipt of the application, which can then be immediately tagged for local HR review if warranted, without the need for human processing prior to HR review.

**Converting UCLA HR Scores into UCD HR Scores**

Descriptions of the algorithms and the results of simulations demonstrating their implementation were presented at past A&E meetings and are provided in a comprehensive report entitled “Converting UCLA HR Scores into UCD HR Scores (Algorithms & Simulation Results)” available on the ASIS A&E whiteboard. It is expected that these algorithms will be operationally implemented by Brian Alexander on the same software platform (Cold Fusion) used for managing and processing applications as they are received. At the end of our HR reading process, UCLA HR scores can be then automatically calibrated with UCD HR scores, and the UCLA HR score of each applicant can be then automatically converted into a unique UCD HR score, without the need for human intervention.

**New BOARS proposal regarding non-resident comparability**

A draft of a new BOARS proposal regarding comparability of non-resident applicants was discussed. The new proposal, as currently written, would reaffirm BOARS’ commitment to ensuring that non-resident applicants admitted at each UC
campus compare favorably with admitted CA residents at the same campus and require use of the same evaluation criteria and admission cut-offs for residents and non-residents at each campus, to the fullest extent possible. It would also require campuses to report to BOARS annually demonstrating the favorable comparability of their non-resident admits.

There were several comments about the proposal, including an opinion that we need to be more aggressive in admitting non-residents because of their lower enrollment yield rates, in comparison with those for residents. The need to assess the relative academic performance of the two groups after enrollment to confirm the effectiveness of admissions policies and selection decisions was also expressed. BOARS will discuss the proposal and adopt it with any revisions after its meeting with President Yudoff on 12/9/11.

**Tie-breaking for final selection of applicants for admission**

Ideas for tie-breaking for final selection of applicants for admission were discussed. The hierarchical single-criterion tie-breaking method in use at UCI and UCSD were reviewed. The committee was reminded that the UCD HR policy requires consideration of a set of multiple criteria. One idea proposed by Walter Robinson that garnered some interest was the selection of applicants meeting the largest set of criteria (based primarily on socio-economic factors) deemed by A&E to be most important. This idea will be explored further with the assistance of Miguel Robinson, who will perform analysis to examine the effect of different tie-breaking criteria sets on the characteristics of the admitted applicant pool using last-year’s admissions data.
Background

Consistent with UCD HR policy, all applications with actual UCLA HR scores of either 4 or 4.25 will be read this year, regardless of when the actual UCLA HR score becomes known. Accurate prediction of UCLA HR scores is therefore necessary to ensure that the number of applications with UCLA HR scores that are read locally is not substantially greater than the number of applications with actual UCLA HR scores of 4 or 4.25, so that reader workload can be minimized. Accurate prediction of UCLA HR scores will also minimize the fraction of applications with mis-predicted UCLA HR scores that need to be read near or after the end of the regularly scheduled reading time frame, as the actual UCLA HR scores become available.

Tongshan Chang and Erika Jackson at UCOP provided UA with separate formulas for predicting the UCLA HR scores of applicants in each of three separate applicant groups, (i) CA residents, (ii) domestic residents and (iii) international applicants. Each formula consists of a single polynomial expression: the sum of the quantitative measures of a wide range of applicant characteristics considered in the UCLA HR process, each multiplied (weighted) by an appropriate coefficient. The appropriate set of regression coefficients was determined for each applicant group from multi-variable regression analysis of the HR scores of all applicants to UCLA last year in the respective applicant group. Also provided by UCOP were correlation tables for each of the applicant groups showing the number of applicants receiving each possible combination of predicted value (PV) and actual HR score. Using the UCOP data, Miguel Robinson and Donalynn Owfook created a table showing the correlation between the PV and actual HR scores of last-year’s CA-resident applicants to UC Davis who also applied to UCLA (a subset of the group of all CA-resident applicants to UCLA).

The range of PV scores that will trigger a local HR read

The correlation between the PV and actual HR scores of last-year’s CA-resident applicants to UC Davis who also applied to UCLA prepared by Miguel and Donalynn was analyzed by R. Aldredge. The goal was to determine the optimal range of PV scores that should trigger a local read of applications for which we expect to receive a UCLA HR score (likely unknown when the application is received). The results of the analysis are presented in the attached charts, as Options A, B & C. Option A involves locally reading all applications to UC Davis from applicants who also applied to UCLA and have a PV between 4 and 4.25 (inclusive). Options B and C expand the group of locally read applicants to include PV ranges of 3.5-4.25 and 3-4.25, respectively. There were a total of 6,972 applications to UC Davis last year from students who received an HR score from
UCLA of either 4 or 4.25. The two columns of the correlation table that show the distribution of PV scores for these applicants is highlighted in grey on all of the attached charts.

In Option A, a total of 6,149 applications would be read, those having a PV between 4 and 4.25. The two rows of the correlation table that show the distribution of actual HR scores for these applicants are highlighted in grey. As highlighted in red, only 3,660 of the total number of applications with actual HR scores of 4 or 4.25 (6,972) would be read (52% of the total). The rest (3,312 or 48% of the total) would still need to be read, possibly near or after the end of the regularly scheduled reading time frame, as the actual UCLA HR scores become available.

In Option B, a total of 10,857 applications would be read, those having a PV between 3.5 and 4.25. The three rows of the correlation table that show the distribution of actual HR scores for these applicants are highlighted in grey. As highlighted in red, 5,781 of the total number of applications with actual HR scores of 4 or 4.25 (6,972) would be read (83% of the total). A remainder of 17% would still need to be read in this case. However, 3,885 extra applications (having actual UCLA scores of less than 4 or greater than 4.25) would have been read as well during the process.

In Option C, a total of 13,799 applications would be read, those having a PV between 3 and 4.25. The four rows of the correlation table that show the distribution of actual HR scores for these applicants are highlighted in grey. As highlighted in red, 6,209 of the total number of applications with actual HR scores of 4 or 4.25 (6,972) would be read (89% of the total). A remainder of 11% of the total would still need to be read in this case. However, 6,827 extra applications (having actual UCLA scores of less than 4 or greater than 4.25) would have been read as well during the process.

The following table summarizes the results of the analysis discussed above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>PV Range</th>
<th>Apps Read</th>
<th>Apps Read w/ 4–4.25 HR</th>
<th>% of all Apps w/ 4–4.25 HR</th>
<th>Extra Apps Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4 – 4.25</td>
<td>6,149</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.5 – 4.25</td>
<td>10,857</td>
<td>5,781</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>3,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3 – 4.25</td>
<td>13,799</td>
<td>6,209</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>6,827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these results, the optimal range of PV scores that should trigger a local read of applications for which we expect to receive UCLA HR scores would seem to be between 3.5 and 4.25 (Option B). This would result in a local read of 83% of the total number of applications having actual UCLA HR scores of either 4 or 4.25, while significantly minimizing the number of extra applications that have scores outside of this range that would be also read in the process.

Notes:
1. The analysis above is based on application of the UCOP PV formula that was optimized for last-year’s CA residents. The accuracy of this formula in predicting the actual UCLA HR scores of this year’s applicants is unknown but expected to be similar to that reflected in the cross-calibration table discussed above, assuming that HR practice and outcomes at UCLA will be substantially similar to those of last year. In addition, it is assumed that comparable accuracy of the PV formulas will result when they are used to predict the HR scores of applicants to UC Davis who also applied to UC Irvine but not UCLA because of the similarity of the HR processes at UC Irvine and UCLA. When these additional applications from UC Irvine are considered, the overall number of applications that are tagged for local evaluation may become less than that indicated in the table above, although the percentages in the fifth column would be expected to be similar.

2. Analyses of the correlation between PV and actual HR scores for non-resident domestic and international applicants to UC Davis who also applied to UCLA, similar to that presented above, should also be performed in order to determine the optimal ranges of PV scores that should trigger a local read of applications from each of these groups. Absent the results of such analyses, the use of the same range of PV scores for these groups as that used for CA residents should be acceptable, given the relatively small numbers of non-resident applicants.

3. It is expected that UCOP will create PV formulas for use by UC Davis each year based on multivariable-regression analysis of actual HR scores assigned at UCLA during the most recent admissions cycle. However, the analysis presented above should be completed by UA at UC Davis each year based on updated PV formulas received from UCOP in order to evaluate their effectiveness and determine the optimal ranges of PV scores that will trigger local reads. This will be especially important as we begin to make use of HR scores from additional campuses other than UCLA in the future and perhaps begin also to focus on different and/or reduced ranges of externally-derived HR scores for further, local evaluation.

4. It would be prudent to take full advantage of UCOP assistance in providing PV formulas annually for prediction of HR scores assigned at UCLA (and eventually other campuses) and to focus our efforts on assessing the effectiveness of the local application of the PV formulas, as described above. The analysis presented above illustrates the importance of the accuracy of the PV formulas as well as the procedures and metrics used for measuring their effectiveness in reducing reader workload. Practicable assessments of the accuracy and effectiveness of any new PV formulas (such as the assessment measures defined in the table presented above) should be performed annually.

5. It would be worthwhile for UA to develop local PV formulas based on regression analysis of UCD HR scores, when available, to enable the
prediction of the UCD HR scores. These formulas would be potentially useful in our algorithmic process of converting HR scores received from other campuses into UCD HR scores; this process is described in detail in the document entitled “Converting UCLA HR Scores into UCD HR Scores (Algorithms & Simulation Results),” which is available on the ASIS A&E committee whiteboard. The UCD PV formulas might also be of interest to other UC campuses who might wish to use HR scores assigned at UC Davis to reduce reader workload, in order to identify a subset for further local review prior to receiving actual HR scores from UC Davis.
**OPTION A: Reading all apps with PVs between 4 and 4.25 (inclusive)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PV</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.25</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>2.75</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.25</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>4.75</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
<td>1295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>2452</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>4257</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>3088</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>24105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6,149 Apps Read with 4 - 4.25 PV**

**3,660 Apps Read with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR (52% of the total)**

**6,972 Total Apps with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR**

6,972 Total Apps with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR
## OPTION B Reading all apps with PVs between 3.5 and 4.25 (inclusive)

### Actual UCLA HR Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PV</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.25</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>2.75</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.25</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>4.75</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>2452</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>4257</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>3088</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>24105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total Apps Read with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR (83% of the total):** 6,972
- **Total Apps Read with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR (those with Actual HR not 4 or 4.25):** 3,885
- **Total Apps Read with 3.5 - 4.25 PV:** 10,857

---
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### OPTION C: Reading all apps with PVs between 3 and 4.25 (inclusive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PV</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.25</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>2.75</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.25</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>4.75</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>2452</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>4257</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>3088</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>24105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actual UCLA HR Score**

- **6,209 Apps Read with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR (89% of the total)**
- **6,972 Total Apps with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR**
- **6,827 Extra Apps Read (those with Actual HR not 4 or 4.25)**

**13,799 Apps Read with 3 - 4.25 PV**
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment  
Friday, Dec. 16, 2011  
2:15 pm – 4:15 pm  
Registrar Office Studio

Present:  R. Aldredge, Chair, O. Orgun, D. Hunter, G. Butler  
L. J. Bossio, J. Sorensen, M. Robinson, W. Robinson,

Not Present:  N. Pan (sabbatical), P. Burman, J. Addona, C. Bates

Admissions Update:  W. Robinson reported that applications were being received and reading of those applications by UA has begun. He announced that the certification process for the readers was successful and that UA now has well trained readers. Eighty-eight readers have been certified to date; this figure rises to a total of ninety-two readers when combined with the in-house readers. It was also announced that a UC Davis recruiter based in Hong Kong is providing the campus a global reach.

R. Aldredge asked for clarification as to why UA was reading and scoring international and domestic non-resident applications at Davis rather than using predictive values (PVs). The response by UA was that the GPAs had to be recalculated, mixed records had to be sorted out, and data integrity checks had to be performed, requiring reading of all applications at this time.

Predicting UCLA HR scores: It was stressed that UA needs to do PV scoring for international and non-residents as well (those with UCLA HR scores of 4 and 4.25). The question is whether we have all the data points. To date, the PV tool from UCOP has not been implemented at UC Davis for international and domestic non-resident applicants.

Converting UCLA HR scores into UCD HR scores: The conversion process should be done at the end of the cycle. Orhan and Ralph will help UA in that process.

BOARS Resolution on Evaluation of Residents and Non-residents: The BOARS resolution stipulates that the evaluation and selection of non-resident applicants should be according to the same criteria and cutoff scores. The admitted non-residents should compare favorably to admitted California residents. Non-resident targets should preserve the integrity of the admissions process; Senate committees should ensure that the BOARS principles are met; annual reports should be submitted by each campus. The resolution will be communicated to the chancellors.
A&E members commented that the resolution needs to be strengthened. It needs to indicate that non-residents are an important segment of the student population at UC. The point that non-residents diversify and enrich each campus community needs to be stressed.

**BOARS Referral Pool Proposal for Admission of ELC 9%:** BOARS has proposed that admission committees should take ELC status seriously and consider admitting ELC applicants within a given percentile. BOARS further proposes that ELC applicants who do not receive an offer from any campus should be added to the regular referral pool and guaranteed admission to UC Merced. BOARS also suggested that ELC status could be considered for tie-breaking purposes, for example. However, there is no guarantee to admit students from the referral pool. Is guaranteeing admission to eligible applicants a realistic expectation? Can we afford to continue to this? Tie-Breaking will be discussed at a future meeting. Miguel has done some work on this, but nothing definitive at this time.

**Intercollegiate Athletics Review:** J. Addona’s comments on the ICA review are perceptive. A&E members are requested to comment using the “comment” feature on the whiteboard before the deadline of January 13. Some questioned whether the ICA’s eight guidelines will remain guidelines anymore.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment  
Thursday, Jan. 12, 2012  
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm  
410 Mrak Hall  

Present: R. Aldredge, Chair, N. Pan, D. Hunter, G. Butler, J. Addona,  
C. Bates, M. Robinson, W. Robinson,  


Admissions Update: W. Robinson announced that an Associate Director of  
Admissions was hired to start work in a month or so. B. Alexander was  
commended for building an excellent environment for holistic review (HR).  
Norming is currently being done weekly.  

Converting UCLA HR Scores into UCD HR Scores: O. Orgun’s code is  
being used to do the conversion. Currently there are 581 individuals on it.  

Bin-filling and Tie-breaking: Multiple criteria or attributes such low income,  
1st generation, API (1-5), ELC (1-4), Veteran status, Foster, Native American  
status will be used for tie-breaking. The clustering appears to be between 4s  
and 5s and tie-breaking will take place at those points. It is estimated 4,700 had  
HR values of 4 at this time. This is a seed yr, a baseline yr. M. Robinson was  
asked to use 2012 data to on those that are UC Davis 4s and UCLA 3s and  
report the results at the next meeting. It is important that we do not create a  
system that disadvantages residents or non-residents.  

BOARS Update: The transfer proposal is in process of revision.  

ICA Review: J. Addona provided a very good analysis. We will need to look  
into best practices at other universities and replicate those. What direction we  
want to go is the issue. We need to continue to emphasize academics. The  
student comes first. R. Aldredge will summarize the discussion and transmit the  
committee’s comments on Jan. 13, 2012.  

Commendation: R. Aldredge was commended by Director Robinson and  
Associate Director Hunter for the innumerable hours he spent over the last  
several months providing guidance and training to UA staff in holistic review.  

Next Meeting: A&E is scheduled to meet Jan. 26, 2012 in Mrak Hall.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment  
Thursday, Jan. 26, 2012  
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm  
410 Mrak Hall


Not Present: D. Hunter, W. Robinson, C. Bates

Admissions Update: M. Robinson, Donalynn Owfook (analyst in UA) and O. Orgun recently met to learn more about bin filling and calibration using Python programming language. Three data sets were obtained from Brian Alexander and analyzed. A Statistical Analysis System or SAS was also employed for data analysis. Cold Fusion was another program that was utilized. UA said that they are on track and on target with their HR reviews. March 16 is decision day. HR scores have been obtained from UCLA. So far 5,300 students who applied to UCLA have been read at Davis and their scores were being mapped onto UCD HR scores. Comparisons of translated scores with actual scores will also be done.

Tie-Breaking Project: M. Robinson was assigned a project by Chair Aldredge at A&E’s previous meeting and Robinson presented his findings at this meeting. Robinson indicated the he performed frequency analysis on a series of variables for tie-breaking on smaller and smaller subpopulations using the 2012 application pool. The HR score ranges of interest for tie breaking were UC Davis = 4 and UCLA = 3. The variables used included low-income, first generation, API (1-5), ELC, Vet status, foster youth status, and Native American Indian status. The frequency of the individuals who possess any of these attributes appears to be consistent with the entire applicant pool. However, there appeared to be marked differences in the particular individuals who possess a
specific criterion for tie breaking when they are considered from the perspective of either the UC Davis or UCLA HR scoring.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment  
Thursday, Feb. 9, 2012  
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm  
410 Mrak Hall


Not Present: L.J. Bossio, D. Hunter, P. Burman, N. Pan

UA Update: W. Robinson announced that all reads were done. Supplemental reads have now started. 1400 referrals were received and 700 are now confirmed, which is kind of low. 4,000 referrals would be the norm for a 49,000 applicant pool. Other campuses show higher numbers of referrals. More scores from UCLA are expected to be received in the coming days (about 17,000 total scores have been already received so far). Tie-breaking is a new frontier for UC Davis.

Tie-Breaking: At A&E's previous meeting, M. Robinson was asked to study the questions below and report his findings at this meeting. Specifically, Robinson was asked to consider applicants having Davis (HR=4) and for UCLA (HR=3) displaying the following attributes (variables): API (1-5), ELC (1-9), LOW INCOME, and FIRST GENERATION.

1. How many students with a given UCD HR score (e.g., 4) have at least one of the above characteristics?
2. How many students have two of these characteristics, then three, then four?
3. Then rank by ELC (highest more preferable)
4. Numbers (and percentages) of applicants that meet each characteristic.

M. Robinson's analysis showed the following: While single variables produced the highest numbers, two-variable combinations produced moderate numbers, and three-variable combinations produced still more moderate numbers, and four-variable combinations produced the least numbers. Starting at the bottom is suggested at this time (having all four attributes) that gives the smallest number of students. At this meeting M. Robinson was asked to continue this experiment by adding more variables, such as being a single parent and a Native American (being a member of a federally recognized tribe) and present his findings at the next meeting.
More on Tie-Breaking: There was more discussion on tie-breaking. This discussion is best represented by J. Sorensen’s draft summary transmitted to A&E via email and printed below:

After looking at preliminary data, it was agreed upon that the following eight socio-economic criteria would be taken into consideration for tie-breaking purposes in order to rank applicants with the same HR score (in no particular order):

1) API (1-5)
2) ELC (1-9)
3) Low Income
4) First-Generation College Student
5) Foster Youth
6) Affiliation with Federally Recognized Native American Tribe
7) Veteran Status
8) Applicant is a Single Parent

Because “From a Single Parent Household” forms such a large group, it was decided that this category would not be taken into consideration at this time.

At this point, the categories will not be weighted, nor will there be a hierarchy of most significant to least significant regarding these socio-economic obstacles.

*It was decided that tie-breaking would begin with those applicants with the greatest combined number of socio-economic obstacles (the most possible being eight), and would then proceed to those with seven, then six, then five, etc., until the target number of admits is reached.

*In the event that further tie-breaking needs to occur within a category (for instance, we need to admit only 100 of the 500 with a combined three of the criteria listed above), we will select from the top those with the highest CR1 scores until the target number of admits is reached. [While the committee realizes this is not ideal because some factors will be counted twice, we decided to use CR1 scores because every student has a CR1 mechanically produced, and because the bulk of the CR1 score is comprised of hard academic criteria (GPA, test scores, A-G courses).]
*Similarly, in the event that further tie-breaking needs to occur even after we have admitted all students with any one of the criteria listed above (for instance, 1800 of 3500 HR=4 students have at least one of the criteria, and our target is greater than 1800), we will then select from the top (among those with none of the criteria above) those with the highest CR1 scores until the target number of admits is reached.

**J. Sorensen also transmitted the following weighted formula of tie-breaking for future consideration and possible use:**

The following formula is based on the assumption that 1) a combination of socio-economic indicators (SEI) should be considered for tie-breaking, 2) that those categories should be weighted to the extent possible with existing information, 3) that these criteria should, combined, be given relatively more weight than the academic indicators already contained in each student’s CR1 score (keeping in mind that the CR1 score already takes into consideration First Generation and other factors, but not to the extent that we’d like to see in the tie-breaking process), 4) that the total score will make applicants with one, several, or no socio-economic factors comparable in the end, and finally 5) that the score can be mechanically produced.

The points and weighting below is based on the assumption that CR1 has a maximum score of 12,500 and that if our cutoff is generally in the HR=4 range, these students will broadly have CR1 scores ranging from 3000-6000. [This range needs to be confirmed. At our last meeting, we noted that HR=1 scores had CR1 scores ranging from 6300-9800].

I have drafted the weighting in a “holistic” fashion, based on the read-sheets from the UCLA training we did last year. All of the relative weights are up for discussion and redistribution.

**1) API (1-5)**

I propose that points be distributed on a sliding scale based on the API of the applicant’s school. Applicants from lower API schools will be given more points, and those from relatively higher API schools will be given less.

API 1 = 1000

API 2 = 800

API 3 = 600
API 4 = 400
API 5 = 200

Range: 0 (school is not API 5 or lower) to 1000

Maximum points in this category: 1000

2) ELC (1-9)

I propose points be distributed on a sliding scale based on the applicants' percentile achievement in their local context. Applicants in the top 1% of their class will be given the most points, and those in the top 9% would be given proportionally less. I propose that this category be weighted more heavily than API because we would like to reward achievement in context (i.e., what students did with their limited opportunities) more so than the simple fact of limited opportunity. This committee had previously discussed how ELC is also a relatively good indicator of “likeliness to succeed at UCD” in that students at low API schools who finish in the top X% have done the most with the opportunities they had (and get points for both API and ELC), but conversely, at higher API schools, finishing in the top X% is that much more difficult because of the competitive nature of those schools. Thus, being ELC at a relatively higher API school is also a strong indicator of “likeliness to succeed at UCD.”

ELC 1 = 3000
ELC 2 = 2800
ELC 3 = 2600
ELC 4 = 2400
ELC 5 = 2200
ELC 6 = 2000
ELC 7 = 1800
ELC 8 = 1600
ELC 9 = 1400

Range: 0 (applicant is not ELC) to 3000

Maximum points in this category: 3000
Keep in mind that by definition, ELC 1 students are the top 1% and so comprise a very small pool of applicants (my guess is that most ELC 1 students will have been admitted by other means already and would not be in this tie-breaking pool). The number of applicants affected of course increases as we move down to ELC 9.

By contrast, API 1 schools are by definition the bottom 10% (in terms of academic opportunity), and affect a relatively larger proportion (in fact all of ELC 1-9 combined, at least in terms of percentage). By giving points to API 5 and below, we are essentially giving bonus points to the bottom 50% (again, in terms of academic opportunity). Because API affects so many, it makes sense to weight it proportionally less. Some applicants will of course receive points from both categories.

3) Low Income

While ideally, this category could also be a sliding scale, our immediately accessible data indicates only federally defined low income or not.

Range: 0 (applicant is not from a low income household) to 1000 (applicant is)

Maximum points in this category: 1000

4) First-Generation College Student

Range: 0 (applicant is FG) to 1000 (applicant is not FG)

Maximum points in this category: 1000

For categories 5-8 below, each applies to a very small number of applicants, but in terms of the diversity of our campus and opportunity for these applicants, I propose that these criteria should be considered relatively more significant. Applicants are either identified as part of the group (1500) or not (0).

5) Foster Youth

Range: 0 (applicant is not FY) to 1500 (applicant is FY)

Maximum points in this category: 1500

6) Affiliation with Federally Recognized Native American Tribe

Range: 0 (applicant is not affiliated) to 1500 (applicant is)

Maximum points in this category: 1500
7) Veteran Status

Range: 0 (applicant does not have veteran status) to 1500 (applicant does)

Maximum points in this category: 1500

8) Applicant is a Single Parent

Range: 0 (applicant is not a single parent) to 1500 (applicant is)

Maximum points in this category: 1500

9) From a Single Parent Household

Though this category captures a large number of applicants, I think it should be considered as a socio-economic obstacle, though given relatively less weight than those above.

Range: 0 (applicant is from a single parent household) to 500 (applicant is not)

Maximum points in this category: 500

Maximum total points for all socio-economic indicators (SEI): 12,500

Maximum total CR1 score: 12,500

Total maximum: 25,000

By adding the CR1 score at the end, we guarantee that every applicant has a total score.

It seems that most applicants who would be subjected to tie-breaking in this manner would be getting 1/3rd or less of the total possible points, both in terms of SEI points and CR1 score. It is highly unlikely that applicants with no SEI points will be ranked higher than those with at least one of the nine criteria unless their CR1 scores are higher by a very large margin. Seeing what these scores would look like on a sample set, followed by a bit of data analysis, would be helpful in seeing how we might like the weighting to be distributed.

20/20 Initiative: Chair Aldredge spoke briefly about the Chancellor’s 20/20 Initiative. The initiative is about adding 5000 additional students, of which about 3000 are non-residents (national/international) and 2,000 are residents. Aldredge presented some data he acquired from attending a previous conference.
What admission rate is required to reach this target? Improving admission yield (currently 13%) and recruiting aggressively internationally would be necessary.

A&E’s next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, Feb. 23, 2012, in 410 Mrak.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment
Thursday, Feb. 23, 2012
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm
410 Mrak Hall


Not Present:  D. Hunter, P. Burman

Admission Update:  W. Robinson indicated that all the application reviews have now been completed. At this time, UA is doing tie-breaks. He indicated that there is now a target of increasing national/international students by 150 students. W. Robinson proposed the following tie-breaking approach:

1. **Level 1** = Veterans, Single Parent, Native American Affiliated in Federally recognized Tribe;

2. **Level 2** = (all 5 of these) low income, first generation, API 1-5, ELC, EAOP, (4 of 5), (3 of 5), (2 of 5), (1 of 5); and

3. **Level 3** = Scholastic Index 2, which is comprised of High School GPA Weighted/Capped $4.50 \times 1,000 + \text{Test} 2400 + a\cdot g 20 \times 50 = 7,900$ and then by going down the scholastic index until the target is reached.

Chair Aldredge pointed out that none of the criteria above was considered more important than another according to the model of tie-breaking agreed upon at the last meeting and the proposal above is therefore inconsistent with the approved model. There was insufficient analysis provided by UA to evaluate the merits of this proposal. There was concern on the part of UA about not having a working model in place for implementing tie-breaking, the model approved by A&E (attached) not having yet been implemented by UA analysts. Chair Aldredge pointed out that Orhan Orgun had developed an algorithm that implements the approved A&E tie-breaking model, for purposes of analysis of the potential outcomes, which could be used. Orhan then shared the results of this algorithm with the committee. It was then agreed that Orhan’s algorithm, reflecting A&E’s approved tie-breaking model, would be implemented by UA with Orhan’s assistance in the next few days.
It was also agreed among the committee that an additional criterion of EAOP status would be added to those listed in the approved tie-breaking model.

**2020 Initiative – Enrollment Management:** Under the Chancellor’s 2020 Initiative, three task forces were formed: These are *Academic Resources, Enrollment Management,* and *Facilities Planning.* R. Aldredge is a member of the *Enrollment Management Task Force.* He reported that he attended a recent meeting of the task force and was impressed by the great modeling that was shown, which tracked students and their level of persistence over time.

**BOARS Transfer Proposal:** This proposal is on A&E’s whiteboard for comment. Members are requested to comment on the proposal before the deadline of May 2, 2012.

A&E’s next meeting is scheduled for March 8, 2012 in 410 Mrak.
CRITERIA FOR TIE-BREAKING
Approved by the Admissions and Enrollment Committee on 2/9/12
Amended on 2/23/12 to include EAOP status (reflected below)
Originally prepared by Joseph T. Sorensen, A&E committee member

After looking at preliminary data, it was agreed upon that the following eight socio-economic criteria would be taken into consideration for tie-breaking purposes in order to rank applicants with the same HR score (in no particular order):

1) API (1-5)
2) ELC (1-9)
3) Low Income
4) First-Generation College Student
5) Foster Youth
6) Affiliation with Federally Recognized Native American Tribe
7) Veteran Status
8) Applicant is a Single Parent
9) Applicant has EAOP status (approved on 2/23/12)

Because “From a Single Parent Household” forms such a large group, it was decided that this category would not be taken into consideration at this time.

At this point, the categories will not be weighted, nor will there be a hierarchy of most significant to least significant regarding these socio-economic obstacles.

*It was decided that tie-breaking would begin with those applicants with the greatest combined number of socio-economic obstacles (the most possible being eight), and would then proceed to those with seven, then six, then five, etc., until the target number of admits is reached.

*In the event that further tie-breaking needs to occur within a category (for instance, we need to admit only 100 of the 500 with a combined three of the criteria listed above), we will select from the top those with the highest CR1 scores until the target number of admits is reached. [While the committee realizes this is not ideal because some factors will be counted twice, we decided to use CR1 scores because every student has a CR1 mechanically produced, and because the bulk of the CR1 score is comprised of hard academic criteria (GPA, test scores, A-G courses).]

*Similarly, in the event that further tie-breaking needs to occur even after we have admitted all students with any one of the criteria listed above (for instance, 1800 of 3500 HR=4 students have at least one of the criteria, and our target is greater than 1800), we will then select from the top (among those with none of the criteria above) those with the highest CR1 scores until the target number of admits is reached.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment  
Thursday, March 8, 2012  
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm  
408 Mrak Hall

Present:  R. Aldredge, Chair, O. Orgun, N. Pan, J. Sorensen, C. Bates,  
W. Robinson, L.J. Bossio, D. Hunter, G. Butler, J. Addona,  
S. Bekele (Analyst)

Guest:  Brian Alexander

Not Present:  M. Robinson, P. Burman

Admission Update:  W. Robinson indicated that UA was putting the final  
touches to selecting the freshman class.  Decisions will be posted next Thursday.  
The freshman enrollment target this year is 4,900.  It appears UA will meet that  
target.  However, the target of 150 more non-resident students is unlikely to be  
met.  W. Robinson thanked D. Hunter for her countless hours of work, O. Orgun  
for his algorithmic work in the tie-breaking area, and the committee for its  
imagination and advice.  W. Robinson anticipates the committee can expect a  
robust discussion after May 1.  He stressed that we may be establishing a new  
baseline depending on the outcome.  The admit rate is anticipated to be 47%.  
The SR pool is smaller than was expected this first year of HR implementation.

UA’s technology and analytical support, Brian Alexander, said O. Orgun spent a  
good amount of time with the analysts using the Python programming language  
in determining the criteria for tie-breaking.  He said predictive values used at  
Davis for UCLA were very close to actual UCLA HR scores. About 1,000  
applicants were identified early on for calibration of UCD and UCLA HR scores,  
which were made available in mid-February.  Chair Aldredge thanked and  
congratulated the UA staff and the A&E committee for their collective efforts  
and the tremendous progress made during the past year toward development  
and implementation of the new UC Davis HR process.

Wait List:  The wait list last year was about 6,000 and it’s expected to be about  
the same number this year. Approximately 2200 offers to students on the wait  
list are planned. It was noted that those in the referral pool are not the most  
competitive students and that no reviews of students in the referral pool was  
conducted this year.
**BOARS Update:** R. Aldredge reported that at a recent meeting BOARS discussed online courses. Although more acceptances of online courses are anticipated in the future, there was a concern about the level of preparedness for non-matriculated students.

**2020 Initiative Subcommittee:** R. Aldredge summarized the results of data presented at the most recent meeting of the Enrollment Management subcommittee of the 2020-Initiative subcommittee. This data suggested the possibility of a net loss of annual revenue in the year 2020 and beyond associated with the enrollment of an additional 5000 undergraduates, 3000 of whom are national or international students), when additional costs are fully accounted for (e.g., for additional capital resources and new-faculty start-up packages).

**Executive Session:** Several issues were discussed.

A&E’s next meeting is scheduled for March 22, 2012 in 410 Mrak.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment
Thursday, March 8, 2012
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm
410 Mrak Hall


Not Present: M. Robinson, P. Burman, O. Orgun, N. Pan, C. Bates

Admission Update: W. Robinson thanked the committee for guiding and helping UA in the development of holistic review at Davis. He announced that admit decisions went out last Friday on March 16, 2012. More than 22,530 students were offered admission, of which 84% are California residents and 16% non-residents. The admit rate for Fall 2012 is 45.6% compared to 46% last year. The enrollment target is 4,900. We are admitting more California residents even as we admit more national and international students. The wait list now has 6,909 applicants. Some of the students in the wait list could also be on the referral list.

UA is now moving to a yield mode and then to transfer applicants. Yield events have been scheduled for admitted students locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. The transfer event is scheduled for May 11.

Other Updates: Chair Aldredge announced that he plans to continue A&E's bi-monthly meetings (every two weeks) for the spring quarter. Meetings will be scheduled soon.

BOARS Update: In May 2012, BOARS is expected to report to the Regents on the implementation of individualized/holistic review on UC campuses. Each campus is being asked to draft a two-page statement about how they have responded to the changes and how the implementation is proceeding. Some guiding questions are: What are the selection approaches compared to two years ago? What are the issues that have been identified and what lessons have been learned? How might have the applicant pool changed over the past two years? How has your campus dealt with increased ELC applications? What has the impact been on yield? Any other issues you have come up with? A draft will be prepared by UA in the next two weeks for discussion by A&E. In the long run, it is prudent to have longitudinal studies that assess admissions data compared to the past over a period of time.
**Analytical Support and other Issues:** There is a need for analytical support in UA. We also need new PV tools for the other campuses. Our most competitors are UCSB and UCI. UCSC used the Berkeley process this year and had only 4 readers for conducting holistic reviews.

**Intercollegiate Athletics Report:** A&E discussed some aspects of this report at this meeting and would like comments from members to be posted on the whiteboard. Responses are due by 4-12-12.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment  
Tuesday, April 10, 2012  
3:00 pm – 5:00 pm  
410 Mrak Hall


Not Present:  P. Burman, G. Butler, M. Robinson

Special Guest:  Joe Kiskis

Introductions:  The chair of the Special Committee on Athletics, Joe Kiskis was introduced. This was followed by an update from the Admissions Office.

Admission Update:  W. Robinson announced that Decision Day was last Friday, April 6. Yield events are being held in several places and the reception in Asia was well attended. Also, the reception in southern California was successful. Decisions on transfer students are coming out soon. SIRs are now coming in. W. Robinson will be traveling to Saudi Arabia soon with Vice Provost Bill Lacy. An uptick of students from that country is expected at UC Davis.

BOARS Update:  BOARS met this past Friday, April 6. There was discussion about transfer students. It was announced that there will be a cap on transfer units whether or not a student comes from a junior college or a four-year institution. The question was asked whether the transfer units were to be capped at 105. R. Aldredge will check on that. In addition, admission statistics were also discussed at BOARS. The data covering Fall 2010, Fall 2011, and Fall 2012 systemwide show that there were increases across the board. There was an increase in international students noted across all the campuses as well. The admission rates at Davis were 44.5% for California residents, 53.1% for out of state and 52.3% for international students.

20/20 Subcommittee:  This committee meets every two weeks. At Davis, 2% of the undergrad international students are from Japan.

Special Committee on Athletics Report:  Chair Aldredge reported that he forwarded his personal comments to the Executive Council regarding the Special Committee’s report, asking that the EC NOT endorse the report before hearing from A&E. Notwithstanding this request, the Executive Council endorsed the report at its meeting on April 6 so that the report could be considered for
adoption by the Representative Assembly at its regularly scheduled meeting on April 17.

**Discussion:** J. Kiskis reported that UA routinely admits UC-eligible athletes sponsored by ICA, even when these applicants are not competitive for admission with non-sponsored athletes. A point was made that admissions standards should be the same for all applicants, including non-athletes and those sponsored or supported by ICA or another campus units (e.g., Music). It was also argued that the authority for admission of a given student should not be delegated to ICA.

The athletics report makes a number of recommendations to the administration and aims to bring the Senate closer to the process. Strengthening the connections between the advisory committees and the Senate is one of the goals. Chair Aldredge identified two concerns in the report. These are on pages 12 and 13. Recommendation 1 and 4 are said to be of concern. Traditionally Academic Senate faculty have not been involved in individual admission cases and the report seems to encourage such intervention. Admission decisions should be made by UA, not ICA. There should be no implied assumption that ICA has authority over admissions. Therefore, the language in the report should be modified. Perhaps a statement should be inserted as follows: *ICA-sponsored applicants should be held to similar standards of competitiveness as assessed through holistic review and compared to other applicants.* Commentary on the report is due on April 12 and will be posted on the A&E whiteboard.

**Draft Report to BOARS on Transition to HR:** A rough draft is posted on the A&E’s whiteboard. This draft will not be finalized until the next A&E meeting.

**Executive Session:** A&E’s Academic Senate members discussed analytical support for A&E

The next meeting is on Tues, April 24 at the Registrar Office’s Studio.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment  
Tuesday, April 24, 2012  
3:00 pm – 5:00 pm  
Registrar Office Studio  


Not Present: Lora Jo Bossio  

Admission Update: W. Robinson reported that he just returned from a visit to Saudi Arabia. There were over 300 universities (including 72 US universities) that were represented whose mission was to recruit Saudi students. Robinson reported that over 50,000 Saudi students come to the US every year to attend college. Davis currently has 33 such students—all in University Extension.  

Robinson announced that transfer admit decisions were released last Friday, April 20th. Fall 2012 preliminary freshman data systemwide as well as by campus were distributed. Davis had a total of 42,543 applicants and admitted 18,922 or 44.5%. There were 4,086 international applicants out of which 2,137 were admitted or 52.3%. These applicants reportedly had strong academic scores. The admit rate for domestic out-of-state residents was 53.1% while that for transfer students was 58.1%. The academic profile of the transfer students was really good, with GPAs having grown from 2.99 to 3.25 and now to 3.73. UC San Diego has raised its GPA for transfer students to 3.5. It was reported that 470 more California residents were admitted this year than last year. Because of selective criteria for majors, Engineering required a minimum of 3.3 GPA this year.  

Report to BOARS on Transition to HR: A draft prepared by Chair Aldredge in conjunction with UA was reviewed. The draft was edited at the meeting and will be finalized soon. The report is being prepared in response to The Regents request to have BOARS submit a two-year report on comprehensive review and the implementation of holistic review for their July meeting.  

BOARS Draft Statement on Online Courses: BOARS is developing a statement on online courses which is still in draft form. The statement will outline BOARS’s expectations of courses and programs for K-12 online learning. There is a disclaimer in the statement which states: “Participating in this educational program does not in itself provide preference in admission to the University of California. Students interested in applying to UC should contact
the admissions office of the UC campus they want to attend to find out the details of the admissions process.”

**Excess Units Cap Policy:** New policy would maintain the current 105 quarter/70 semester cap on transferrable units from a community college but extends the cap to lower division units earned at a four-year institution. Should there be any limits on UC courses?

**Institutional Analysis (IA):** Chair Aldredge will meet with folks in IA to pursue a study on performance outcome. The study will aim to find out how HR correlates with performance. O. Orgun will be assisting UA with analytical work.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment  
Tuesday, May 8, 2012  
3:00 pm – 5:00 pm  
410 Mrak Hall

Present: R. Aldredge, Chair, P. Burman, O. Orgun, W. Robinson,  
D. Hunter, G. Butler, Lora Jo Bossio, J. Addona, C. Bates, S. Bekele  
(Analyst)

Not Present: N. Pan, J. Sorensen

Admission Update: SIRs have come in. Yield rates are higher than expected.  
Number of admits for international students is 46 above target. Chicano/Latino  
are down by 350 compared to last year. African Americans have increased by 30  
students from last year. SIRs are dynamic (fluid). Yield rate for residents was  
27.1%, last year it was 22.9%. Yield rate for the College of Ag, for example is  
42% while for HArCS is 27%. Collaboration between campuses continues and  
has not changed. However, wait lists have increased across all the campuses.  
Admit rates are normally frozen as of the first week of April. Outcomes appear  
to be very good this year.

BOARS Update: San Diego used two processes for admission last year.  
This year with HR their results are comparable to two years ago. UCB provided  
scores to Santa Cruz, but now is seeking payment for its services. The chair of  
A&E suggests payment per read instead of per score. Because Santa Cruz used  
the Berkeley rubric, it found itself with about 20,000 students that needed tie-  
breaking. They are in the process of reassessing their approach.

The Academic Council is concerned that international students compare so  
favorably that they will be displacing residents. It is being suggested that for  
each resident displaced, the responsible campus should pay 150% of $6,000.

Completion of SAT subject tests is an indicator of admissibility (there is a  
correlation). ETR and ELC give us the most diverse students but not  
necessarily the top students.

2020 Initiative Enrollment Management: R. Aldredge recently met with G.  
Butler and Institutional Analysis Director Robert Loessberg-Zahl to explore  
trends in admission and longitudinal studies. Members were asked what they  
wished to see in terms of outcomes and attributes with student being admitted.  
Studies can be performed based on HR and based on SR, for example.
2012-Cycle Data Analysis: O. Orgun collaborated with staff in Undergraduate Admissions, and from that collaboration he projected data on ethnicity, applicants, and success rates. His data identified the California demographic representation, the representation in the admit pool, and the representation in applicant pool, etc.

At the next meeting, May 22, 2012, we can review J. Sorensen’s proposal.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment
Tuesday, May 22, 2012
3:00 pm – 5:00 pm
The Studio


Not Present:  P. Burman, W. Robinson

Admission Update:  D. Hunter reported that SIRs were going well. There may be duplicates in the SIRs, but the process is rolling nicely. Those that are wait-listed are seeing their applications denied, and now they are appealing. From 900-1200 appeals are expected. Traditionally, only a handful of the appeals are granted. For example, out of 600 appeals, only 12 were granted in the past, and most of these were special needs cases.

The percent of admitted who enrolled was defined as ‘yield.’ Biomedical Engineering has the highest take rate (yield) at 27.9%. The SIR yield for Biomedical Engineering is now higher than it was 3 years ago by 12%. HArCS has seen yield rates take off from 16% to 27.4%. Generally, the yield is going up. The College of Ag expects an over-enrollment by about 50 students while Biological Sciences expects under-enrollment by 35-50.

Nonresidents are below what was predicted (229 predicted vs. 125 SIRs). Internationals are over what was predicted (306 predicted vs. 352 SIRs). Most internationals enroll in Economics, Managerial Economics, and Political Science. Currently 396 internationals who didn't apply to Davis are being considered for admission.

BOARS Update:  BOARS recently met by conference call. Accessibility and affordability were topics of discussion. Strategies on how to disburse financial aid were also discussed. The 2008-09 report of Prof. Robert Mare on holistic review of freshman admission at UCLA will be a topic of discussion at BOARS next meeting.

2020 Initiative Enrollment Management:  R. Aldredge indicated that the 20/20 group recently met with student counselors and peer advisors to hear about their perspectives. These constituents were concerned about bringing more students to the campus. They asked about campus services to be improved.
for those who are already here. It was indicated that about 300 faculty will be
hired in the next few years among whom will be Lecturers, SOE. 20/20 is a
thorough process.

**J. Sorensen Proposal for Tie Breaking:** Sorensen’s proposal provides
weighting to such factors as low income, API, ELC, etc. A concern was expressed
whether we will be more California-centric as a result of adopting such a policy.

**Data Analysis & Tie Breaking:** O. Orgun presented his analysis about his
findings on actual admits and unweighted admits for whites, African Americans,
Latinos, Asian Americans, etc. His presentation also included a hypothetical
Sorensen admit and Robinson admit, which showed slight differences in admits.
Orgun’s next presentation will include an analysis of admits by major.
Committee on Admissions and Enrollment  
Tuesday, June 5, 2012  
3:00 pm – 5:00 pm  
410 Mrak  


Not Present: P. Burman, Lora Jo Bossio  

Guest: Ken Burtis  

Announcements: This is the last meeting of A&E for the 2011-2012 academic year. As of September 1, 2012, R. Aldredge will step down as chair to assume the Vice Chair position at BOARS. The new chair of A&E will be Patrick Farrell. O. Orgun is retiring July 1, 2012.  

Token of Appreciation: W. Robinson presented a gift to R. Aldredge to thank him for his leadership and tenacity in leading UA through the HR process. In turn, Chair Aldredge thanked UA for their high achievement quick adaptation to the changes that were implemented in the admission process.  

Admission Update: Transfer outcomes were reported to be on target. TAG is a useful predictor. International students were reported to be 119 over target at UC Davis. Readers who participated in holistic review were sent a questionnaire and their responses aggregated. Among the questions were “what motivated you to participate in HR?” and assessing the quality and usefulness of the training materials.  

2020 Initiative: Ken Burtis is the point person for the administration on the 2020 Initiative. The initiative comprises three task forces: Task Force on Academic Resources, Task Force on Enrollment Management, and Task Force on Facilities Planning. Burtis indicated that so far 10 meetings have been conducted. The recommendations or summary thoughts will be consolidated over the summer and mid-term reports will be released. He indicated that the process is complicated in that there are a number of moving parts. Everything is connected to everything. The goal is to have the process due by the end of the Fall Quarter.  

BOARS Update: UCOP data show increase in SIR rates from last year.
Data Analysis & Tie Breaking: O. Orgun presented his analysis comparing outcomes using differing modalities. His presentation also included a hypothetical Sorensen and Robinson models, which showed slight differences in admits.
PROPOSAL FOR A UC DAVIS FRESHMAN ADMISSION PROCESS
BASED ON HOLISTIC REVIEW

Prepared by the 2010-2011
Admissions & Enrollment Committee
of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate
R. C. Aldredge & M. M. Rashid (Co-Chairs), O. C. Orgun, N. Pan, J. Sorenson

Background

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

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

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

Assumptions and Constraints

It is assumed that UC Davis will make use of holistic-review (HR) score information provided by other campuses for applicants we share in common with those campuses. In many cases, UC Davis will
not re-read these shared applications. However, UC Davis will have to develop and maintain the ability to read and score applicant files locally, both to accommodate applicants for whom we have no HR score from another campus, and for other reasons. Specifically, in-common applications will be read at UC Davis if they fall within a particular score range, based on the HR score from the other campus. Also, a modest number of in-common applications from across the entire score range will be read locally, in order to establish the correspondence between locally-generated scores and those from the other campus. These features of the proposed process are described more fully below.

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

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

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

Guiding Principles

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The details of the proposed process are as follows.

1. Davis readers are to be trained using the same principles and strategies of evaluation as are UCLA readers. As with the UCLA process, readers have 7 score levels to select from in scoring files. However, the “bin sizes” – i.e. the approximate proportions of the applicant pool that should fall within each score level – are not the same as at UCLA. Instead, they are set to fit UC Davis's circumstances of selectivity. Specifically, the percentage of applicants within the top and bottom bins should be a multiple of 5 (e.g. the top 25% or the bottom 30%), with the other five bins of approximately equal size in between. The size of the top bin should be such that its lowest HR score is higher than the HR-score cut-off for the most selective major on campus, to accommodate admission of all applicants within the top bin. The size of the bottom bin should be such that its highest HR score is lower than that of all students accepted into the least selective major on campus, to accommodate potential denial of all applications within the bottom bin.

2. Consistent with UCLA’s process, two independent, blind reads of each Davis-only file should be carried out, in which local and UC Davis context information is used. In cases where the two scores are neighboring or identical, the final score for the file is the average of the two read scores. The reported scores can thus take one of 13 values. In cases where the two scores are not neighboring (i.e. they differ by more than one), a third read is undertaken by a senior reader, whose score stands as the final reported score. This procedure is identical to the UCLA procedure.

3. Again consistent with UCLA’s process, readers may recommend files for Supplemental review. The criteria and procedures governing Supplemental Review should be the same as in the UCLA process.

4. Applications in common with UCLA are subjected to an automated prediction of their eventual UCLA HR score using a multiple-linear-regression statistical model. The predictive model is necessarily calibrated on the previous year’s UCLA applicant pool. The predictor variables in the model consist of the range of quantitative indicators from the UCLA read sheet. The model
predictions are not used to influence the admit/deny decision for any student. Instead, they are used only to estimate which of the in-common files are likely to receive a UCLA HR score in the range selected for re-evaluation (e.g., 4 or 4.25). These files constitute the bulk of the in-common files that are to be re-read locally. Were UC Davis to wait until the actual scores arrived from UCLA, insufficient time might remain to read them all locally, prior to the decision-release deadline. By predicting UCLA score outcomes at the beginning of the reading period, UC Davis can get a head start on reading the in-common files that will, in all likelihood, have to be read. Should this prediction-driven process fail to mark for local reading a file whose actual score turns out to be in the range selected for re-evaluation (e.g., 4 or 4.25), then that file must be read locally as soon as is practical. The predictive model is also used to randomly select a modest number of files for calibration (e.g., on the order of 1000) whose scores are likely to uniformly cover the UCLA score range.

5. Because in-common files receiving a score from UCLA in the range selected for re-evaluation have already been read twice, these files should receive only a single local read. The “calibration” files (taken from throughout the score range), however, receive two local reads, in order to maximize the resolution of the calibration process.

6. All applicants, including those with UCLA-averaged scores and those with UC Davis-averaged scores, are ranked on a common scale. The UCLA-to-common-scale conversion is calibrated using the local read outcomes for the 1000 “calibration files.” The conversion also facilitates the assignment of a single common-scale score to each application with “mixed” HR scores (e.g., a 4 or 4.25 from UCLA and a separate, independent single read score from UC Davis).

7. At the end of the reading period, the integration of all applicant HR scores (whether derived at UCLA or UC Davis) into a common-scale is achieved using a fast, entirely algorithmic procedure. Recommended-admit cut-offs are then established on the common scale for each major. Applicants who fall near the cut-off on the common scale will be subject to an automated tie-breaking process. The tie-breaking process should not involve any additional reading by a human reader; instead, it should algorithmically combine multiple criteria to render a quantitative result.
Office of the President

TO MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY:

ACTION ITEM

For Meeting of January 19, 2011

RESOLUTION REGARDING INDIVIDUALIZED REVIEW AND HOLISTIC EVALUATION IN UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, evaluation of applicants’ achievement in the context of opportunities and challenges requires that a trained reader examine the entire application in considering personal achievements, challenges, leadership, and contributions to applicants’ communities alongside context information; and
WHEREAS, a form of Comprehensive Review in which the reader produces a single holistic score based on all information in the applicant’s file has been shown to thoroughly evaluate each applicant’s achievement in relation to opportunities and challenges; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

BACKGROUND

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

These guidelines provide the framework within which campuses shall establish specific criteria and procedures for the selection of undergraduate applicants to be admitted when the number of eligible applicants exceeds the places
II. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

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

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

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

1. The admissions process honors academic achievement and accords priority to students of high academic accomplishment. At the same time, merit should be assessed in terms of the full range of an applicant's academic and personal achievements and likely contribution to the campus community, viewed in the context of the opportunities and challenges that the applicant has faced.

2. Campus admissions procedures should involve a comprehensive review of applications using a broad variety of factors to select an entering class.

3. No fixed proportion of applicants should be admitted based solely on a narrow set of criteria.

4. Campus policies should reflect continued commitment to the goal of enrolling classes that exhibit academic excellence as well as diversity of talents and abilities, personal experience, and backgrounds.

5. Faculty on individual campuses should be given flexibility to create admission policies and practices that, while consistent with Universitywide criteria and policies, are also sensitive to local campus values and academic priorities.

6. The admission process should select students of whom the campus will be proud, and who give evidence that they will use their education to make contributions to the intellectual, cultural, social, and political life of the State and the Nation.

7. The admissions process should select those students who demonstrate a strong likelihood that they will persist to graduation.

8. Campus selection policies should ensure that no applicant will be denied admission without a comprehensive review of his or her file.

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

III. SELECTION CRITERIA

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

A. Freshman Applicants

The following criteria provide a comprehensive list of factors campuses may use to select their admitted class. Based on campus-specific institutional goals and needs, admissions decisions will be based on a broad variety of factors to ensure attainment of the goals set forth in the 1988 University of California Policy on Undergraduate Admissions and
1. Academic Grade Point Average (GPA) calculated on all academic courses completed in the subject areas specified by the University's eligibility requirements (the a-f subjects), including additional points for completion of University certified honors courses (see 4, below). It is recommended that the maximum value allowed for the GPA shall be 4.0.

2. Scores on the following tests: the Scholastic Assessment Test I or the American College Test, and the College Board Scholastic Assessment Test II: Subject Tests.

3. The number, content of, and performance in courses completed in academic subjects beyond the minimum specified by the University's eligibility requirements.

4. The number of and performance in University approved honors courses, College Board Advanced Placement courses, International Baccalaureate courses, and transferable college courses completed. It is recommended that caution be exercised in order not to assign excessive weight to these courses, especially if considerable weight already has been given in the context of 1, above. Additionally, in recognition of existing differences in availability of these courses among high schools, it is recommended that reviewers assess completion of this coursework against the availability of these courses at the candidate's secondary school.

5. Being identified as eligible in the local context, by being ranked in the top 4% of the class at the end of the junior year, as determined by academic criteria established by the University of California.

6. The quality of the senior year program, as measured by type and number of academic courses (see 3 and 4, above) in progress or planned.

7. The quality of academic performance relative to the educational opportunities available in the applicant's secondary school.

8. Outstanding performance in one or more specific academic subject areas.

9. Outstanding work in one or more special projects in any academic field of study.

10. Recent, marked improvement in academic performance, as demonstrated by academic grade point average and quality of coursework (see 3 and 4, above) completed and in progress, with particular attention being given to the last two years of high school.

11. Special talents, achievements, and awards in a particular field, such as in the visual and performing arts, in communication, or in athletic endeavors; special skills, such as demonstrated written and oral proficiency in other languages; special interests, such as intensive study and exploration of other cultures; or experiences that demonstrate unusual promise for leadership, such as significant community service or significant participation in student government; or other significant experiences or achievements that demonstrate the applicant's promise for contributing to the intellectual vitality of a campus.

12. Completion of special projects undertaken either in the context of the high school curriculum or in conjunction with special school events, projects or programs co-sponsored by the school, community organizations, postsecondary educational institutions, other agencies, or private firms, that offer significant evidence of an applicant's special effort and determination or that may indicate special suitability to an academic program on a specific campus.

13. Academic accomplishments in light of the applicant's life experiences and special circumstances. These experiences and circumstances may include, but are not limited to, disabilities, low family income, first generation to attend college, need to work, disadvantaged social or educational environment, difficult personal and family situations or circumstances, refugee status, or veteran status.

14. Location of the applicant's secondary school and residence. These factors shall be considered in order to provide for geographic diversity in the student population and also to account for the wide variety of educational environments.
existing in California.

B. Advanced Standing Applicants

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

Criteria to Select Advanced Standing Applicants

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

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

IV. APPLICATION PROCEDURES

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

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

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

V. ACCOMMODATION OF UC ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

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

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

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

Last updated February 15, 2002.
Single Score Holistic Review Processes

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

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

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

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

20 [http://students.berkeley.edu/admissions/freshmen.asp?id=56&navid=N](http://students.berkeley.edu/admissions/freshmen.asp?id=56&navid=N); [http://www.admissions.ucla.edu/Prospect/Adm_fr/FrSel.htm](http://www.admissions.ucla.edu/Prospect/Adm_fr/FrSel.htm)
ratings. Senior readers look for any evidence that the original decision to deny admission should be reversed. Consequently, considerable deference is still given to “traditional” measures of achievement at the same time that they place great value on the expert judgments of readers to take into account multiple criteria in their ratings of applicants.

Assessment of Single Score Holistic Processes

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

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

Two Stage or Multiple Score Processes

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

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

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

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

Prepared by Ralph Aldredge & Orhan Orgun, 11/16/11
For internal review by members of the UC Davis Academic Senate Committee on Admissions & Enrollment and its consultants

Overview

Holistic review (HR) is a time-intensive process and collaboration among the UC campuses will be beneficial. Although the HR process at a given UC campus will generate HR scores peculiar to that campus, sharing of HR scores among campuses is encouraged by BOARS and is expected to reduce the overall HR workload. Currently, UCLA HR scores are used at both UCI and UCSD to reduce HR workload. At UC Davis, we plan also to use HR scores from UCLA, as well as HR scores from other campuses as they become available. However, the new UC Davis HR admissions policy (attached) requires calibration of the HR scores received externally from other campuses with those assigned through HR at UC Davis to ensure the fairest interpretation of scores received externally for applications that are not read at UC Davis. At the end of the UCD HR-review reading period the integration of all applicant HR scores (whether derived at UCD or another UC campus) into a common-scale is achieved using a fast, entirely algorithmic procedure, as indicated in the UCD HR policy document (page 4, paragraph 7). Recommended-admit cut-offs are then established on the common scale for each major. Applicants who fall near the cut-off on the common scale will be subject to an automated tiebreaking process (not described herein), which will involve no further human reading but rely on an algorithmic assessment of multiple criteria for selection of applicants for admission.

At its meeting on 5/10/11, A&E unanimously approved the “bin-filling” method proposed by R. Aldredge for integrating all HR scores (whether derived at UCD or another UC campus) into a common-scale. This approach involves two components, (a) a calibration process in which a specific contiguous range of UCD HR scores appropriate for possible assignment of applicants with a given UCLA HR score is determined, followed by (b) determination of the specific UCD score to which a particular applicant’s UCLA HR score corresponds among the range of allowable UCD HR scores determined during calibration; this component is called bin filling. A detailed description of the bin-filling method is attached. The calibration process begins with the random selection of a modest number of applications having UCLA HR scores (e.g., on the order of 1000), uniformly distributed across the entire range of possible UCLA HR scores. Each of these applications is then read at UC Davis and assigned a UCD HR score. Based on each applicant’s UCLA and UCD HR scores, a calibration map is then determined algorithmically. The calibration map indicates the specific contiguous range of UCD HR scores appropriate for possible
assignment of applicants with a given UCLA HR score. Examples are provided in Tables 1 & 2 (discussed below) and in the diagrams that immediately follow.

A calibration procedure proposed by O. Orgun was presented at the A&E meeting on 5/10/11. This algorithm is designed to achieve a self-consistent mapping of UCLA HR scores to UCD HR scores when both scores are known. In other words, this algorithm determines the range of contiguous UCD HR scores appropriate for possible assignment of an applicant with a given UCLA HR score while preserving that applicant’s rank upon translation relative to other applicants whose UCLA HR scores are also translated. The algorithm was implemented independently by R. Aldredge and O. Orgun, on different software platforms, and identical computational results were obtained. These results were presented and discussed at the A&E meeting on 10/21/11. Also presented at this meeting were the results of bin-filling simulations, based on a separate algorithm developed by O. Orgun for this purpose and a calibration of UCLA HR scores mapped onto fictitious UCD HR-score bins (in lieu of actual UCD HR scores, which are currently unavailable). Descriptions of the detailed calibration and bin-filling procedures developed by O. Orgun are attached.

Additional simulations calibrating UCLA and UCB HR scores were presented at the A&E meeting on 10/28/11. These new simulations were performed to provide additional insight resulting from the consideration of HR-score data sets obtained from similar HR admissions processes. Our earlier simulations involved the calibration of UCLA HR scores with fictitious UCD HR scores derived from the previous UC Davis applicant evaluation process, which was comprehensive but non-holistic.

The results of the calibration and bin-filling simulations presented at the A&E meetings on 10/21/11 and 10/28/11 are discussed below, followed by the results of new simulations of translating UCLA HR scores into UCB HR scores and vice versa, after calibration of the two HR-score data sets as previously simulated. Collectively, the simulation results demonstrate the implementation and operability of the Orgun algorithms for the calibration and bin-filling components of the new UC Davis holistic-review admissions policy.

### Calibration Simulations

These simulations involve determining the specific contiguous range of UCD HR scores appropriate for possible assignment of applicants with a given UCLA HR score.

#### UCLA HR mapped to UCD CR2

Simulations of the calibration of UCLA HR scores with UCD CR2-score bins (serving as fictitious UCD HR scores) were completed with 2011 UCD admissions data provided by consultants Elias Lopez and Donna Owfook. Only UCD applicants with known UCLA HR scores were considered in the simulation (a total of 26,609).
To create the CR2-score bins for use as fictitious UCD HR scores, applicants considered in the simulation were first ranked in accordance with their CR2 score, determined through the comprehensive but non-holistic applicant evaluation process in use last year. The applicants were then distributed across a total of 13 CR2 bins (numbered 1, 1.5, 2, ..., through 7) as illustrated in the second and last three rows of Table 1A. Applicants with the highest CR2 scores were placed in UCD CR2-score bin 1 and those with lower CR2 scores in higher-numbered, less-competitive bins. The distribution was chosen to be consistent with the expected distribution of scores assigned by UC Davis readers (bin sizes) approved by A&E on 7/5/11 (attached), allowing for the fact that many non-integral scores would result from averaging when the HR scores of two readers of the same application differ by 1, in accordance with UCD HR policy (c.f., page 3, paragraph no. 2 of the attached policy document). The approach was to assume initially a distribution across the integrally numbered CR2 bins (e.g., 1, 2, ..., 7) identical to that expected of the readers and then to populate the non-integral bins with the bottom quarter (according to CR2 score) of those in the more competitive adjacent integral bin and the top quarter of those in the less competitive adjacent integral bin. The result was the distribution shown in the second row from the bottom of Table 1A.

Table 1A shows the number of applicants with each possible combination of UCLA HR score and UCD CR2-score bin. The results show that many applicants with high UCLA HR scores (e.g., 4 or greater) are also in high-numbered CR2 bins (having received low raw CR2 scores). However, others with high UCLA HR scores are in low-numbered CR2 bins, having received very favorable evaluations at UCD but not at UCLA. Of perhaps greater concern is the number of applicants (although not substantial) in high-numbered CR2 bins who received low HR scores from UCLA, considering the more competitive nature of the admissions process at UCLA. Highlighted in black font are the allowable score combinations resulting from the calibration process, which are shown exclusively in the calibration mapping results presented in Table 1B.

The results in Table 1B demonstrate the self-consistent translation of UCLA HR scores into UCD CR2-score bins; that is, determination of the range of contiguous CR2 bins appropriate for possible assignment of an applicant with a UCLA HR score, while preserving that applicant’s rank upon assignment relative to other applicants whose UCLA HR scores are also translated. For example, according to the non-zero entries in the table, applications with a UCLA HR score of either 1, 1.5, 2 or 2.25 would all be assigned to a CR2-score bin of 1 (assuming that they were not read at UC Davis). However, applicants with a UCLA HR score of 2.5 could be potentially assigned to a CR2-score bin of 1, 1.5, 2 or 2.5. Self-consistent translation into CR2-score bins was possible for only 48% of the applicants having UCLA HR scores when the entire pool (26,609) of these applicants was considered. The results were only slightly better when CR1 bins were created and used in place of CR2 bins (50%, in this case)—not presented herein. It was hypothesized that the rate of self-consistent translation would be higher when calibrating UCLA HR scores with
actual UCD HR scores (when available), instead of CR1 or CR2 score bins, due to the similarity between the UCD and UCLA HR processes (which should rank applicants in a qualitatively similar manner).

**UCB HR mapped to UCLA HR**

To test the hypothesis stated directly above, a calibration of UCLA HR scores with UCB HR scores (for applicants with both) was performed. The results, presented in Tables 2A & 2B, show self-consistent translation of UCLA HR scores into UCB HR scores for 70% of the 18,902 applicants to UCD for fall 2011 having both UCLA and UCB HR scores. This supports the hypothesis that higher self-consistent translation rates should be achieved when calibrating UCLA HR scores with actual UCD HR scores (when the latter become available) instead of with UCD CR1 or CR2 score bins, due to the greater similarity between the UCLA and UCD HR processes in comparison with that between the UCLA HR process and our previous non-holistic evaluation process used to generate the CR1 and CR2 scores.

The correlation between UCLA and UCB HR scores presented in Table 2A highlights the differences between the UCLA and UCD HR processes in the overall assessment of admissibility, notwithstanding the substantial similarity of the two HR processes. For example, 62% of all applicants to UCD for fall 2011 who also applied to both UCLA and UCB (18,902 total) received an HR score between 4 and 5 (inclusive) from UCB while only 43% of the same applicants were assigned an HR score between 4 and 5 from UCLA. On the other end of the spectrum, 7% of the applicants received a score between 1 and 2 from UCB while 11% received a score within the same range from UCLA. This illustrates the importance of calibration in properly interpreting HR scores from other campuses, to fairly and adequately compare applications not read at UCD with those receiving in-house HR review, while mitigating biases associated with cross-campus differences in selectivity.

**Bin Filling**

These simulations involve determination of the specific UCD score bin to which a given applicant’s UCLA HR score corresponds, among the range of allowable contiguous UCD score bins determined during calibration to ensure self-consistent translation. Note that the bin-filling process occurs after all of the applicants without external HR scores to be translated have been evaluated by UCD readers and assigned to UCD HR score bins.

O. Orgun completed simulations of the bin-filling process using an algorithm that he developed. This algorithm ascribes a quantitative measure of incompatibility to each allowable potential UCD bin assignment for a specific applicant (A) with a given UCLA HR score. To determine the amount of incompatibility, each applicant (B) without a UCLA HR score who is already in one of the allowable assignment bins (as result of UCD HR) is first ranked relative to all other type-B applicants in all of the allowable potential assignment bins. The metric used for ranking could be, for example, a CR1 score or predicted UCLA HR score.
derived for each applicant B. Next, the rank of applicant A relative to all type-B applicants is determined using the same metric. The amount of incompatibility associated with the assignment of applicant A to a particular potential UCD bin (numbered N) is then defined as the sum of (a) the total number of type-B applicants in all allowable assignment bins numbered higher than N (in less competitive bins) who rank higher than applicant A and (b) the total number of type-B applicants in all allowable assignment bins numbered lower than N (in more competitive bins) who rank lower than applicant A. The most appropriate UCD bin assignment for applicant A is the one resulting in the smallest amount of incompatibility, as defined above.

**UCLA HR translated into UCD CR2**

Results of the bin-filling simulations for translating UCLA HR scores into CR2-score bins are presented in Table 1C. The results show non-uniformity in the distribution of applicants with UCLA HR scores among the UCD CR2-score bins to which they are assigned. Specifically, substantially more applicants are assigned to the lowest and highest CR2-score bins than to the middle of the allowable range of assignment bins. This non-uniformity is consistent with the lack of a strong correlation between UCLA HR scores with CR2 scores, resulting in a wide range of CR2-score bins for assignment of applicants with a given UCLA HR score (as exhibited in Table 1A). Since the bin-filling process forces all applicants with a given UCLA HR score into a relatively narrow range of allowable UCD bins, it is then natural that most of these applicants (who might have been otherwise placed into UCD bins outside of the allowable UCD bin range had their applications been read at UCD) will be forced into the lowest and highest allowable UCD bins, which are closest to the bins into which the applicants might have otherwise been assigned.

**UCB HR translated into UCLA HR**

As a follow-up to the simulations of filling UCD CR2 bins with applicants having UCLA HR scores a calibration of UCLA and UCB HR scores was performed (as described above), followed by a bin-filling simulation in which applicants having UCB HR scores but not UCLA HR scores were assigned to bins that originally contained applicants having both UCLA and UCB HR scores. Bin filling was accomplished by ranking via CR1, as described above. The calibration results presented in Tables 2A & 2B have been already discussed, while the bin-filling results are presented in Table 2C.

Table 2C shows that 61% of all applicants having UCB HR scores but not UCLA HR scores (totaling 6,249) would be assigned a UCLA HR score between 4 and 5 through the bin-filling process. All of these applicants had a UCB HR score of either 4 or 5. However a significant number of additional applicants with a UCB HR score of 4 (18% of the total) would have been assigned a UCLA HR score of either 3 or 3.5 through the bin-filling process. This is consistent with the fact that a significant number of applicants in the target UCLA HR bins (having both UCLA and UCB HR
scores) with a UCB HR score of 4 actually received an HR score of either 3 or 3.5 from UCLA, as illustrated in Table 2A.

Bin-filling simulations were performed for two additional cases, involving (a) UCB-HR source bins (6,249) with target bins initially containing applicants with UCLA HR scores but not UCB scores (7,707) and (b) UCLA-HR source bins (7,707) with target bins initially containing applicants with both UCLA and UCB HR scores (18,902). The results for case (a) were identical to those presented in Table 1C, and the results for case (b) were qualitatively very similar.

Calibration-Map Diagrams

Calibration-map diagrams illustrating the correspondence between source and target HR-score bins, based on the data in Tables 1 and 2 and for case (b) defined directly above are attached (numbered 1, 2 & 3, respectively).
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### TABLE 1A: All Applicants with both UCD CR2 and UCLA HR Scores (26,609)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin No.</th>
<th>UCLA HR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UCD Bins</td>
<td>2997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCD Bin Dist</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum Dist</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 1B: Calibration of all UCLA HR Scores (26,609) -- Mapping onto UCD CR2 Bins (48% conversion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin No.</th>
<th>UCLA HR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Calib</td>
<td>2483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum Dist</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Calib</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bin No.</td>
<td>UCLA HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CR2 Bin</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5.5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6.5</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCLA Dist</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA CR2 Bin</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist after CR2 Mapping</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum Dist</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mapped</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping Dist</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum Dist</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original UCD Only</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Dist</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum Dist</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCD Only + UCLA Mapped</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>5190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapped Percent of Total</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cum Dist</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1C:** UCLA (26,609) filling CR2 Bins initially with UCD only applicants (19,206) via Tiebreaking with CR1

**Original UCD Only + UCLA Mapped:**

- **UCD Only + UCLA Mapped**: 7195
- **Mapped Percent of Total**: 77%
- **Score Dist after Mapping**: 16%
- **Cum Dist after Mapping**: 16%
### TABLE 2A: All Applicants with both UCLA & UCB HR Scores (18,902)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin No.</th>
<th>UCB HR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.25</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>2.75</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.25</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>4.75</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>UCB Tot</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Cum Dist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>2829</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>11178</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total in UCLA Bins: 423 | Cum Dist  594 | Total 1134 | Dist 1226 | Cum Dist 1750 | Dist 1501 | Total 2083 | Dist 2011 | Total 3243 | Dist 1853 | Total 1916 | Dist 591 | Total 577 | Dist 18902 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCLA Bin Dist</th>
<th>Calibrated %</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>6%</th>
<th>6%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>17%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cum Dist</td>
<td>Calibrated %</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2B: Calibration of all UCB HR Scores (18,902) – Mapping onto UCLA HR Bins (70% conversion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin No.</th>
<th>UCB HR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.25</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>2.75</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.25</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>4.75</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>UCB Tot</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Cum Dist</th>
<th>% Calib</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>2829</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>9878</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Calibrated: 194 | Cum Dist 338 | Total 649 | Cum Dist 294 | Total 891 | Cum Dist 449 | Total 1521 | Cum Dist 1499 | Total 2829 | Cum Dist 1727 | Total 1754 | Cum Dist 495 | Total 575 | Cum Dist 13215 | 70% | 100%     | 42% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution %</th>
<th>Calibrated %</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>12%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>21%</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cum Dist %</td>
<td>Calibrated %</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % Calibrated | Calibrated % | 46% | 57% | 57% | 24%| 51% | 30%| 73% | 75% | 87% | 93% | 92% | 84%| 100% | 70% |
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### TABLE 2C: UCB (6,249) filling Bins initially with both UCLA & UCB (18,902) via Tiebreaking with CR1

#### UCLA HR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bin No.</th>
<th>UCB HR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.25</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>2.75</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.25</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>4.75</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>UCB Tot</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Cum Dist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>4575</td>
<td>73% 94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>6% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Mapped

- **Mapping Dist**: 0%
- **Cum Dist**: 0%
- **Original Dist**: 423
- **Original Cum Dist**: 2%
- **Orig Destin. + UCB Mapped**: 453
- **Mapped Percent of Total**: 52%
- **Score Dist after Mapping**: 2%
- **Cum Dist after Mapping**: 2%

#### Dist and Cum Dist after Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Dist</th>
<th>Cum Dist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Score Dist and Cum Dist after Mapping

- **Score Dist**: 2%
- **Cum Dist**: 2%
Calibration-Map Diagram 1

Calibration Mapping of UCLA HR scores onto UCD CR2-score bins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCD CR2-SCORE BINS</th>
<th>UCLA HR SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Calibration-Map Diagram 2

Calibration Mapping of UCB HR scores onto UCLA-score bins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCLA HR SCORES</th>
<th>UCB HR SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Calibration-Map Diagram 3

Calibration Mapping of UCLA HR scores onto UCB-score bins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCB HR SCORES</th>
<th>UCLA HR SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A "Bin-Filling" approach to HR-Score Mapping
by Ralph Aldredge
(approved by the Admissions & Enrollment Committee, 5/10/11)

1. UCD HR of applications that don’t have available UCX HR scores, resulting in a distribution of these applications over 13 bins, each characterized by a size (number of applications in the bin) and discrete percentile (number of all other applicants reviewed thus far with scores below that of those in the bin); understanding that the bin sizes and percentiles will change somewhat from those identified initially (before averaging) to guide the readers—e.g., top 25%, middle 40% divided into 5 bins and bottom 35%.

2. Calibration of UCX HR scores with UCD HR Scores by performing local UCD HR of a sample of applications (e.g., 1000) with UCX HR scores that are likely to be in a tie-breaking range; for example, UCLA HR scores of 2.75, 3 & 3.5.

3. Using the results of the calibration to distribute applications with sufficiently high UCX HR scores over the bins created in step one, resulting in changes in the respective bin sizes and associated percentiles.

4. Evaluation of the remaining applications, those with sufficiently low UCX HR scores (e.g., UCLA HR scores of 4 and 4.25) with the abbreviated local UCD HR process (one read) and then distributing these applications over the bins defined by step 3, resulting in further changes in the respective bin sizes and associated percentiles.

The final result of this process is the distribution of all applicants over 13 bins, each characterized by a size (number of applications in the bin) and associated percentile (number of all other applicants reviewed with scores below that of those in the bin). Each applicant would then have a unique percentile, representing the number of all other applicants to UCD (irrespective of wherever else they might have applied) that have lower scores. This percentile, the UCD Common Percentile Score, could be useful to other campuses.
## Freshman Application Scoring Guidelines for Readers

Approved by the Admissions & Enrollment Committee, 7/5/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCD Bin</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Cumm. Percentile</th>
<th>Likely Admit Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>85-99 (top 15%)</td>
<td>85-99 (top 15%)</td>
<td>Likely admits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75-85 (next 10%)</td>
<td>75-99 (top 25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65-75 (next 10%)</td>
<td>65-99 (top 35%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55-65 (next 10%)</td>
<td>55-99 (top 45%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>45-55 (next 10%)</td>
<td>45-99 (top 55%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35-45 (next 10%)</td>
<td>35-99 (top 65%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0-35 (bottom 35%)</td>
<td>0-99 (top 99%)</td>
<td>Likely denied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governing UCD HR Principles:

1. All applicants, regardless of where their HR scores come from, will be ranked on a single scale, which will be used to make final admit/deny decisions.
2. The scale used will be that generated through the UCD HR process.
3. The relative rankings of the UCD applicants (generated by the UCD HR process) will be invariant: the addition of UCLA scores to the UCD scale will not change the relative rankings of UCD applicants with respect to other UCD applicants.
4. Each applicant with a UCLA score will be assigned to one specific UCD score level.
5. A number of applications with UCLA scores will undergo a full UCD read and these applications will be used for calibrating the UCLA and UCD score scales.
6. UCLA applicants will be assigned to a UCD score level that is in agreement with the calibration.
7. Where calibration leaves the exact UCD score equivalent for a UCLA score indeterminate (one of several possible UCD scores would be possible), a “bin-filling” algorithmic method (similar to the tie break procedure used for final admit/deny decisions, but not necessarily identical) will be used to assign the UCLA scores to a specific UCD level.
8. Admit/deny cutoffs for all majors will be assigned on this shared score scale (at major-specific scores).
9. The score level within which the admit/deny cutoff falls will be subject to a final (algorithmic) tie break.

Notice that all human evaluation has taken place before these steps, in generating the HR scores. There is no further human evaluation once the HR scores are given.

Components to be discussed:
A. Calibration of the UCLA and UCD scales to determine the range of appropriate UCD “bins” for bin filling.
B. Choosing a specific UCD bin from among those consistent with the calibration (“bin filling”)

**Calibration Overview**

We start with UCD-generated HR scores:

The bin sizes are meant to approximate the proportion of applicants with each given score, but are not exactly to scale.

HR scores from UCLA will also come in a 13-level scale. Applications in the shaded bins will preferably be read at UCD and their UCD scores used. However, calibration and bin filling will include these bins, in case there are some applications with these scores that are not read at UCD for logistical reasons. The bin sizes in this picture are probably not very accurate; they are nonetheless drawn at different sizes to attract attention to the fact that, while UCLA and UCD use the same number of overall score levels, the distributions of the specific scores are very different by design.
A calibration algorithm proposed by O. Orgun and presented at the A&E meeting on 5/10/11 is described in detail below. This algorithm is designed to achieve a self-consistent mapping of UCLA HR scores to UCD HR scores when both scores are known. In other words, this algorithm determines the range of contiguous UCD HR scores appropriate for possible assignment of an applicant with a given UCLA HR score while preserving that applicant’s rank upon translation relative to other applicants whose UCLA HR scores are also translated. The diagram below provides an example of the results of calibration and bin-filling, showing the assignment of several (imaginary) UCLA applicants to UCD score levels.

Of note:

a) UCLA applicants with the same UCLA score may be assigned to any one of a number of contiguous UCD bins.

b) A given UCD bin may have UCLA applicants coming into it from any one of a number of adjacent UCLA bins.

c) For two UCLA applicants A, B, if A is in a higher UCLA bin than B, then A cannot be in a
lower UCD bin than B (self-consistent mapping)

d) The range of UCD bins to which an applicant with a given UCLA score can be potentially assigned is determined by the score calibration procedure described below.

e) Likewise, the range of UCLA bins from which applicants assigned to a given UCD bin are obtained will depend on the calibration procedure described below.

**Calibration Algorithm**

We start with about 1,000 applications to be scored both at UCLA and at UCD. Each set of scores (UCLA scores; UCD scores) will put this set of applications in a partially ordered set (poset). The ordering relation has some useful properties (these probably appear trivial to us, but the literature on posets seems to imply that these properties are important in developing a way to merge two posets). In particular, for any pair A, B,  A > B implies B < A. Furthermore, for a triplet A, B, C, A > B and B > C together imply A > C.

In developing a calibrated scale against which other applicants (with only UCLA or only UCD scores) can be compared, it seems that a good step is to merge the partial orderings of the test set given by the UCLA and UCD scores. The result will still be a poset containing all the same applications, but one with more ordering relations specified (fewer applicants left mutually unranked) than in the UCLA or UCD posets.

Ideal case: the UCLA and UCD HR scores for the 1,000 test cases are such that there are no inconsistencies in the relative ranking of the applicants. That is, for an arbitrary pair of applicants, A and B:

\[
\text{UCLA-score}(A) > \text{UCLA-score}(B) \implies \text{UCD-score}(A) \geq \text{UCD-score}(B) \\
\text{and} \\
\text{UCD-score}(A) > \text{UCD-score}(B) \implies \text{UCLA-score}(A) \geq \text{UCLA-score}(B)
\]

One easy way to come up with a combined poset seems to be this: Consider the top score stratum in each poset (UCD scores; UCLA scores). Whichsoever set is smaller becomes the top layer of the combined scale. Now, remove the applicants assigned to this layer. Then look at the top layers of the remainders of the two posets and repeat the process until all applicants are accounted for. This will give a combined ordering of the 1,000 test cases. There will be at most 25 layers in this combined scale (since there are 13 layers in each of the source scales). Here's a simplified demonstration of this procedure applied to input scales of 7 layers each (instead of 13 each). Each letter of the alphabet represents an individual applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCLA score</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>UCD score</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F, G, H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J, K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I, J, K, L</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>M, N, O, P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q, R, S, T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>P, Q, R, S, T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In combining these scales, we first identify the scale that has the smallest top layer. This is the UCLA scale, where only candidate A has a score of 1. The top layer of that scale (in this case, the singleton set of candidate A) becomes the top layer of the combined scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combine scores (UCLA/UCD)</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also remove applicants in this layer (in this case, candidate A) from the UCLA and UCD (source) scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCLA score</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>UCD score</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B, C, D, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>F, G, H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I, J, K, L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J, K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M, N, O, P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Q, R, S, T</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P, Q, R, S, T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>P, Q, R, S, T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we repeat the layering process: the smallest top layer is UCLA score 2, with candidates B, C. We add those to the combined scale and remove them from the original scales. After several more iterations, we reach this state:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combine scores (UCLA/UCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Original scales (portion not yet combined):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCLA score</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>UCD score</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B, C, D, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>F, G, H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I, J, K, L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J, K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M, N, O, P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Q, R, S, T</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P, Q, R, S, T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>P, Q, R, S, T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now the smallest top layer is UCD score 2, with applicants F, G. The next step gives us:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined scores (UCLA/UCD)</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5/1</td>
<td>D, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>F, G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Repeating this for the rest of the scales, we get:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined scores (UCLA/UCD)</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5/1</td>
<td>D, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>F, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>J, K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5/5</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5/6</td>
<td>N, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5/7</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>Q, R, S, T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we consider a more realistic case, in which the UCLA and UCD stratifications are not fully consistent with one another. That is, there are some candidates A1 and A2 such that UCLA-score(A1) > UCLA-score(A2) but UCD-score(A2) > UCD-score(A1). The calibration process will eliminate candidates with mismatched scores from the calibration and develop a combined scale containing only scores that are consistent across the two campuses. The number of scores retained in the calibration is a measure of the degree of consistency between the scores from the two campuses.

An example follows, in which there is only one candidate whose score is mismatched between UCLA and UCD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCLA score</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>UCD score</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A, C, D, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B, F, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F, G, H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>J, K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I, J, K, L</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>M, N, O, P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q, R, S, T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>P, Q, R, S, T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One way to proceed would be to modify the top layer selection process above slightly: for the top layer system to work, one of the top layers needs to be a subset of the other (such that we make the subset the next layer of the combined scale). Score mismatches will give rise to intersecting top layers. The task is to drop the smallest number of elements from one of the top layers to regain a subset relationship. To do this, we simply compare the number of elements in each top layer that is not in the top layer of the other scale. Whichever one is smaller gets dropped. In the present example, this happens in the second step (after we have assigned A to the top layer with no mishaps). Now the new top layers are:

UCLA: B, C  
UCD: C, D, E

Neither is a subset of the other.  
The difference sets are:  
In UCLA but not in UCD: B  
In UCD but not in UCLA: D, E

Since \( \{B\} \) is the smaller set, it gets dropped from the combined ranking, which eventually results in the following calibration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined scores (UCLA/UCD)</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5/1</td>
<td>D, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>F, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>J, K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5/5</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5/6</td>
<td>N, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5/7</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>Q, R, S, T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The candidate with the mismatched scores did not end up contributing to the calibration of the score scales. I believe this is as it should be; calibration this way is based on scores that are consistent across the two campuses.

Applicants who were dropped from the score calibration for mismatched scores will still need to be assigned final scores for their admission decisions. There are several ways one could do this (a) to ignore their UCLA scores altogether since they have undergone two UCD reads. The other possibility (because they have mismatched scores, which might indicate some difficulty in determining their proper score) is (b) for them to undergo a third UCD read; if their UCD score was already the result of a third read, then that score presumably stands. A&E has decided to adopt approach (a).
The results of the fictitious calibration example described above are summarized below in both tabular and graphical forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined scores (UCLA/UCD)</th>
<th>UCD scores</th>
<th>UCLA scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5/1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5/5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5/6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5/7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next step is the bin-filling process, which determines for example the following:

a) Which applicants with UCLA scores of 3 will be placed in UCD bin 2 and which ones in UCD bin 3?

b) Which UCLA applicants with UCLA scores of 4.5 will be placed in UCD bin 5, which ones in UCD bin 6, and which ones in UCD bin 7?

Note that once an applicant with a UCLA score (whose application is not read locally) is placed in a UCD bin, their UCLA score is no longer used for any purpose. Therefore, when final admission decisions are made, applicants in UCD bin 1 will no longer be distinguished from one another based on whether their UCLA HR scores were 1, 2, or 2.5. If a given major's cutoff line falls inside UCD bin 1, all these three groups of UCLA applicants will participate in tie break, along with all UCD applicants who were given UCD HR scores of 1.

**Bin-filling Algorithm**

An algorithm for bin-filling, when (according to calibration) two or more UCD bins correspond to a given UCLA bin, is described below.

Suppose that a given UCLA bin corresponds to a certain range of UCD bins. Assume that a specific individual UCLA candidate is assigned to one of these UCD bins. We can define a measure of the incompatibility of this bin assignment as follows:

Within each UCD bin (separately), rank the existing applicants according to some ranking method (e.g., CR1 scores). Also determine the relative ranking of the individual UCLA applicant with respect to the existing applicants in each bin. Now, for each UCD bin better than the actual bin that the UCLA applicant is assigned to, it is undesirable for existing candidates within this bin to be ranked lower than the UCLA applicant. Likewise, for UCD bins worse than the one that the candidate is assigned to, it is undesirable for existing candidates to be ranked higher than the UCLA applicant.
For each potential UCD bin for our given applicant, we can add up these incompatibility measures. Then, the applicant is placed in the UCD bin that yields the smallest total incompatibility.

Here is an example:

Suppose UCLA bin X may (according to calibration) correspond to UCD bins A, B, C, D (with A the best and D the worst).

Suppose candidate Q is in UCLA bin X and the bin-filling algorithm is to be used to assign them to UCD bin A, B, C, or D.

Define the following values:
\( A_{\text{better}} \): number of candidates in UCD bin A that are ranked higher (according to CR1 scores) than candidate Q.

Analogously, \( A_{\text{worse}} \), \( B_{\text{better}} \), \( B_{\text{worse}} \), \( C_{\text{better}} \), \( C_{\text{worse}} \), \( D_{\text{better}} \), \( D_{\text{worse}} \)

Now, if we were to put Q in UCD bin A, the total incompatibility would be:
\[ B_{\text{better}} + C_{\text{better}} + D_{\text{better}} \]

For bin B:
\[ A_{\text{worse}} + C_{\text{better}} + D_{\text{better}} \]

For bin C:
\[ A_{\text{worse}} + B_{\text{worse}} + D_{\text{better}} \]

For bin D:
\[ A_{\text{worse}} + B_{\text{worse}} + C_{\text{worse}} \]

Whichever bin assignment yields the smallest total incompatibility value is chosen.
This is a code for calibration written by Orgun Orhan in Python

UCLA_scores = [5, 4.75, 4.5, 4.25, 4, 3.5, 3, 2.75, 2.5, 2.25, 2, 1.5, 1]

UCD_scores = [7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1]

#Rows: UCLA HR scores
#Column: UCD CD scores translated into 7-point scale
#Each cell is number of apps with UCLA/UCD score combination
#These are listed from best to worst
score_corrs = [
    [361, 59, 27, 5, 1, 2, 2],
    [500, 95, 30, 12, 2, 2, 17],
    [807, 231, 134, 55, 25, 4, 32],
    [682, 336, 194, 103, 41, 18, 45],
    [692, 490, 417, 264, 131, 67, 74],
    [410, 384, 290, 105, 118, 105],
    [301, 432, 494, 506, 427, 278, 296],
    [140, 309, 398, 465, 471, 421, 540],
    [84, 247, 414, 598, 780, 851, 1763],
    [13, 70, 125, 200, 342, 496, 1694],
    [5, 25, 57, 86, 202, 341, 2668],
    [1, 4, 5, 10, 17, 67, 1019],
    [1, 0, 2, 3, 8, 22, 1058]
]

def construct_column(UCLA_position, UCD_position):
    column = []
    for i in range(UCLA_position, len(score_corrs)):
        column.append(score_corrs[i][UCD_position])
    return column

#Initialize

#Scores
current_UCLA_score = UCLA_scores.pop()
current_UCD_score = UCD_scores.pop()

#Calibration results
calib = []

#Position in score correspondence table
current_UCLA_position = 0
current_UCD_position = 0

print("UCLA --> UCD")

while(UCLA_scores and UCD_scores):
    # Candidates with current UCLA/UCD score combination
    shared = score_corrs[current_UCLA_position][current_UCD_position]
    if shared:  # This should in fact always be non-zero
        print(current_UCLA_score, " --> ", current_UCD_score)
        calib.append([current_UCLA_score, current_UCD_score])

    UCLA_array =
    score_corrs[current_UCLA_position][current_UCD_position:]  # rows
can be referenced directly
    UCD_array = construct_column(current_UCLA_position,
current_UCD_position)  # column needs to be constructed

    #print("\nUCLA array: ", UCLA_array)
    #print("UCD array: ", UCD_array)
    #print("Shared: ", shared, "\n")

    # Difference sets
    UCLA_not_in_UCD = sum(UCLA_array) - shared
    UCD_not_in_UCLA = sum(UCD_array) - shared
    #print("UCLA not in UCD: ", UCLA_not_in_UCD)
    #print("UCD not in UCLA: ", UCD_not_in_UCLA)

    if UCLA_not_in_UCD > UCD_not_in_UCLA:
        # discard the smaller; keep the larger
        current_UCD_score = UCD_scores.pop()
        current_UCD_position += 1
        UCLA_array.pop(0)
    else:  # not dealing with equal numbers
        current_UCLA_score = UCLA_scores.pop()
        current_UCLA_position += 1
        UCD_array.pop(0)
# Peeling done; figure out which side still has material left
# Everything left on that side can correspond to the lowest score
# on the other side

if UCLA_scores:
    print(current_UCLA_score, " --> ", current_UCD_score)
    calib.append([current_UCLA_score, current_UCD_score])
    for i in range(len(UCLA_scores)):
        print(UCLA_scores[-i-1], " -->", current_UCD_score)
        calib.append([UCLA_scores[-i-1], current_UCD_score])

if UCD_scores:
    print(current_UCLA_score, " --> ", current_UCD_score)
    for i in range(len(UCD_scores)):
        print(current_UCLA_score, " -->", UCD_scores[-i-1])
        calib.append([current_UCLA_score, UCD_scores[-i-1]])
This is a code for bin-filling written by Orgun Orhan in Python

#File format: 3 columns  
#UCLA HR score; UCD CR2 score; UCD CR1 score
shared_apps_file = open('HR.CR2.CR1.csv')

#File format: 2 columns
#UCD CR2 score; UCD CR1 score
UCD_apps_file = open('CR2.CR1.csv')

#Read in UCLA/UCD shared applicant scores
print('Reading in shared applicant scores...',)
shared_apps = []
for app in shared_apps_file:
    scores = app.strip().split(';')  
    #print(scores)
    HR = float(scores[0])  #UCLA HR score
    CR2 = int(scores[1])  #UCD CR1 score
    CR1 = int(scores[2])  #UCD CR2 score; stands in for UCD HR score in calibration
    shared_apps.append({'HR':HR, 'CR1':CR1, 'CR2':CR2})  #Each app is a dictionary with scores as values
shared_apps_file.close()
print('done')

#Read in UCD-only applicant scores
print('Reading in UCD-only applicant scores...',)
UCD_apps = []
for app in UCD_apps_file:
    scores = app.strip().split(';')  
    #print(scores)
    #HR = float(scores[0])  #UCD-only apps; these do not have UCLA HR1 scores
    CR2 = int(scores[0])  #CR2 score; stands in for HR score (done below in filling in bin populations)
    CR1 = int(scores[1])  #CR2 scores; will be used for ranking during bin filling
    UCD_apps.append({'CR1':CR1, 'CR2':CR2})
UCD_apps_file.close()
print('done')

#Sort applicants according to CR2 score so that they can be assigned to HR1 bins
UCD_apps = sorted(UCD_apps, key = lambda UCD_apps: UCD_apps['CR2'])
# Arbitrary; in real life will be whatever it turns out to be when human readers have scored all applications
UCD_bin_percents = [10, 7.5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 17.5, 20]

# Assign students to UCD "HR" bins according to CR1 scores, in the proportions given above
print('Assigning UCD-only students to "HR" bins...',)
for UCD_bin in UCD_bin_percents:
    UCD_bin_sizes.append(int(UCD_bin * n_UCD_apps / 100))
UCD_bin_sizes.append(n_UCD_apps - sum(UCD_bin_sizes)) # This eliminates any rounding mishaps

# Populate UCD bins with actual applicants
# Each applicant is represented by their CR1 score
for i in range(len(UCD_bin_sizes)):
    binpop = UCD_bin_sizes[i]
    bin_apps = []
    for j in range(binpop):
        app = UCD_apps.pop() # Pop from end, starting with highest score
        bin_apps.append(app['CR1'])
    UCD_bin_populations[i+1] = sorted(bin_apps) # Ranked to facilitate bin filling
print('done')

# Example calibration taken from Ralph's simulations
# In real life, to be calculated from actual scores
# UCD bin scores are given as whole numbers; this makes it simpler to access them
print('done')
calibration = { # Keys are UCLA HR scores; values are lists of potential UCD bins
def binfill(target_bins, CR1, bin_populations):
    positions = []  # number of applicants above and below current applicant in bin, according to CR1 score ranking

    # Only one possible bin, no need to tie break
    if len(target_bins) == 1:
        # print("Assigned to sole bin", target_bins[0])
        return target_bins[0]

    # More than one bin possible, need to tie break
    print("Tie breaking applicant with CR score of", CR1, "among UCD bins", target_bins)
    for possible_bin in target_bins:
        # print("Checking bin", possible_bin)
        target_bin_population = bin_populations[possible_bin]
        # UCD students already in bin, represented by their CR1 scores
        num_below = 0
        num_above = 0
        # Tally UCD scores above and below current UCLA applicant under consideration
        for existing_applicant_CR1 in target_bin_population:
            # print("Existing applicant CR1", existing_applicant_CR1, "vs current applicant CR1", CR1)
            if CR1 < existing_applicant_CR1:
                num_above += 1
            if CR1 > existing_applicant_CR1:
                num_below += 1
        positions.append([num_below, num_above])  # CR1 ranking in each calibration bin
print("In bin", possible_bin, num_below, "below and", num_above, "above current applicant")

#Badness scores as defined in Orhan's email message
badness_scores = []
for i in range(len(target_bins)):
    bin_badness = 0
    for j in range(i):
        bin_badness += positions[j][0]  # applicants below current one in better bins
    for j in range(i+1, len(target_bins)):
        bin_badness += positions[j][1]  # applicants above current one in worse bins
    badness_scores.append(bin_badness)
    print("Badness for bin", target_bins[i], "is", bin_badness)

#Choose bin with the smallest badness total
min_badness = badness_scores[0]
best_bin = 0
for i in range(1, len(badness_scores)):
    if badness_scores[i] < min_badness:
        min_badness = badness_scores[i]
        best_bin = i
    # print("Assigning to bin", target_bins[best_bin])
return target_bins[best_bin]

print('Performing bin filling (long process)...',)
# tie break all shared applicants
tie_break_results = []
for applicant in shared_apps:
    HR_score = applicant['HR']
    CR1_score = applicant['CR1']
    # CR2 is not used here (it is only used for calibration)
    # In real life, for shared applicants with UCD HR scores, these scores
    # would be used both for calibration and admission. Therefore, shared
    # applicants with scores should be taken out of the UCLA pool
    potential_UCD_bins = calibration[HR_score]
    actual_UCD_bin = binfill(potential_UCD_bins, CR1_score, UCD_bin_populations)
student = {'HR':HR_score, 'CR1':CR1_score, 'Bin':(actual_UCD_bin+1)/2}  # UCD bin number converted to UCD HR score
    binfill_results.append(student)
print('done')

# write results to file
print('Writing results to file...',)
rawbad = open('rawbad.csv', 'w')
rawbad.write('UCLA HR score, UCD CR1 score, UCD bin
')
for student in binfill_results:
    HR = str(student['HR'])
    CR1 = str(student['CR1'])
    Bin = str(student['Bin'])
    rawbad.write(HR+',',+CR1+',',+Bin+'
')
rawbad.close()
print("OLE!")
% Calibration Routine
clear all
close all

dirname='./Input Data/';
%filename=[dirname 'hr_input_1000_2.txt'];
%filename=[dirname 'hr_input_1000_1.txt'];
%filename=[dirname 'hr_input_2000.txt'];
%filename=[dirname 'hr_input_26610.txt'];
%filename=[dirname 'hr13x13_CR2_input_26609.txt'];
%filename=[dirname 'hr13x13_CR1_input_26609.txt'];
%filename=[dirname 'UCLA(26609) to UCD_CR2 via CR1_tb.txt'];
%filename=[dirname 'UCLA(26609) to UCD_CR1 via CR1_tb.txt'];
%filename=[dirname 'UCLAvs UCB HR Scores (18902).txt'];
%filename=[dirname 'UCB vs UCLA HR Scores (18902).txt'];
filename=[dirname 'UCB(6249) to UCLA&UCB(18902) via CR1.txt'];
filename=[dirname 'UCB(6249) to UCLAonly(7707) via CR1.txt'];
filename=[dirname 'UCLA(7707) to UCLA&UCB(18902) via CR1.txt'];
filename=[dirname 'UCLA(7707) to UCBonly(6249) via CR1.txt'];

data=dlmread(filename);

[num_stud,dum]=size(data);
n=num_stud;
sid=data(:,1);
%hr_ucla=[1,1.5,2,2.25,2.5,2.75,3,3.5,4,4.25,4.5,4.75,5];
hr_ucd=[1,1.5,2,2.25,2.5,2.75,3,3.5,4,4.25,4.5,4.75,5];
%hr_ucd=[1,1.5,2,2.5,3,3.5,4,4.5,5,5.5,6,6.5,7]; %for UCD data
%hr_ucd=[1,1.5,2,2.25,2.5,2.75,3,3.5,4,5,5.5,6,6.5,7]; %for UCD data
hr_ucla=[1,1.5,2,2.25,2.5,2.75,3,3.5,4,5]; %for UCB data
%hr_ucla=[1,1.5,2,2.5,3,3.5,4,5,5.5,6,6.5,7];
%dum,max_ucla]=size(hr_ucla);
%dum,max_ucd]=size(hr_ucd);
top_ucla=1;
top_ucd=1;
for i=1:n
    sid_tag(i)=0;
end
for k=1:max_ucd
    for j=1:max_ucla
        cnt_all(j,k)=0;
        cnt_good(j,k)=0;
    end
end

[X,Y]=meshgrid(hr_ucla,hr_ucd);
while (top_ucla<=max_ucla)&(top_ucd<=max_ucd)
    for j=1:max_ucla
        cnt_ucla(j)=0;
    end
    for k=1:max_ucd
        cnt_ucd(k)=0;
    end
    cnt_match=0;
    for i=1:n
        if (data(i,2)==hr_ucla(top_ucla))&(sid_tag(i)==0)
            cnt_ucla(top_ucla)=cnt_ucla(top_ucla)+1;
        end
        if (data(i,3)==hr_ucd(top_ucd))&(sid_tag(i)==0)
            cnt_ucd(top_ucd)=cnt_ucd(top_ucd)+1;
        end
        if (data(i,2)==hr_ucla(top_ucla))&(data(i,3)==hr_ucd(top_ucd))&(sid_tag(i)==0)
            cnt_match=cnt_match+1;
            sid_tag(i)=1;
        end
    end

flag_ucla=0;
flag_ucd=0;
    if (cnt_ucla(top_ucla)==cnt_match)
        flag_ucla=1;
    elseif (cnt_ucla(top_ucla)-cnt_match)<(cnt_ucd(top_ucd)-cnt_match)
        for i=1:n
            if (data(i,2)==hr_ucla(top_ucla))&(sid_tag(i)==0)
                sid_tag(i)=2;
            end
        end
        flag_ucla=1;
    end
if (cnt_ucd(top_ucd)==cnt_match)
    flag_ucd=1;
end
elseif (cnt_ucd(top_ucd)-cnt_match)<(cnt_ucla(top_ucla)-
cnt_match)
    for i=1:n
        if (data(i,3)==hr_ucd(top_ucd))&(sid_tag(i)==0)
            sid_tag(i)=2;
        end
    end
    flag_ucd=1;
end
if flag_ucla==1
    top_ucla=top_ucla+1;
end
if flag_ucd==1
    top_ucd=top_ucd+1;
end

%top_ucd,top_ucla, max_ucla,max_ucd
end

for i=1:n
    for j=1:max_ucla
        k=find(hr_ucd==data(i,3));
        if data(i,2)==hr_ucla(j)
            cnt_all(j,k)=cnt_all(j,k)+1;
            if sid_tag(i)==1
                cnt_good(j,k)=cnt_good(j,k)+1;
            end
        end
    end
end
cnt_all
cnt_good
dum=sum(cnt_all,1);
cntall_tot=sum(dum)
dum=sum(cnt_good,1);
cntgood_tot=sum(dum)
rate_good=100*cntgood_tot/cntall_tot
Determining the Range of Predicted UCLA HR Scores that should Trigger local Evaluation
Prepared by Ralph Aldredge, 12/3/11
For internal review by members of the UC Davis Academic Senate
Committee on Admissions & Enrollment and its consultants

Background

Consistent with UCD HR policy, all applications with actual UCLA HR scores of either 4 or 4.25 will be read this year, regardless of when the actual UCLA HR score becomes known. Accurate prediction of UCLA HR scores is therefore necessary to ensure that the number of applications with UCLA HR scores that are read locally is not substantially greater than the number of applications with actual UCLA HR scores of 4 or 4.25, so that reader workload can be minimized. Accurate prediction of UCLA HR scores will also minimize the fraction of applications with mis-predicted UCLA HR scores that need to be read near or after the end of the regularly scheduled reading time frame, as the actual UCLA HR scores become available.

Tongshan Chang and Erika Jackson at UCOP provided UA with separate formulas for predicting the UCLA HR scores of applicants in each of three separate applicant groups, (i) CA residents, (ii) domestic residents and (iii) international applicants. Each formula consists of a single polynomial expression: the sum of the quantitative measures of a wide range of applicant characteristics considered in the UCLA HR process, each multiplied (weighted) by an appropriate coefficient. The appropriate set of regression coefficients was determined for each applicant group from multi-variable regression analysis of the HR scores of all applicants to UCLA last year in the respective applicant group. Also provided by UCOP were correlation tables for each of the applicant groups showing the number of applicants receiving each possible combination of predicted value (PV) and actual HR score. Using the UCOP data, Miguel Robinson and Donalynn Owfook created a table showing the correlation between the PV and actual HR scores of last-year’s CA-resident applicants to UC Davis who also applied to UCLA (a subset of the group of all CA-resident applicants to UCLA).

The range of PV scores that will trigger a local HR read

The correlation between the PV and actual HR scores of last-year’s CA-resident applicants to UC Davis who also applied to UCLA prepared by Miguel and Donalynn was analyzed by R. Aldredge. The goal was to determine the optimal range of PV scores that should trigger a local read of applications for which we expect to receive a UCLA HR score (likely unknown when the application is received). The results of the analysis are presented in the attached charts, as Options A, B & C. Option A involves locally reading all applications to UC Davis from applicants who also applied to UCLA and have a PV between 4 and 4.25 (inclusive). Options B and C expand the group of locally read applicants to include PV ranges of 3.5-4.25 and 3-4.25, respectively. There were a total of 6,972 applications to UC Davis last year from students who received an HR score from
UCLA of either 4 or 4.25. The two columns of the correlation table that show the distribution of PV scores for these applicants is highlighted in grey on all of the attached charts.

In Option A, a total of 6,149 applications would be read, those having a PV between 4 and 4.25. The two rows of the correlation table that show the distribution of actual HR scores for these applicants are highlighted in grey. As highlighted in red, only 3,660 of the total number of applications with actual HR scores of 4 or 4.25 (6,972) would be read (52% of the total). The rest (3,312 or 48% of the total) would still need to be read, possibly near or after the end of the regularly scheduled reading time frame, as the actual UCLA HR scores become available.

In Option B, a total of 10,857 applications would be read, those having a PV between 3.5 and 4.25. The three rows of the correlation table that show the distribution of actual HR scores for these applicants are highlighted in grey. As highlighted in red, 5,781 of the total number of applications with actual HR scores of 4 or 4.25 (6,972) would be read (83% of the total). A remainder of 17% would still need to be read in this case. However, 3,885 extra applications (having actual UCLA scores of less than 4 or greater than 4.25) would have been read as well during the process.

In Option C, a total of 13,799 applications would be read, those having a PV between 3 and 4.25. The four rows of the correlation table that show the distribution of actual HR scores for these applicants are highlighted in grey. As highlighted in red, 6,209 of the total number of applications with actual HR scores of 4 or 4.25 (6,972) would be read (89% of the total). A remainder of 11% of the total would still need to be read in this case. However, 6,827 extra applications (having actual UCLA scores of less than 4 or greater than 4.25) would have been read as well during the process.

The following table summarizes the results of the analysis discussed above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>PV Range</th>
<th>Apps Read</th>
<th>Apps Read w/ 4–4.25 HR</th>
<th>% of all Apps w/ 4–4.25 HR</th>
<th>Extra Apps Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4 – 4.25</td>
<td>6,149</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.5 – 4.25</td>
<td>10,857</td>
<td>5,781</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>3,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3 – 4.25</td>
<td>13,799</td>
<td>6,209</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>6,827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these results, the optimal range of PV scores that should trigger a local read of applications for which we expect to receive UCLA HR scores would seem to be between 3.5 and 4.25 (Option B). This would result in a local read of 83% of the total number of applications having actual UCLA HR scores of either 4 or 4.25, while significantly minimizing the number of extra applications that have scores outside of this range that would be also read in the process.

Notes:
1. The analysis above is based on application of the UCOP PV formula that was optimized for last-year’s CA residents. The accuracy of this formula in predicting the actual UCLA HR scores of this year’s applicants is unknown but expected to be similar to that reflected in the cross-calibration table discussed above, assuming that HR practice and outcomes at UCLA will be substantially similar to those of last year. In addition, it is assumed that comparable accuracy of the PV formulas will result when they are used to predict the HR scores of applicants to UC Davis who also applied to UC Irvine but not UCLA because of the similarity of the HR processes at UC Irvine and UCLA. When these additional applications from UC Irvine are considered, the overall number of applications that are tagged for local evaluation may become less than that indicated in the table above, although the percentages in the fifth column would be expected to be similar.

2. Analyses of the correlation between PV and actual HR scores for non-resident domestic and international applicants to UC Davis who also applied to UCLA, similar to that presented above, should also be performed in order to determine the optimal ranges of PV scores that should trigger a local read of applications from each of these groups. Absent the results of such analyses, the use of the same range of PV scores for these groups as that used for CA residents should be acceptable, given the relatively small numbers of non-resident applicants.

3. It is expected that UCOP will create PV formulas for use by UC Davis each year based on multivariable-regression analysis of actual HR scores assigned at UCLA during the most recent admissions cycle. However, the analysis presented above should be completed by UA at UC Davis each year based on updated PV formulas received from UCOP in order to evaluate their effectiveness and determine the optimal ranges of PV scores that will trigger local reads. This will be especially important as we begin to make use of HR scores from additional campuses other than UCLA in the future and perhaps begin also to focus on different and/or reduced ranges of externally-derived HR scores for further, local evaluation.

4. It would be prudent to take full advantage of UCOP assistance in providing PV formulas annually for prediction of HR scores assigned at UCLA (and eventually other campuses) and to focus our efforts on assessing the effectiveness of the local application of the PV formulas, as described above. The analysis presented above illustrates the importance of the accuracy of the PV formulas as well as the procedures and metrics used for measuring their effectiveness in reducing reader workload. Practicable assessments of the accuracy and effectiveness of any new PV formulas (such as the assessment measures defined in the table presented above) should be performed annually.

5. It would be worthwhile for UA to develop local PV formulas based on regression analysis of UCD HR scores, when available, to enable the
prediction of the UCD HR scores. These formulas would be potentially useful in our algorithmic process of converting HR scores received from other campuses into UCD HR scores; this process is described in detail in the document entitled “Converting UCLA HR Scores into UCD HR Scores (Algorithms & Simulation Results),” which is available on the ASIS A&E committee whiteboard. The UCD PV formulas might also be of interest to other UC campuses who might wish to use HR scores assigned at UC Davis to reduce reader workload, in order to identify a subset for further local review prior to receiving actual HR scores from UC Davis.
### OPTION A: Reading all apps with PVs between 4 and 4.25 (inclusive)

#### Actual UCLA HR Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PV</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.25</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>2.75</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.25</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>4.75</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>2452</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>4257</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>3088</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>24105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes
- **3,660 Apps Read with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR (52% of the total)**
- **6,972 Total Apps with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR**
- **6,149 Apps Read with 4 - 4.25 PV**
- **3,660 Apps Read with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR (52% of the total)**
### OPTION B Reading all apps with PVs between 3.5 and 4.25 (inclusive)

#### Actual UCLA HR Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PV</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.25</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>2.75</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.25</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>4.75</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>2452</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>4257</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>3088</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>24105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **5,781 Apps Read with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR (83% of the total)**
- **6,972 Total Apps with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR**
- **3,885 Extra Apps Read (those with Actual HR not 4 or 4.25)**

10,857 Apps Read with 3.5 - 4.25 PV
**OPTION C: Reading all apps with PVs between 3 and 4.25 (inclusive)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PV</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.25</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>2.75</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.25</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>4.75</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>2452</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>4257</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>3088</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>24105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actual UCLA HR Score**

- 13,799 Apps Read with 3 - 4.25 PV
- 6,209 Apps Read with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR (89% of the total)
- 6,827 Extra Apps Read (those with Actual HR not 4 or 4.25)
- 6,972 Total Apps with 4 - 4.25 Actual HR
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings:</th>
<th>Meeting frequency:</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>As needed – average 2/quarter</td>
<td>fluctuates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total proposals Reviewed: (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)</th>
<th>Total of reviewed proposals deferred from the previous year --</th>
<th>Total proposals deferred to the coming academic year --</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responded to ten Requests for Consultation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>One – implementation of MIV changes to reflect diversity activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed revision to MIV for contributions to diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
None

Listing of committee policies established or revised:
None

Issues considered by the committee:
- Modifying "My Info Vault" to allow input of information related to diversity for use by CAP when evaluating for appointments and promotion
- Updates to “Living Principles of Community” online course
- Pilot Program “Provost’s Fellowship for Diversity in Teaching”
- UC Faculty Salary Equity Study in conjunction with UCAAD findings
- Affirmative Action Recruitment & Retention
- Campus Climate Survey Project
- UC Faculty Diversity Working Group Report

Committee Narrative:

Committee members worked with CAP, the Vice-Provost of Student Affairs and the MIV analyst to find ways to denote diversity service so that it can be easily recognized when CAP is evaluating faculty for merits and promotions. The committee will continue to work toward implementation of revisions to MIV so that diversity may be included in CAP review as per the revision to APM 210 1d which was effective July 1, 2005.

Committee members were integral in providing feedback for the Online Training for Living Principles of Community. A new version will be online in June, and another module for faculty/academics is being developed. Committee members offered ideas of example scenarios to be included.

The committee worked with the Director of the UC Davis Cross-Cultural Center and the office of Campus Community Relations to develop the Provost's Fellowship for Diversity in Teaching Pilot Project. This initiative supports the Cross Cultural Center’s mission to “foster a
multicultural community through education and cultural diversity and establish an environment of cross-cultural learning and exchange for the entire campus." The Call for Applications will go out in June with the goal of having a faculty member selected and in place by the fall or winter quarter of the 2012-13 academic year.

The Affirmative Action & Diversity Committee continues to investigate salary inequities in conjunction with UCAAD. The UC Davis dean of Social Sciences agreed to do an in-depth look at salary inequities. Data analyses were run by their office including only "social science" faculty in the DSS division. This yielded a slightly lower percentage of discrepancy between men and women receiving off-scale salary (37% as opposed to 47%) than our original data. The committee will continue to review and monitor data on salary inequities.

The Affirmative Action & Diversity committee will continue to review diversity data from the Davis campus as well as other UC campuses for both students and faculty. The committee will also continue to review recruitment and retention in regards to Affirmative Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Rivera, Chair
Courtney Grant Joslyn
Kyu Kim
Francis Lu
Cynthia Pickett
Monica Vazirani
Tina Jeoh Zicari
Katherine Arosteguy, AF Representative
Ana Corbacho, AF Representative
Joachim Schnier, AF Representative
Rahim Reed, Ex-Officio
Everett Wilson, Consultant
Debbie Stacionis, Analyst
**Committee on Committees**

The Committee on Committees (COC) traditionally meets bi-weekly during fall quarter and weekly during winter and spring quarters.

During the past year COC was asked to provide a variety of nominees or appointments to system-wide Academic Senate and administration committees/task forces, campus administrative committees and task forces this past year COC responded to 31 requests.
The Committee was also asked to appoint the chair and members of three Davis Divisional special committees during 11-12:

- Special Committee on Simplifying the Academic Personnel Process
- Athletics Special Committee
- Special Committee on the November 18th Incident

CoC meets each year with several select committee chairs to assess committee effectiveness and discuss any issues concerning committee role and function. In addition, the committee meets with various administrators who routinely interact with Senate committees. During this past year, COC interviewed:

- Davis Division Chair, Linda Bisson
- Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, Ralph Hexter
- Committee on Academic Personnel Oversight Chair Shirley Chiang
- Committee on Planning and Budget Chair Ann Orel
- Committee on Research Chair Katherine Olmsted
- Graduate Council Chair Andre Knoesen
- Undergraduate Council Chair Jon Rossini

The Committee’s main responsibility is to fill over 200 standing committee positions annually. In carrying out this responsibility, members contact current members and chair (all current members/chairs are considered for continuing service) to assess committee and membership effectiveness and willingness to continue serving. The outcome of these contacts along with the length of service (the committee strives to rotate members and chairs after 3 consecutive years of service) determines the positions to be filled each year.

Once the vacancies are determined for each committee, COC members seek out replacements with consideration for the list of faculty that expressed interest in serving and committee balance with respect to college/school, gender, and ethnicity representation.

Submitted by:

Richard Tucker, Chair

2011-2012 Committee on Committees Membership:
Patricia Boeshaar, Mathematics and Physical Sciences Division
James Chalfant, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences
Gail S. Goodman, Social Sciences Division
Gregory Miller, College of Engineering
Pablo Ortiz, Humanities, Arts & Cultural Studies Division
Rex Perschbacher, Law/GSM/Education Cluster, Law School
Mitchell L. Sutter, Biological Sciences, Neurobiology, Physiology & Behavior
Richard P. Tucker, School of Medicine
Frank J.M. Verstraete, School of Veterinary Medicine
### Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 4</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: As needed. Most of the work was done online via ICMS.</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: 4 (when courses were being reviewed).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total: 401 Courses Reviewed in ICMS</td>
<td>Total reviewed or deferred from the previous year: 50</td>
<td>Total deferred to the coming academic year: In ICMS: 220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issues considered by the committee**
1) GE Implementation  
2) UCOE Program & Implementation  
3) Proctoring Online Exams  
4) Teaching/Course Evaluations  
5) Requests for Consultation

**Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:**
COCI will be reviewing and/or amending some of its policies and procedures in 2012-13, e.g., in relation to exams for online courses and the course approval workflow.
Committee’s narrative:

Course Requests
The primary duty of the Committee is to review and act upon requests to add new courses and change or cancel existing courses. The following table summarizes our actions from September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>338</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Version</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Version</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Version</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With General Education Impact 217

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rejected/Deny</th>
<th>63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Version</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Version</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Version</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With General Education Impact 29
**Associate Instructors**
The Committee also is required to approve/reject requests from departments to use advanced graduate students to teach upper-division courses. The Chair normally does this without consulting with the Committee (except as needed) and by following explicit Committee policy on this matter. This year the Committee received and approved 158 Associate Instructors from 26 different departments.

**Nonstudent Teaching Assistants**
The Committee is required to approve/reject requests from departments to use teaching assistants who are not UCD students. Normally, this task is delegated to the chair. The Committee received and approved 13 requests from 5 departments.

**Undergraduate Teaching Assistants**
The Committee is required to approve/reject petitions for the use of undergraduates as teaching assistants (this is an exception to policy). The Committee received and approved 0 petitions from 0 departments.

**Undergraduate Readers**
Like undergraduate teaching assistants, undergraduate readers are to be used only in exceptional circumstances. The Committee has written and maintains policy for the hiring of undergraduate readers. However, the Committee does not receive and review petitions for undergraduate readers.

**Grading Variances**
The Committee must approve requests to change course grading from Pass/No-Pass or Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory to letter grade or vice-versa. Normally this task is delegated to the Chair. Following the process described in the Committee web page, the Committee granted grading variances in 25 classes.

---

**Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI)**

**Committee Membership 2011-2012**

At-large Members
Benjamin Shaw, Chair
Marta Altisent
Richard Green
David Hawkins
Nelson Max
Terence M. Murphy
David Webb
Becky Westerdahl
Ex-officio Members
Moradewun Adejunmobi
Rachel Chen
Angelique Y. Louie
Elias Lopez
Lee Michael Martin
Jeanette Natzle
Kenneth Shackel
Judith Turgeon

Academic Federation Representative
Sean McDonnell

GSA Representative
Dan Villarreal

Academic Senate Analyst
Edwin M. Arevalo, Associate Director of the Davis Division
### Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings:</th>
<th>Meeting frequency:</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two 2-hour meetings.</td>
<td>Two times a year</td>
<td>Approximately 4-8 hours for review of the nominations for each meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 16 initial nominations were received and reviewed. 8 finalists were identified. Of those, 4 undergraduate and 2 graduate/professional recipients were selected.

| Listing of bylaw changes proposed: | No new bylaw changes were proposed. |

| Listing of committee policies established or revised: |
| In order to reduce time and workload, committee members reduced the length of the citation to 100 words. By doing this, the citation can be used as the 100 word biography we will use in the brochure. |

| Issues considered by the committee:  | None submitted. |

| Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: |
| To reduce the amount of materials the committee must review, the committee recommends the following revision to the dossier guidelines: |
| c. Examples of Teaching Materials: Choose 3-4 of the following that best exhibit your nominee’s outstanding teaching. |

### Committee’s narrative:

The primary charge to this committee is to select up to six members of the Academic Senate for a Distinguished Teaching Award in either the category of Undergraduate Teaching or Graduate and Professional Teaching.

A Call for Nominations for the 2012 Awards was sent out on November 7, 2011. The committee received a total of sixteen nomination packets for review; seven in the Undergraduate Teaching category and nine in the Graduate/Professional Teaching category. A total of eight finalists were selected at a meeting on January 30, 2012. Finalists were asked to submit dossiers by February 27. Upon deliberation and discussion at a meeting on March 19, 2012 six recipients were selected. Their names were submitted to the Representative Assembly and were unanimously confirmed via a ballot.
The 2012 recipients were presented Distinguished Teaching Awards at the combined Academic Senate and Academic Federation Award Ceremony on May 2, 2012:

**Undergraduate Category:**
- Frances Dolan, English
- Ari Kelman, History
- Davis Osleger, Geology
- Jay Stachowicz, Evolution & Ecology

**Graduate/Professional Category:**
- Richard Sexton, Agricultural & Resource Economics
- Richard Tucker, SOM: Cell Biology & Human Anatomy

Respectfully submitted,

John Harada, Chair  
Ronald Olsson  
Kent Pinkerton  
Peter Wainwright  
Charles Walker  
Sona Hosseini (GSA Representative)  
Debbie Stacionis, Analyst, Academic Senate Office.
CERJ took the following actions during 2011-2012.

### Proposed Amendments to Bylaws and Regulations

*The Committee is authorized “To prepare and report for action by the Representative Assembly such changes and additions to the Bylaws and Regulations as it may deem advisable.” (Davis Division Bylaw 71(B)(1)). The following changes were recommended during the academic year 2011-2012:

1. **Davis Division Bylaw 28: Committees of the Davis Division: General Provisions.** The amendment specifies procedures for delegation of authority by committees of the Division and also gives explicit authority for administrators who are ex officio members of a committee to delegate their membership to a person who reports to that administrator. This proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on June 8, 2012.

2. **Davis Division Bylaw 31: Special Committees.** The amendment allows limited voting rights to members of Divisional special committees who are not members of the Academic Senate. This proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on June 8, 2012.

3. **Davis Division Bylaw 56: Committee on Courses of Instruction.** The amendment gives to the Committee on Courses of Instruction the responsibility of oversight of student evaluation of teaching. The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on April 17, 2012.

4. **Davis Division Bylaws 80: Graduate Council.** The amendment gives explicit authority to the Graduate Council for the approval and review of post-baccalaureate certificate programs not offered solely through a University Extension program. This proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on June 8, 2012.

5. **Davis Division Bylaw 88: Committee on Public Service.** The amendment gives explicit authority to the Public Service Committee for the approval and review of post-baccalaureate certificate programs offered solely through a University Extension program. It also eliminates from the list of members the title of “Director of the Public Service Research Program.” This proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on June 8, 2012.

6. **Davis Division Bylaw 135: Membership of the Faculty.** The amendment changes a clause in Davis Division Bylaw 135, which would specify that the limitation of voting rights in Faculties...
of schools and colleges to Senate members applies only to final actions on matters for the Academic Senate and to advice given to University officers or other non-Senate agencies in the Senate’s name. The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on October 25, 2011.

(7) Davis Division Bylaw 147: Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine. The amendment reduces membership in the Faculty to the minimum required by universitywide Bylaws, and it would allow as representatives non-members of the Academic Senate who hold appointments in its departments. The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on April 17, 2012.

(8) Davis Division Regulation A540: Grades. The amendment would eliminate the Enrolled-No Work Submitted notation and substitute for it a grade of F. A provision is added to allow petition to the Grade Changes Committee for removal of the grade in cases where failure to complete work is due to circumstances beyond the student’s control. The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on June 8, 2012.

(9) Davis Division Regulation 528: Credit by Examination. The amendment allows students registered in a semester to be eligible for credit by examination. In addition, it would allow students registered in Spring Quarter to earn credit by examination in the immediately succeeding Summer Session. The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on June 8, 2012.

(10) Davis Division Regulation 538: Examinations. Three revisions of Regulation 538 were proposed. The first revision concerns the relation between the accommodations and the academic demands and standards of academic performance of the course. The revision prohibits only fundamental alterations. The second revision concerns the provision of facilities and personnel in making the accommodation. The revision specifies that accommodation would have to cause undue financial and administrative burdens in order to be prohibited. The third revision states that course instructors have a legal obligation to provide recommended academic accommodations. The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on June 8, 2012.

(11) Davis Division Regulation 534: Course Evaluations. The proposed Regulation mandates the use of course evaluations in courses specified by the Committee on Courses of Instruction and requires that the course evaluation process protect the privacy of the students and not compromise the confidentiality of the information with respect to the instructor. The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on April 17, 2012.

**Formal Advice Issued**

Most of the work of the Committee involves advising Senate officers, Senate committees, and individual members when questions or conflicts arise. Such advice is not formally binding but suggests the likely outcome should a formal Legislative Ruling be requested. Advice of a recurring nature and/or of general importance is listed below and is also published in CERJ’s on-line Archive of Advice.
(1) **General Education Topical Breadth.** CERJ was asked to give advice on the issue of General Education (GE) Topical Breadth courses, specifically whether it is mandatory for all courses, with very few exceptions, to be designated as Topical Breadth courses. The complete Advice, dated October 11, 2011, including background and rationale, is appended to this report.

(2) **Undergraduate Senior Residency.** CERJ was asked to give advice on the issue of management of the undergraduate senior residency requirement, specifically concerning re-delegation of authority to colleges to waive the senior residency requirement. The complete Advice, dated October 27, 2011, including background and rationale, is appended to this report.

(3) **Submission of Written Petitions.** CERJ was asked by the Divisional Chair to provide advice regarding procedures for accepting written petitions for a ballot on an issue. The complete formal Advice, dated December 1, 2011, including background and rationale, is appended to this report.

(4) **Professional Schools Offering Undergraduate Degrees.** CERJ was asked for advice as to whether a professional school can offer a new undergraduate degree without first obtaining approval at the universitywide level. The complete Advice, dated December 19, 2011 is appended to this report.

(5) **Ballots on Issues.** CERJ was asked for advice as to whether a ballot on issues of the Division may contain more than one separate issue. The complete Advice, dated January 4, 2012 is appended to this report.

(6) **Impacted Majors.** CERJ was asked for advice regarding the authority of an undergraduate college to declare a major “impacted” by restricting admissions to the major. The complete Advice, dated February 14, 2012, is appended to this report.

(7) **Voting in Special Committees.** CERJ was asked for advice regarding the right to vote in a special committee of the Division. The complete Advice, dated April 18, 2012, is appended to this report.

(8) **Special Meetings of the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division.** CERJ was asked for advice regarding several issues related to special meetings of the Representative Assembly, including timing, order of business, and specific procedures for the conduct of meetings. The complete Advice, dated May 7, 2012, is appended to this report.

(9) **Administration of Final Examinations.** CERJ was asked to advise a department chair concerning the administration of final examinations in undergraduate courses. The question was whether a final research project in a course would qualify as a take-home final examination, and if not, whether a final examination is required in the course. The complete Advice, dated June 18, 2012, is appended to this report.
Other Advice/Responses Provided

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

Revision of Senate Regulation 610 (Residency). CERJ was asked to comment on a revision to Senate Regulation 610, which clarifies the meaning of “residence” in a regular term, making it “irrespective of physical location or mode of delivery,” as well as stating that it does not apply to the California Residency Requirement or to non-resident supplemental tuition.

Athletics Strategic Audit. A request for consultation was issued by the Divisional office concerning administration planning for the future of UC Davis intercollegiate athletics programs.

Representation of non-Senate members on Senate Committees. The chair of the Academic Federation inquired about the applicability to Senate committees of Davis Division Bylaw 2 (E), allowing by Bylaw provisions a limited right to vote by non-Senate members.

Electronic Voting in Departments. The Divisional office asked CERJ to investigate how new electronic voting procedures in departments affect universitywide Bylaw 55 faculty voting rights.

Course Approval Procedures. CERJ received a request from the chair of the Committee on Courses of Instruction regarding policy for course approvals.

Representation in Representative Assembly. The Divisional office was contacted by a faculty member who wanted to know why a number of departments have no listed representatives to the Representative Assembly.

General Catalog and the Code of the Senate. A member of Undergraduate Council inquired about the authority of statements in the General Catalog that have no basis in the Code of the Senate.

Membership in the Representative Assembly. A member of the Division inquired about whether he is or is not a member of the Representative Assembly.

Abstention on Ballots in Issues. The Divisional office inquired whether a separate ballot category, “abstain,” could be included in an upcoming ballots on issues.

Pro and Con Arguments Concerning Impending Ballots in Issues. A question was sent to CERJ regarding the format for pro and con arguments being posted on the Web and whether arguments from non-Senate members should be posted separately from arguments from Senate members.
Rescission of Petition. CERJ was asked by the Divisional office whether signatories to a petition for a ballot on issues, which has been certified and announced to the Division, could retract the petition.

General Education Catalog Galley Review. The Divisional office asked CERJ to review a section concerning the General Education requirement for the upcoming edition of the General Catalog.

General Education Requirements. The Faculty of the College of Engineering proposed exceptions to Davis Division Regulation 522, the General Education requirement for the Bachelor's degree.

Ballot for Divisional Representatives to the UC Assembly. CERJ approved the wording of notification of nominations for Divisional Representatives to the universitywide Assembly. Only one candidate was nominated for the three positions for 2012-2014. CERJ declared him elected and Committee on Committees will make nominations for the remaining positions.

Electronic Voting by Emeriti. An emeritus member of the Division asked to vote on ballot issues outside the framework of the e-voting of the Division.

Legacy General Education Course Designations. The Office of the Registrar consulted the Divisional office regarding the format for information regarding legacy General Education (“GE2”) courses in the General Catalog.

Quorum at Representative Assembly Meeting. CERJ discussed with the Divisional office how best to proceed when there is a lack of a quorum at Representative Assembly meetings.

Grade Change Committee Guidelines. Given that the Class Schedule will not be published in the future, the Office of the Registrar has proposed a new method of distribution of the guidelines for grade changes.

Qualifications for Instructor in a Graduate Course. The chair of the Committee on Courses of Instruction inquired concerning the authority of the committee to inform an instructional program about the qualifications for an instructor in a graduate course.

Teaching Privileges of Emeritus Faculty. A member of the Division inquired about whether emeritus faculty have the right to teach courses without being recalled to service.

Graduate Student Re-taking Course. The Graduate Council asked for an interpretation of Davis Division Regulation A540(F)(2), regarding the conditions for a graduate student to re-take a course.

Conflict of Interest in Graduate Programs. The Graduate Council inquired of CERJ concerning possible conflicts of interest when faculty are enrolled in graduate programs that are staffed by members of the faculty member’s home department.
Annotation of Emphasis within Major on Transcript. The Undergraduate Council inquired of CERJ concerning the authority of the Undergraduate Council to direct the Office of the Registrar to annotate student transcripts with the name of an emphasis within the student’s major.

Units in a Major. A member of the Division inquired on behalf of his department concerning whether there is a “preferred” number of units in a major.

Notice of Representative Assembly Meetings. The Divisional office requested CERJ advice on whether documents pertaining to a meeting of the Representative Assembly could be handed out at the meeting rather than being submitted with the meeting’s agenda.

Memorial to Regents. CERJ conducted a ballot of the Division regarding a proposed universitywide memorial to the Regents.

Report of the Special Committee on Athletics. CERJ was asked by the Divisional office to comment on the report of the Special Committee on Athletics. Comments were provided. The report was received by the Representative Assembly and its recommendations endorsed by the Assembly as well.

Election to Committee on Committees. CERJ approved a call for nominations for Committee on Committees. One position was filled by a single nomination, one received no nominations and will be filled by the Committee on Committees, and the third received two nominations, which required an election.

Vice-Chair Appointment. The Divisional office inquired as to whether the appointment of the Vice-Chair for the next academic year requires Representative Assembly approval.

Special Meeting of the Representative Assembly. CERJ gave advice to the Secretary concerning the agenda for the May 9, 2012 Representative Assembly special meeting.

Executive Council Resolution. CERJ gave advice to the Executive Council regarding wording of a proposed resolution.

Faculty Role in Certifying Completion of Major Requirements. On the basis of an inquiry from the College of Letters and Science, the Divisional office requested CERJ advice regarding the Senate faculty’s role in certifying completion of major requirements.

General Education FAQ. The Committee on General Education asked CERJ to review a Frequently Asked Questions document that it intended to place on the General Education Web site.

Graduate Admissions Requirement. A faculty member in the School of Veterinary Medicine (SVM) inquired about whether a Bachelor’s degree is needed for admission to the University of California graduate degree programs. CERJ advised that policy on this matter is within the jurisdiction of the Graduate Council. SVM will petition the Davis Division Graduate Council to allow admission of such students to Davis Division graduate programs.
Return of Graded Work. The Divisional chair inquired of CERJ about whether students have a right under the Code of the Senate to have their graded work returned to them.

Student Petition. The Divisional office asked CERJ for guidance in handling of a student petition.

Task Force on Self-Supporting Degree Programs. CERJ was asked to clarify the role of Graduate Council regarding credential and certificate graduate programs. Legislation was approved by the Representative Assembly for both the Graduate Council and the Public Service Committee clarifying that the Graduate Council has authority over all certificate programs not offered solely by University Extension.

Pending Matters for 2012-2013

(1) Collegiality as a Criterion in Personnel Actions and Electronic Voting in Departments. A member of the Division inquired whether “collegiality” may be used as a criterion in personnel actions and whether departments using this as a criterion must have it approved by the Committee on Academic Personnel. CAP Oversight Committee has been queried about this matter and has responded. This issue has been taken back to CAP-Oversight in the context of the larger question of electronic voting in departments.

(2) Grade of A+. A proposal was forwarded to CERJ from an ASUCD Senate member to increase the number of grade-points for the grade A+ from 4.0 to 4.3. The ASUCD Senate Member was invited to attend a CERJ meeting, and CERJ has drafted legislation based on the discussion. The proposed legislation will be sent out to Divisional committees for review and comment in the fall 2012 if ASUCD still wishes to proceed with the proposal.

(3) Membership of the Faculty Research Lecture Committee. The Faculty Research Lecture Committee has expressed an interest in expanding its membership. CERJ has drafted a proposed amendment to expand the committee’s membership. The proposal will be discussed with Committee on Committees in Fall 2012 and sent out to Divisional committees for review and comment.

(4) Report of the Special Committee on Athletics. Some recommendations in the Report of the Special Committee on Athletics will require legislative action. Amendments to the Bylaws for the Undergraduate Council and the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment have been drafted and will be sent to those committees for review and comment in Fall 2012.

(5) Right to the Grade Incomplete. The chair of the Grade Changes Committee inquired of CERJ as to whether an instructor may prohibit students in his courses from receiving the grade “Incomplete.” CERJ provided advice, and the chair of the Grade Changes Committee indicated that the Grade Changes Committee wishes CERJ to draft an amendment to DDR A540 to clarify the conditions under which the grade is permitted. Legislation has been
drafted and will be sent to the Grade Changes Committee for review and comment in Fall 2012.

(6) Bylaws of the School of Veterinary Medicine. An amendment to the Bylaws of the Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine was received by the Divisional office for review. CERJ advised the Divisional office that a process should be put in place for CERJ review of proposed amendments to school or college Faculty Bylaws and Regulations before they are submitted for approval to the respective Faculty. CERJ has drafted a memo to the Faculty Executive Committee chairs regarding the requirement for CERJ review of proposed amendments to college and school bylaws and regulations. The draft memo will be reviewed and distributed in Fall 2012, and the Divisional office will then implement appropriate procedures.

(7) CA&ES Bylaws Conformity. The CA&ES Executive Committee is looking into making amendments to its Bylaws to conform to Divisional and universitywide Bylaws and Regulations. CERJ prepared a draft of revisions, which was forwarded to the Executive Committee of the college.

(8) Balloting Issues. CERJ drafted a document outlining several issues that came up during the confidence/no-confidence petitions and ballots during the 2011-12 year. CERJ may wish to discuss the document with the Divisional office and advise on future procedures.

(9) Undergraduate Certificate Programs. The chair of Undergraduate Council asked CERJ to draft an amendment to its Bylaw to grant to the committee jurisdiction over undergraduate certificate programs not offered solely by UC Extension. Legislation was drafted and will be sent to Undergraduate Council for review in the fall 2012.

(10) Authority to Rescind Degrees. The Divisional office has requested advice from CERJ regarding the manner in which a Davis Master’s degree in Law may be rescinded when a student enters the Davis J.D. Program. The School of Law is asking for a blanket authority to rescind the LL.M. degree in such cases. CERJ will discuss and provide advice in the fall 2012.

(11) CERJ Web Site. CERJ will be adding links on the web pages for Divisional Bylaws and Regulations to Legislative Rulings and Formal Advice issued by CERJ. Existing web pages for Legislative Rulings and Formal Advice will also be indexed.

Respectfully Submitted,

G.J. Mattey, Chair
James Fadel
Mark Grismer
Kimberly Pulliam, Analyst
CERJ was asked to give advice on the issue of General Education (GE) Topical Breadth courses, specifically whether it is mandatory for all courses, with very few exceptions, to be designated as Topical Breadth courses.

CERJ advises that there is no course which has a mandatory GE designation.

Analysis

Davis Division Regulation 523 specifies criteria for GE certification. The last sentence of sentence (A) states:

Where appropriate, a course may be assigned to more than one Topical Breadth area, and most courses are expected to be assigned to one or more areas. (Emphasis added.)

One way of reading the italicized phrase is that there is a kind of obligation for courses to be assigned to one or more area, as in the phrase “you are expected to remain quiet during class.”

However, there is no evidence that the phrase should be taken in this way and substantial evidence that it should be taken in the sense of a prediction, as in “it is expected that more than 100,000 spectators will attend the game.”

There are several documents that support the latter reading. One is the Rationale of the legislation, which states as a difference from the previous iteration of General Education (GE2):

“The number of topical breadth GE courses is greatly increased because most undergraduate courses will be assigned to a topical breadth area.” (Emphasis added.)

Similar language is found in a document entitled “GE Topical Breadth – Course Approval Description – Draft 11-17-07”:

“The department or program listing courses in the catalog should recommend which of the above three subject matter areas is most appropriate for each course that takes a critical, analytical perspective on knowledge, considering how knowledge has been acquired, and the assumptions, theories, or paradigms that guide its interpretation. Most undergraduate courses should be appropriate for assignment to an area of GE Topical Breadth.” (Emphasis added.)

Here the the word “should” may be thought to indicate a mandate. However, a more plausible reading is that the department or program should recommend certain courses as appropriate if they wish to make the course a General Education Breadth course. The last sentence can be read as before, that it is an expectation that the most courses will be appropriate.
Thus it seems that the intention of these declarations was that there was an expectation that most courses would qualify for GE Breadth, but also that it is up to the department or program offering the courses to apply for this standing.

However, there is a document favoring the claim of a mandate, and it seems to emanate from the following language in a document entitled "Revised General Education Requirement" and posted on the GE Web page.

“The GE requirement is defined in terms of units, not courses. The units of every course at UCD (with very few exceptions) are assigned to one of the three Topical Breadth Areas or are certified as interdisciplinary. Unless otherwise restricted, every course unit that a student takes, including courses for major and minor requirements, will be counted toward the required minimum number of units in each Topical Breadth Area.” (Emphasis added.)

This seems to be the basis for the claim that all GE3 courses proposed for the Revised General Education Requirement must be assigned to a Topical Breadth Area. The language here seems to state that a restriction is required for a course not to count toward Topical Breadth. However, one could read that the “restriction” would be that the department or program did not apply for the course to have Topical Breadth designation. On this reading there is nothing that says that any course must be so designated.

The final piece of evidence is that he chair of COCI has stated that the requirement of application for designation was the working assumption of COCI and the GE Implementation Task Force all along. As there was no mandate for application, there is no mandate for designation.

Conclusion

CERJ believes that the preponderance of evidence is that there is an expectation that most courses will count for Topical Breadth. There are a number of documents from various phases of the planning process are posted on the GE Web site, some of which lend some support to the interpretation of mandatory designation. However, only the Regulation is definitive, and the committee which brought the Regulation forward is in the best position to convey its intent. Along with that committee, CERJ concludes that there is no necessity for any course to have Topical Breadth standing.
CERJ was asked to give advice on the issue of management of the undergraduate senior residency requirement specifically concerning re-delegation of authority to colleges to waive the senior residency requirement.

The legislative basis of suspension (or “waiver”) of the systemwide Residence Requirement (Regulation 630) lies in Davis Division Bylaw 73(C)(6), which authorizes the Executive Council:

To act on behalf of the Davis Division in recommending to the President of the University candidates for degrees and honors in a school, college or graduate division subject to the jurisdiction of the Davis Division. At its discretion, the Executive Council may recommend candidates under suspension of Divisional and Senate Regulations, provided that each such petition submitted by a candidate has been approved by the appropriate faculty or the Graduate Council. Such petitions may include those for the awarding of posthumous degrees. The committee, after forwarding its recommendations to the President, shall maintain in the Academic Senate Office a record of its actions, including separate lists of the names of candidates recommended under suspension of the Regulations.

The Bylaw requires that the appropriate college Faculty (in the case of the undergraduate Residence Requirement) approve any petition for suspension before the Executive Council may recommend suspension. It does not impose any conditions on such approval. Presumably, each college Faculty has in its Bylaws provisions for the handling of student petitions, e.g., by referring them to one of its committees. It is then up to the committee to decide upon its procedures, e.g., the automatic approval of waivers falling within a certain range of units. (Of course, these “approvals” are only necessary and not sufficient for a waiver to take effect—this is beyond the power even of the Executive Council, which only recommends candidates to the President.)

In consequence, the Executive Council has no legislative authority to impose constraints on the college waiver-approval process. Moreover, the Executive Council cannot “delegate” authority to the college Faculties; the basis of their authority is found in DDB 73(C)(6) itself. In turn, the Faculties cannot “delegate” authority to the deans of the colleges, unless by explicit Bylaw provisions.

There are some practical consequences of this advice for the goal of achieving more uniformity in the processing of waivers. The Executive Council can set parameters for automatic waivers if it so chooses. (However, according to its Bylaw, every such waiver still must be recorded and kept in the Divisional office.) It is also in the power of the Executive Council to refuse to consider waivers beyond a fixed number of units, though this might have the consequence of excluding from consideration some special hardship cases. The appropriate Faculty committees may also take such actions (if they have not done so already). Beyond this, the only way to improve the uniformity of the process is through communication between the Executive Council and the Faculties of the colleges.

In some cases, agreements with students that the requirement will be waived may be desirable. Such agreements should not be made until after Executive Council approval of the waiver. Agreements should not be made at the college level, since college “approval” is only a necessary and not a sufficient condition for Divisional endorsement of the waiver. Students should be made aware that even at the Divisional level, the endorsement is only a recommendation to the President of the University.
Davis Division Bylaw 17, last amended in 1971, defines the conditions for a ballot on issues. It reads, in part:

Any issue must be submitted to a ballot of the Division at the request of (1) the President of the Academic Senate or (2) the Chief Campus Officer, acting through the Chair of the Division with the consent of the Executive Council (3) the Executive Council, (4) the Representative Assembly by resolution adopted at a duly called meeting or (5) 50 voting members of the Division presented in a written petition. Upon receiving a petition or other request, the Secretary shall promptly verify the validity of the request, immediately notify the members of the Division of the nature of the impending ballot, and prepare the ballot.

The Bylaw does not specify the form of a “written petition,” and in particular how the request of the fifty voting members of the Division is to be embodied in it. In practice, the procedure followed by the Divisional office for requiring signatures on any “written petition” conforms to another Bylaw. Davis Division Bylaw 16(E), “Provisions Applicable When Candidates Are Standing For Election,” last amended in 2007, states in part that:

Each nomination shall be in writing, shall contain a statement that the nominee will accept the nomination and a brief biography of 120 words or less, and shall be signed by five members of the Davis Division.

The practice until the present for petitions has been to require handwritten signatures, as this is how it has been done traditionally, and the Divisional office has a protocol for processing them. (The language “shall be signed by five members of the Davis Division” dates at least to 1985, when handwritten signatures were the norm.) This method was last used in a ballot on an issue in 2006.

The Divisional office will accept signatures in facsimile form. In the past, this has been done using FAX. However, budgetary constraints in the Divisional office no longer make this possible, so scanned images of signatures are being accepted. For the uniformity required for “a” written petition, the original signatures must be affixed to documents that are otherwise identical except for the signatures themselves. The Divisional office may require additional information such as department and/or title and rank.

Suggestions have been made very recently about means of petitioning without handwritten signatures, original or reproduced, CERJ believes that such proposals must be fully evaluated before being implemented and therefore advises that the current system be kept in place at the present time.
CERJ was asked for advice as to whether a professional school can offer a new undergraduate degree without first obtaining approval at the universitywide level. The advice is that unless a degree title unique to the Davis campus (such as “Bachelor of Business”) would be used, no universitywide review is required.

Rationale

The establishment of degree programs is governed by the universitywide “Compendium: Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units”:

http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/ucpolicies/documents/compendium_jan2011.pdf,

which states,

With the exception of undergraduate degree programs involving a title unique to the campus, all actions involving undergraduate degree programs are carried out on the nine established campuses. That is, creating a new undergraduate degree program, changing the name of an existing undergraduate degree program, and consolidating, transferring, or discontinuing an existing undergraduate degree program are campus decisions and there is no universitywide review of them. If approved by the responsible divisional Academic Senate committee and supported by the campus administration, a proposed action involving an undergraduate degree program is implemented. (p. 9, emphasis added).

The Compendium defines a degree title through examples such as Bachelor of Science or Master of Fine Arts (p. 13). Unless the proposal for a new major would have a new title unique to the campus (e.g., “Bachelor of Business”), there is no universitywide review of the proposal.

Also, PPM 200-25, Exhibit A, contains a flow-chart according to which only proposals for establishing graduate programs are routed to universitywide beyond the campus.

There is a more fundamental question as to whether a professional school can offer an undergraduate degree at all. There is nothing in the “Compendium” or in the Code of the Senate which prohibits a professional school from offering an undergraduate degree. In fact, the School of Veterinary Medicine on the Davis campus offers a Bachelor of Science degree.
CERJ was asked for advice as to whether a ballot on issues of the Division (Davis Division Bylaw 17) may contain more than one separate issues. CERJ advises that the form of resolutions in a ballot on issues is determined solely by the petitioners, whether or not it contains separate issues.

Rationale

Davis Division Bylaw 16(A) establishes the role of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction (CERJ) with respect to all elections:

When elections by ballot are required by the Bylaws or ordered by other action of the Davis Division (except for the election of Departmental Representatives to the Representative Assembly), they shall be conducted by the Secretary of the Davis Division under the supervision of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction.

The traditional supervisory role of CERJ in the case of ballots on issues has been to: (1) advise on the notification of the Division of an impending ballot, (2) check the proposed ballot for conformity to the Code of the Senate, (3) certify election returns.

Nothing in the Code of the Senate requires that ballot resolutions be divided when they contain separate issues. CERJ is not empowered by the Code of the Senate to make such divisions; a specific provision in the Divisional Bylaws would be required to endow it with such power. CERJ will consider whether to propose such an amendment to the Bylaws.

There are two reasons that have been advanced in favor of CERJ’s authority to divide the ballot. CERJ does not find either of them to be cogent.

(1) Robert’s Rules of Order (Section 27, “Division of a Question”) states that in an assembly, where “a series of independent resolutions or main motions dealing with different subjects is offered in one action,” the request of a single member of the assembly is sufficient to separate the issues.

And Davis Division Bylaw 170 states:

The rules contained in Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the Division in all cases to which they are applicable.

But Robert's itself states that its rules are intended to apply to “meeting bodies” which have certain distinguishing characteristics (pp. 2-3). Thus, it applies to the Representative Assembly, to the Faculties and various committees of the Davis Division, and to special meetings of the whole Division. However, in the case of a ballot on issues of the Division, there is no “meeting” or “deliberative” body, and hence Robert’s Rules does not apply.

(2) The California constitution prohibits statewide initiatives covering more than a single issue (Article 2, Section 8(d)). However, a ballot on issues of the Division is not a statewide initiative, and hence this provision of the state constitution does not apply to it.
Impacted Majors
Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction
February 14, 2012

CERJ was asked for advice regarding the authority of an undergraduate college to declare a major “impacted” by restricting admissions to the major. CERJ advises that any decision to declare a major impacted must be approved by the Faculty of the college and reported to the Undergraduate Council.

Rationale

Restriction of admission of students to impacted majors is accomplished by establishing requirements for admission to the major. These requirements ordinarily take the form of a series of courses to be completed, with a minimum grade-point average over those courses. Establishment of admissions requirements by such means as requiring courses for admission to the major (or by other means) constitutes a change in major requirements.

Changes in major requirements historically have been the province of the colleges. There is nothing in the charge to the Undergraduate Council or in the “Universitywide Review Policies for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units” (commonly known as the Compendium), that requires or suggests the need for Undergraduate Council approval of such changes, as they are neither creations of, suspensions of admissions to, or dissolutions of majors. However, because they have a campus-wide effect, declarations of impacted majors should be reported to the Undergraduate Council, given its broad charge to “establish policy for undergraduate education” (Davis Division Bylaw 121(B)(1)).

Because it is a change in major requirements, a declaration of impacted status requires approval by an agency of the Senate. Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(A) states, “The Academic Senate, subject to the approval of the Board, shall determine the conditions for admission, for certificates, and for degrees other than honorary degrees.” Requiring completion of courses for admission to a major is a condition for a degree. Therefore, authority to declare impacted status does not rest with the dean of the college housing the major, but rather with its Faculty. College Faculty Bylaws should state the locus of the authority within the governing structure of the Faculty. But in lieu of Bylaw provisions, CERJ advises that approval by the Faculty Executive Committee would constitute approval by the Faculty.
CERJ was asked for advice regarding the right to vote in a special committee of the Division. CERJ advises that only members of the special committee who are members of the Academic Senate may vote.

Rationale

Davis Division Bylaw 28(A) states: “Committees of the Davis Division include the Representative Assembly, the Committee on Committees, regular standing committees (including the Committee on Academic Personnel, the Faculty Personnel Committees, and the Committee of Academic Personnel Advisers), joint standing committees, special committees, task-forces, and the Faculties of colleges and schools.” Thus, a special committee is a committee of the Davis Division.

Bylaw 28(E) specifies the conditions for voting in committees of the Division. “Only members of the Academic Senate may vote in divisional committees when those agencies or committees are taking final action on any matter for the Academic Senate, or giving advice to University officers or other non-Senate agencies in the name of the Davis Division. Persons other than Senate members may be given the right to vote on other questions, such as those that involve only recommendations to other Senate agencies, but only by explicit Bylaw provisions.”

There are no explicit Bylaw provisions allowing persons other than Senate members to have the right to vote on any special committee. In particular, Bylaw 31, Special Committees, makes no mention of voting rights. Therefore, only members of the Academic Senate may vote in special committees.
Special Meetings of the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division
Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction
May 7, 2012

Special meetings of the Academic Senate are distinguished from regular meetings. Regular meetings are governed by Davis Division Bylaws 18 and 19. Special meetings are governed by Bylaw 20.

A special meeting of the Representative Assembly may be called by the Chair of the Senate, by the Chief Campus Officer, or by the Chair of the Division at any time during the academic year. Upon written request of five members of the Representative Assembly during the academic year, a special meeting must be called within two weeks by the Chair or, in case of his or her absence or disability, by the Secretary. Such meetings do not permit passage of formal legislation.

Timing

A special meeting may be called by the Chair of the Senate or Division, or the Chancellor at any time of the academic year. However, Bylaw 19 requires that all meetings of the Senate take place only after a notification period of at least five instructional days. This limit also applies to meetings called by five members of the Representative Assembly, but there is the further restriction that the meeting must be held within ten instructional days after the written request for the meeting is received.

Order of Business

The order of business in a special meeting is governed by Divisional Bylaw 65, “Order of Business at Special Meetings”:

   The order of business at special meetings of the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division shall be as follows:

   A. Minutes. The reading of the minutes at any special meeting may be dispensed with by a two-thirds vote of the voting members present.

   B. The special business for which the meeting was called.

   C. Any other business that the Representative Assembly may, by the unanimous consent of the voting members present, decide to take up.

The agenda of any special meeting should be formulated according to Bylaw 65.

   A. Minutes
   B. Special Business [specify]
   C. Other Business (by unanimous consent of voting members present)

Resolutions deemed by the Chair to be germane to the special business may be moved, seconded and voted upon during the special business portion of the agenda. Any business falling under the heading of other business, including the proposal of resolutions, must, by Bylaw 65, receive unanimous consent of the voting members of the Assembly present at the meeting to be taken up. “Formal legislation” may not be passed. Bylaw 175(A) defines legislation as follows: “In these Bylaws the term
‘legislation’ shall comprise only Bylaws and Regulations of the Academic Senate and of the agencies of the Academic Senate.”

Resolutions may be moved or seconded only by members of the Assembly, according to Bylaw 36(A).

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. However, the chair (or his or her designated representative) of a standing or special committee of the Division may move or second action on reports of this committee.

Standard rules governing the passage of resolutions apply after unanimous consent has been given to take them up, and such resolutions do not require unanimous consent to be passed.

*Specific Procedures for Conduct of Meeting*

The Chair shall call the meeting to order.

The Chair may ask for a two-thirds vote to dispense with reading of minutes, if there are minutes.

The Chair shall take up the special business for which the meeting is called.

After the special business is concluded, the chair may call for other business.

If other business is proposed, the chair shall ask, “Is there any member of the Representative Assembly who does not consent to take up this item of business?

- If an identified member does not consent, then the item may not be taken up.
- If no member does not consent, then the Chair shall rule that the item be taken up.
- There is no abstention. Non-consent must be indicated actively. [The Chair] then pauses, and if no member calls out, ‘I object,’ the chair announces, ‘Since there is one objection . . .’, the motion is decided upon” (*Robert’s Rules of Order*, 10th Edition, page 52).

If a member of the Assembly rises to make a motion, the Chair shall confirm the membership (by asking for display of the voting card or the name and department of the person). The same procedure holds for seconding a motion.

Debate on the motion takes place as usual. Robert’s Rules of Order allows the following procedures:

- A time-limit on debate or the previous question (“calling the question”) may be moved and seconded by members of the Assembly, and if approved by a two-thirds majority shall limit or end debate on a motion, respectively.
- Voting by ballot (“secret ballot”) may be moved and seconded by members of the Assembly, and if approved by a majority, voting shall be by ballot.

At the conclusion of other business, as the result of a majority vote for adjournment, or at the scheduled adjournment time, the Chair shall adjourn the meeting.
CERJ has been asked to advise a department chair concerning the administration of final examinations in undergraduate courses. The question is whether a final research project in a course would qualify as a take-home final examination, and if not, whether a final examination is required in the course.

CERJ advises that a final research project may be deemed by the instructor as being a take-home final examination. If it is so deemed, then the due date and time for submission of the project is ordinarily that published in the Class Schedule, but in any case no earlier than the first day of finals week. If the project is not deemed a take-home final, then a separate final examination is required for the course, subject to the same time constraints. The only exceptions are courses which the Committee on Courses of Instruction has approved as being exempt from the UC Academic Senate Regulation (SR) requirement that a final examination be administered in all undergraduate courses.

The Regulations of the Academic Senate govern the administration of final examinations on all campuses, including the Davis campus. The relevant Regulations are 770 and 772 (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/manual/rpart3.html#r770).

770.
No student shall be excused from assigned final examinations, except as provided in SR 772(D).

772.
A. Final examinations are required in all undergraduate courses, except as provided elsewhere in this Regulation. Whenever practicable each such examination shall be written and must be completed by all participants within a previously announced time limit. Examinations in non-laboratory courses may not exceed three hours’ duration.

B. Examinations are normally not required in laboratory courses or their equivalent, as individually determined by the appropriate Committee on Courses. At its option, the department concerned may require a final examination in any laboratory course, subject to prior announcement in the schedule of classes for the term in question.

C. With the approval of the appropriate Committee on Courses and upon recommendation of the department concerned, the final examination may be omitted in any undergraduate course or sets of courses either once or for a longer period.

D. At the end of the term in which a student is expected to be graduated, the student's major department may examine the student in the field of the major, may excuse the student from final examinations in courses offered by the department during that term, and, with the approval of the appropriate Committee on Courses, may assign a credit value to such general examination.

SR 770 requires all students to complete all “assigned” final examinations, except in cases where a student takes a general examination in the major during the last term of study. SR 772 clarifies which final examinations are “assigned.” In general, they are assigned to all undergraduate courses except where the Divisional Committee on Courses of Instruction has exempted the course from the requirement of a final examination.
Davis Division Regulation (DDR) 538 imposes specific requirements on the administration of final examinations on the Davis campus.

538. Examinations

(A) Except under certain specified circumstances, Senate Regulation (SR) 772 requires that final examinations be given in all undergraduate courses. Final examinations may be given in graduate courses. (Am. 4/26/82)

(B) At the instructor’s option, a final examination in any course other than an on-line course may be wholly or in part of the take-home type. All examinations for on-line courses must be proctored to ensure that the person taking the examination is the student receiving credit. In accordance with SR 772(A), in undergraduate courses, the writing time of a take-home final examination and an in-class final examination together may not exceed three hours. (Am. 5/4/04)

(C) In each course for which a final examination is required, each student shall have the right to take a final examination (or, when the instructor has so opted, to submit a take-home examination) at the time and on the date published in the Class Schedule. For on-line courses, the University Registrar will offer to the instructor of each on-line class the option to have the final in the last time slot on the last day of finals or at a time on dead day to be negotiated between the University Registrar and the instructor. Students shall be notified of the time and place of the final on or before the first day of instruction. (Am. 5/4/04)

(D) In each course (other than in an on-line course) for which a midterm examination is required, each student shall have the right to take a midterm examination (or, when the instructor has so opted, to submit a take-home examination) during one of the scheduled meetings of the class published in the Class Schedule. (Am. 4/26/82; 5/4/04)

(E) Holding a final or midterm examination (or setting a deadline for submission of a take-home examination) at a time not specified in (C) or (D) requires the mutual consent of the instructor and all students involved in the change (other than in an on-line course). Any student who does not consent in writing to the different time must be permitted to take an examination (and/or submit a take-home examination) at the officially scheduled time. A student who consents in writing to the change of examination time waives the right cited in (C) or (D). (Am. 3/13/95 and effective 9/1/95; 5/4/04)

(F) Any departures from the published examination schedule should be carried out so as not to disadvantage students who are unable to accept the alternative examination schedule. An in-class final examination may not be rescheduled for a date earlier than the first day of final week. The due date for a take-home final examination may not be rescheduled for a date earlier than the first day of finals week. In the case of on-line courses, the published examination schedule is that announced no later than the first day of class in accordance with 538(C), and finals may be scheduled or rescheduled to occur on dead day. (Am. 10/26/87 and effective 9/1/88) (Am. 3/13/95 and effective 9/1/95; 5/4/04)

(G) A student who is improperly denied the right cited in (C) or (D) may file a petition with the Executive Council by the end of the next regular term, for appropriate action.

(H) In accordance with current law, students with documented disabilities may be entitled to in-class accommodations. The student shall provide a letter from the campus Student Disability Center (SDC) with a recommendation for those academic accommodations that the instructor is responsible for
providing. It is the student’s responsibility to request accommodations as soon as possible; this notification must be made within a period of time which allows the university a reasonable opportunity to evaluate the request and offer necessary adjustments. The instructor has a legal obligation to provide recommended academic accommodations, unless the instructor can demonstrate that the accommodations will fundamentally alter the nature of the academic demands made of the student, or decrease the standards and types of academic performance. It is the responsibility of the University to provide recommended physical accommodations. No accommodation shall require facilities or personnel that can be demonstrated to result in undue financial and administrative burdens to the University. The instructor should consult with the student and the SDC if there are any questions or concerns. If the instructor and the SDC cannot arrive at a mutually agreeable accommodation, the matter shall be resolved by a committee convened by the Vice Chancellor - Student Affairs that includes the instructor, the department chair, and a representative from the SDC. (En. 6/8/87; Am 11/25/96; Am 4/14/08) (Am. 6/8/2012)

(I) An instructor may release to individual students their original final examinations (or copies thereof) at any time. Otherwise the instructor shall retain final examination materials, or a copy thereof, until the end of the next regular term, during which period students shall have access to their examinations. (En. 5/25/77; Renum. 6/8/87)

(J) Paragraphs (A) through (I) of this Regulation shall be printed in the General Catalog. (En. 5/24/76; Am. and renum. 5/25/77; 6/8/87)

As required by DDR 538(J) the remainder of the Regulation is reproduced in the General Catalog and thus is readily available to all faculty and students.

DDR 538(F) clearly states that final examinations may not be administered before the beginning of finals week, and that take-home final examinations may not be made due before that time.

CERJ adds that in any course in which a final project is thought by the unit offering the course to be pedagogically preferable to a final examination, the unit should request from the Committee on Courses of Instruction an exemption from the final examination requirement.
Annual Report: Academic Year 2011-2012
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Emeriti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: Two</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: Meet As Needed</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Reviewed: Three (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)</th>
<th>Total of reviewed deferred from the previous year: None</th>
<th>Total deferred to the coming academic year: None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None

Issues considered by the committee
Emeriti Representation on President Yudof’s Pepper Spray Task Force
APM 205 Recall of Academic Appointees; Modification of Regents Policy 5203
Campus policy to give staff employees emeritus/a status

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
**Modify charge to Committee on Emeriti**

**Monitor and provide input to Health Care Task Force appointed by Vice President of Human Resources Dwaine Duckett. The goal of the Task Force is to reduce or at least contain health care costs.**

**Committee’s narrative:**

The committee supported the UCD Emeriti Association’s recommendation that emeriti be included on the President’s Pepper Spay Task Force to provide institutional memory to
the Task Force deliberations. The Committee’s support was forwarded to Senate Chair Linda Bisson who in turn contacted the Academic Council Chair Robert Anderson. The recommendation was given to President Yudof who declined to add an additional member(s) to the Task Force. However, Chancellor Katehi, who had received a copy of the recommendation, contacted UCDEA chair Bill Rains and added emeriti to committees she was establishing including three representatives to the 2020 Task Force.

The Committee recommended that the new policy, APM-205, Recall of Academic Appointees which stated that “Compensation for recall appointments may not exceed a total of 43% time for each fiscal year, inclusive of all recall appointments.” should use salary as a basis for limiting compensation as an alternative to percent time. Using % time was viewed as being too restrictive. The UC Davis campus uses either % time or % salary to determine compensation.

The Committee supported the modification of Regents Policy 5203: Policy on Support Groups, Campus Foundations, and Alumni Associations to include Emeriti Associations, Retiree Associations, and Retiree Centers as “Affiliated Organizations”. This modification by President Yudof provides University recognition of Emeriti and Retiree Associations and Retiree Centers and qualifies them for event liability insurance coverage.

The Committee reviewed a new campus policy that outlines the procedure to be used to give staff employees emeritus/a status. The campus policy is based on University Policy adopted in 1999.
Committee on Faculty Research Lecture Award

Total Meetings: 1  
Meeting frequency: Typically one or two meetings a year.  
Average hours of committee work each week: Approximately 1

Total number of nomination packets reviewed:  
Confidential.  
No nominations were deferred from the previous year.  
No nominations were carried forward to the coming academic year.

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None.

Issues considered by the committee: The criteria to be used when reviewing nominations for the Faculty Research Lecture Award and the questions to be kept in mind when selecting the 2012 recipient of the award. The content and structure of nomination letters and whether the Call for Nominations should contain more explicit guidelines. The possible utilization of the new Director of National Awards and Fellowships, in Academic Affairs, to promote the FRL award internally, that is across the campus.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: None.

Committee’s narrative:

The charge of this Committee is to nominate for election by the Representative Assembly a member of the faculty or staff at UC Davis who has established a distinguished record in research for the purpose of delivering a lecture on a topic of their choice. The 2011-12 FRL Committee fulfilled this charge. The Call for Nominations was updated, and the Call was distributed electronically on October 17, 2011.

Nomination packets were received and reviewed by the committee. On January 17, 2012, the committee met to discuss the nominations, the relative merits of the nominees, and to select the 2012 FRL award recipient.

Professor Michael Turelli, in the Department of Evolution and Ecology, was selected and recommended as the 2012 Faculty Research Lecture Award recipient. On February 28, 2012, the Representative Assembly approved the committee’s selection and recommendation by unanimous vote. Professor Turelli was honored on May 2, 2012, at a combined Academic Senate and Academic Federation awards event. On June 6, 2012, he delivered a lecture.
entitled “How good luck, great collaborators, pretty mathematics and maternally inherited bacterium (Wolbachia) may stop the spread of dengue fever.”

At the combined awards event, Professor Turelli was presented with an honorarium, a certificate mounted in a plaque and a medallion. The Department of Evolution and Ecology hosted the lecture and a reception that followed.

During the committee’s January 17, 2012, meeting, the committee discussed increasing membership to seven, or that number whereby each college and school on campus is represented. Subsequent to this meeting, Chair Dahlgren wrote to Gina Anderson, Executive Director of the Academic Senate, to inform her of the committee’s deliberations. Changing the membership required a formal proposal to amend Davis Division Bylaw 76, the Faculty Research Lecture Committee’s charge. No formal proposal to amend the committee’s charge was drafted or put to committee vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Randy A. Dahlgren, Chair
Bruce C. Gates
Qizhi Gong
Alan Hastings
Charles Langley
Bryan Rodman, Analyst, Academic Senate Office
### Faculty Welfare Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 8</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: 3 / Qtr or as needed.</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total items reviewed: 24 (Listed as &quot;Issues considered by the committee&quot;)</td>
<td>Total number of items carried over from the previous year: 0 However, topics were revisited.</td>
<td>Total items carried over to the coming academic year: 0 However, discussion of issues that remain unresolved will continue to be discussed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listing of bylaw changes proposed:** None.

**Listing of committee policies established or revised:** None.

**Issues considered by the committee:**

- University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity Salary Equity Study†
- UC Wide Review: APM 668: Additional Compensation: Negotiated Salary Program†
- UC Wide Review: APM 670: Health Sciences Compensation Plan†
- UC Wide Review: APM 200: General†
- UC Wide Review: APM 205: Recall for Academic Appointees†
- Retention and recruitment of faculty†
- Campus Email Committee Report†
- PPM 200-45: Pre-purchasing System Review†
- PPM 230-10: Sponsored Programs: Publication Rights (formerly PPM 250-10)†
- Report from the Consortium of Women in Research†
- PPM 290-82: Boating Safety†
- UC Davis Athletics Strategic Audit: 2011†
- Proposal to Discontinue the Electronic Materials Engineering Major†
- UPAY 585 Patent Agreement
- 403(b) Roth IRA Option from UCO
- Proposal to Establish New Minors: Biomedical Engineering; Computational Biology and Informatics⁰
- UC Wide Review: Faculty Salaries Task Force Report†
- Off-Scale Task Force Report†
- Technical Revision Review: APM 35 and 190†
- Self-Supporting Degree Program Task Force Report⁰
- APM 10: Academic Freedom†
- APM 15: Faculty Code of Conduct†
Committee’s narrative:

The committee met eight times during the 2011-12 academic year. We typically scheduled our meetings during the week immediately after the University Committee on Academic Welfare (UCFW) met. The Committee Chair Stuart Hill served as the committee’s primary representative at the UCFW meetings, but Committee Member Saul Schaefer attended the Oakland meetings on two occasions when Hill had other commitments.

During the 2010-11 academic year Committee Chair Saul Schaefer sought to streamline how the Committee managed the large number of issues brought before it. The Committee continued those efforts during the current academic year, principally through the use of electronic communication. The Academic Senate Information System (ASIS) was used to notify Members and distribute relevant information about the Committee’s upcoming agenda with supporting documents. Committee members were encouraged to read and comment in advance on all issues under consideration, especially those that required a Committee response.

There were no items of unfinished business that carried over from 2010-11. Nevertheless, the University’s on-going budget crisis led us to consider familiar issues such as reforming the salary schedules for faculty, providing a sound fiscal foundation for the University’s pension plan and providing high quality health care while limiting how rapidly costs would rise. All told, faculty compensation, broadly considered, was the most common topic discussed. Protecting academic freedom, increasing faculty diversity, updating personnel practices, and addressing several disparate policy initiatives filled out most of this year’s agenda. Beyond these deliberations we initiated a call to offer a new savings option for faculty and staff and we proposed correcting the deficiencies in the procedure for acquiring faculty signatures to a revised patent agreement.

Faculty Compensation

We debated and responded to proposals for reforming faculty salaries from systemwide and the Davis campus. The UC Faculty Salaries Task Force sought to address a problem it describe as of enduring and growing significance: current faculty salaries are too low to be competitive with its comparison institutions and the published salary schedule for the University of California only applies to a diminishing minority of faculty members. The Task Force proposed that as faculty members earn new positions at higher step and rank their salaries should rise to at minimum their campus’ mean salary. As resources become available UC salaries should also be adjusted upward to the median systemwide salary of faculty members who share similar rank and step.

Some Committee members thought that this proposal would benefit Davis’ faculty members, but others opposed this plan because they believed it would lock in Davis’ relatively low mean level of pay. The policy also generated skepticism because of its lack of clarity about which faculty
members at the systemwide level would be used to calculate these new measures of minimal median salaries.

The Committee viewed the recommendations of the UC Davis Off-Scale Task Force far more favorably. The Task Force maintained that Davis best faculty members were not rewarded as well as faculty at other campuses. The proposed solution was to institute a system similar to that used at Berkeley, using half step increases where appropriate, that would allow meritorious faculty to be considered for advancement more quickly than currently occurs. Faculty Welfare endorsed this proposal and others developed by Davis’ Task Force should be adopted.

Efforts at reforming current compensation practices were not limited to these proposals. The Negotiated Salary Program (NSP - PPM 668) seeks to allow faculty who are judged to be in “good standing” and have been successful in acquiring research grants to negotiate with their Chairs and use resources from their grants to augment their salaries. A large majority of the Faculty Welfare Committee concluded that this plan would cause more problems than it solved. The NSP would only offer short term salary increases at the cost of departing from UC’s longstanding system of merits and promotions for rewarding faculty. This new parallel system of evaluation would give the Chairs considerable discretion – too much we believe – with few, if any, safeguards that the current system provides. The NSP suffered from the same lack of clarity about key definitions and procedures as the UC Faculty Salaries Task Force.

Faculty Welfare also provided feedback on the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP – PPM 670). This Plan seeks to regularize how faculty members in the health sciences are paid from their academic and clinical responsibilities. Our reaction to the latest iteration of HSCP focused on making procedural changes. HSCP anticipates that an advisory committee will serve as an important avenue of appeal if faculty members disagree with the decisions made by their Deans. The current proposal allows the Dean to appoint half of the members of the Advisory Committee. We argued that for the Advisory Committee to successfully perform its expected role it needed more independence and the Dean would have to select less than 50% of its members.

The final compensation issue raised this year concerned a study that examined the impact of gender in producing salary inequities across UC faculty. The results of the Salary Equity Study concluded that female faculty earn on average $4,000 less per year than male faculty. This study provides sufficient evidence to justify additional research. Some Committee members, however, questioned the accuracy of the Study’s results. They wondered whether a model that identifies only 2-3 possible causes can adequately explain individual differences in faculty salaries across diverse disciplines and institutions. Most Committee Members believed, furthermore, that Davis’ faculty members are often unaware that they can request a career equity study to determine if their work has been given the recognition that it deserves in terms of rank and step. We recommended that greater efforts should be made to inform Davis’ faculty about this option.

Pension Reform

The Faculty Welfare Committee was updated throughout the academic year about on-going efforts to place UC’s retirement plan (UCRP) on a sound financial footing. We learned that recent improvements in funding UC’s pension obligations from increased contributions by faculty and the administration still fall substantially short of addressing the full scope of the program’s long term requirements. We were pleased to learn that the Brown administration
acknowledged the responsibility of the State of California to contribute to UCRP and initially pledged $90 million only to have the legislature’s subsequent actions cast doubt on that $90 million pledge.

The current challenges to UCRP are not limited to underfunding alone. Representatives from UC medical centers have been pushing to institute a defined contribution pension option for some portion of its employees. Proponents have defended this new option by arguing that many of their technically specialized employees want a more portable pension package than UCRP provides. We have viewed this development with some concern. The strength of UCRP rests in large part on having all faculty, staff and the administration contribute to a common pool of resources to fund a single defined benefit plan. The prospect of peeling off even small numbers of employees who will no longer contribute to that common pool of resources is a troubling precedent, especially when a recent investigation has failed to discover any specific groups of employees who were dissatisfied with UCRP.

Healthcare

The greatest long term challenge to maintain affordable, high quality healthcare plans for faculty members is the rapid increase in health care costs. UC finds that it is difficult to cope with these escalating costs at the same time that the State of California diminishes its financial contributions to the university system. Faculty Welfare carefully monitored proposals to begin to control this rising cost curve in part by having UC’s medical centers create their own in-house health care option - UC Care – for UC employees. We do not yet know whether UC Care will emerge as a viable plan and whether that new option could compete on an equal footing with the other healthcare providers such as Health Net and Kaiser Permanente.

Academic Freedom

Recent court cases have cast doubt on faculty members’ expectations of academic freedom when they address questions of University policy. The Faculty Welfare Committee strongly approves the proposed changes in APM 10 and 15. Under these new guidelines faculty members would have the protection “to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance.”

Faculty Diversity

The Committee was asked to comment on a report by the UC Faculty Diversity Working Group that proposed a number of different policy changes to increase faculty diversity. We found some of the report’s recommendations useful, but not all. Our assessment was guided by one simple assumption: decisions that most directly influence faculty diversity are primarily made by provosts, deans, and department chairs. We backed changes advocated in the report in selecting and educating those key actors that would further faculty diversity. Yet, we were not supportive of other proposals that were distant from these decision makers. We argued, for example, that the costs of having all faculty members evaluated in terms of their contribution to faculty diversity during every merit and promotion review would be too costly given the small chance that these procedural changes would increase the diversity of UC’s faculty.
Personnel Practices

Faculty members are expected to follow the University’s rules and regulations and are potentially subject to discipline if they fail to comply. This expectation was viewed by some in the administration as incomplete because it did not include “policies” with rules and regulations. APM 16 sought to correct this omission. Davis’ Faculty Welfare and UCFW did not see a clear justification for this change nor did we support it. We could not discern when University policies that were meant to govern faculty conduct would fail to be subsumed under its rules and regulations.

A proposed change in PPM 230-10 dealing with a research agency’s requirements to restrict the ability of faculty to publish research sponsored by that agency generated a similar response. Agencies typically seek to restrict the dissemination of research they fund because of possible threats to national security. To receive a grant when publication raises such risks a faculty member under current policy would be asked to obtain an exception to the University’s policy protecting the publication rights of faculty from the faculty member’s department chair, the dean of that individual’s college or school, and the Vice Chancellor-Research. The new policy would require that all of these individuals must sign off on an exception and then go up the chain-of-command and obtain the Chancellor’s signature. Faculty Welfare did not support this policy change because we could not find a clear justification for adding this new time-consuming requirement to an already demanding process of review.

Other Policy Changes

Faculty Welfare offered comments on other policy changes: ensuring boating safety while conducting research, a strategic audit of the UC Davis athletics program, an analysis of a new pre-purchasing review system, proposals to establish new minors in Biomedical Engineering and Computational Biology and Informatics, and discontinuing the Electronic Materials Engineering major. We have not discussed these issues at greater length because they lie outside Faculty Welfare’s core concerns.

Resolutions

The Faculty Welfare Committee initiated two proposals in addition to responding to the requests for consultation described above. The first proposal developed in response to information Professor Francois Gygi from Computer Science provided the Committee about problems he discovered with the patent acknowledgement agreement faculty members were being asked to sign.

He pointed out that the electronic copy of the patent agreement that many faculty members received had an error that inadvertently changed the meaning of a potentially important sentence about the role of the University in this legally binding document. Unfortunately, once this mistake was discovered the problem was not publicized. The process of gathering signatures simply continued as if no error had occurred. Professor Gygi asked Faculty Welfare to investigate and determine if we thought that it was appropriate to bring the issue before the systemwide Faculty Welfare Committee.

The Committee reviewed the issue and voted in March. We concluded that making changes in a legally binding document without the knowledge of the signatories was unacceptable. A new
process should be undertaken to gather signatures when faculty members are presented with an accurate copy of the patent agreement. We followed current best practices and sought the support of the Executive Committee of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate before we brought our resolution to UC Faculty Welfare.

The Chair of Faculty Welfare, Stuart Hill, was scheduled to present the resolution concerning the patent agreement before the May 4th meeting of the Davis Executive Council. He learned in the days prior to that meeting that the Office of the President had transferred responsibility for seeking faculty signatures to the respective campuses and would not entertain reopening the issue. In light of this new information the Executive Council supported a comparatively weak resolution to push for instituting safeguards with vendors who would be responsible for gathering signatures in the future. This resolution will be brought before UCFW in the fall.

The second resolution grew out of a suggestion from Committee Member Joel Hass that UC should add a savings plan, a 403(b) Roth, to the 403(b) plan UC employees can already use. The existing 403(b) plan has the tax advantage that UC employees can invest their pre-tax income in a 403(b) account. They will pay federal income tax when they withdraw funds from this account, typically at retirement when many individuals will see their total compensation and the corresponding tax rate decline. The problem with this savings plan is that its tax advantages only accrue to employees who expect that their future income at retirement will diminish compared with their most productive years.

A 403(b) Roth plan would provide tax relief for employees who anticipate that their future earnings will increase. The Roth option requires that subscribers use taxed dollars to build their investment and then they pay no taxes on those funds when they are withdrawn. If an employee expects that their future earnings will grow it makes financial sense to set aside income at a low tax rate today compared with the higher tax bracket they will face in their retirement years. The 403(b) Roth should be attractive to many employees at UC that look forward to a substantial defined benefit pension plan, social security, and personal savings.

Davis’ Faculty Welfare voted to add a 403(b) Roth to UC’s savings plans and won the support of Davis’ Executive Council and preliminary backing to investigate this option from UCFW.

Respectfully submitted

Stuart Hill, Chair
Michael Dahmus
Joel Hass
Alan Jackman
Bernard Levy
Lisa Miller
Saul Schaefer
Kathleen Ward, Academic Federation Representative
Bryan Rodman, Resource Analyst
# Committee on Grade Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings</th>
<th>Meeting frequency</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Once per month during academic year (excl. March)</em></td>
<td><em>2-3 hours meeting and 6-8 hours additional review time.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Retroactive/Grade Change Petitions Reviewed:</th>
<th>Total of reviewed Retroactive/Grade Change Petitions deferred from the previous year:</th>
<th>Total Retroactive/Grade Change Petitions deferred to the coming academic year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>420</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Listing of bylaw changes proposed:


## Listing of committee policies established or revised:

Committee Guidelines revised on 6-12-2012.
Updated Guidelines may be found at [http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/GCC](http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/GCC)

## Issues considered by the committee


## Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:


## Committee’s narrative:

See attached
**2011-2012 Summary and Highlights**

During the 2011-2012 academic year, the Office of the University Registrar received 5152 Grade/Retroactive Change petitions: 4,099 grade change petitions, 806 Retroactive Change Petitions, and 247 Retroactive Withdrawal Petitions. The Grade Change Committee itself reviewed 420 petitions – 8% percent of the submitted total. The remaining 92% were processed internally by the Office of the University Registrar according to the Committee’s published guidelines. The Committee approved 33% of the petitions it reviewed. It should be noted that the number of students challenging their assigned grades has risen, and yet remedy through the Grade Change Committee is limited to corrected clerical or procedural error.

**Petitions Reviewed and Approved, 2011-2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>PNP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 11</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2/26</td>
<td>14/32</td>
<td>5/14</td>
<td>28/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2/11</td>
<td>13/30</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>16/48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 11</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>6/31</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>7/38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 12</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2/12</td>
<td>3/15</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>6/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 12</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>13/32</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>15/45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 12</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0/21</td>
<td>23/32</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>24/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2/14</td>
<td>9/25</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>13/47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 12</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>1/15</td>
<td>24/44</td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>28/72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11/20</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>10/111</td>
<td>105/241</td>
<td>11/47</td>
<td>137/420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** Approved/Total

**Petition Approval Percentage (by meeting), 2011-2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Petition Approval Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 11</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 12</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 12</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 12</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Petition Approval Percentage (by petition type), 2011-2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Petition Approval Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Change</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retro-Drop</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retro-Withdrawal</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Mode Change</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annual Report: Academic Year 2011-12
#### Davis Division: Academic Senate
#### Graduate Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings:</th>
<th>Meeting Frequency:</th>
<th>Average Hours of Committee Work Each Week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council: 11</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Graduate Council Chair - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Planning &amp; Development: 10</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Council Members – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Appeals: 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRC Chair - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs Advisory: 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Subcommittee Chairs – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses: 1 (reviews online)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subcommittee Members - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Policy: 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of members of each standing subcommittee:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review: 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>APD – 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support: 2 (reviews online)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative – 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Courses – 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPC – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRC – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support – 4 (+40 fellowship reviewers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Welfare - 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Items Reviewed:</th>
<th>Total Number of Items Carried Over from Previous Year:</th>
<th>Total items Carried Over to Coming Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>159 business items</td>
<td>32 courses</td>
<td>2 program review reports, 2 program review closure considerations, and 2 other items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189 courses reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,831 student award applications reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Listing of Policies Approved, Established or Revised:
- Policy on Service on Advanced Degree Committees (GC1998-01) – revised policy (Oct 7, May 4)
- Policy on Residence and Transfer Units (GC2011-03) – revised policy (October 7)
- Policy on the Relation of ASR600(B) to Graduate Groups (GC2012-01) – new policy (May 4)
- Policy on UC Davis – Master’s Degree Capstone Requirement (GC2012-02) – new policy (June 1)

#### Summary of Issues the Graduate Council Considered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Bylaw Revisions</th>
<th>Graduate Program Degree Requirement Revisions</th>
<th>Graduate Student Fellowship, Travel, &amp; Summer GSR Awards</th>
<th>Graduate Program Review Actions</th>
<th>Proposals for New Graduate Programs, DEs, or GACs</th>
<th>Graduate Courses Reviewed</th>
<th>Graduation Program Management Advice or Affiliation Approvals</th>
<th>Administrative Committee Appeal</th>
<th>Misc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>222 awards (2,831 applications reviewed)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Total: 189 New: 95 Changes: 25 Cancelled: 0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Narrative:

The Graduate Council is a standing committee of the Divisional Academic Senate responsible for regulating and making recommendations on matters pertaining to graduate education and postdoctoral scholar issues in accordance with Bylaw 80 of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate.

The Council is supported by a structure which includes the following subcommittees: (1) Academic Planning and Development (APD) Committee, (2) Administrative Committee, (3) Bylaws Committee, (4) Courses Committee, (5) Educational Policy Committee (EPC), (6) Program Review Committee (PRC), (7) the Program Review Closure Committee (PRCC),(8) the Student Support Committee, (9) the Student and Postdoctoral Scholar Welfare Committee, and (10) Chair's Advisory Committee. One notable change that took place the past year was the splitting of the Support and Welfare Committee into two separate committees; one focused on student support and the other dedicated to student and postdoctoral welfare.

A summary of the Council’s actions for the year is provided below; the item dates correspond to actions taken at Council meetings. Council agendas and minutes are available to the public at: http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/minutes/ and also archived on ASIS

A. Graduate Program Bylaw Revisions:
   1. Agricultural and Resource Economics Graduate Program (Dec 16)
   2. Hydrologic Sciences Graduate Group (Dec 16)
   3. Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering Graduate Program (Dec 16)
   4. Chemistry Graduate Program (June 1)
   5. Genetics Graduate Group (June 1)
   6. Pharmaceutical Chemistry new Graduate Program (June 1)
   7. Clinical Research Graduate Group (June 11)
   8. DE in Nuclear Science [new DE] (June 11)
   9. Forensic Science Graduate Group (June 11)
   10. Music Graduate Program (June 11)
   11. Political Science Graduate Program (June 11)
   12. Master of Public Health Graduate Group (June 16)

B. Graduate Program Degree Requirement Revisions:
   1. Maternal & Child Nutrition degree requirements (Dec 12)
   2. Dramatic Art degree requirements (Feb 3)
   3. Cultural Studies requirements (March 2)
   4. Philosophy requirements (March 2)
   5. Genetics degree requirements (April 6)
   6. Sociology degree requirements (April 6)
   7. History M.A.T. Proposal Dropped by Dept. (Item closed out April 10)
   8. Civil & Environmental Engineering degree requirements (May 4)
   9. Master of Public Health degree requirements (May 18)
10. Computer Science degree requirements (May 18)
11. French Degree Requirements (May 18)
12. Music degree requirements (May 18)
13. DE Stem and Progenitor Cells – Simple numbering correction (May 18)
14. Political Science degree requirements (June 1)
15. M.S. Pharmaceutical Chemistry (June 11)
16. International Commercial Law degree requirements (June 11)
17. Environmental Policy Management Degree Recs (June 11)
18. DE Nuclear Science (June 11)
19. Agricultural and Resource Economics degree requirements (June 11)
20. NSHL Grad Group: Adding FNP Track to Masters in Science and Healthcare Leadership: Also revising existing Masters in Health Sciences (currently housed in Dept of Family and Community Medicine) and housing it instead in NSHL as a Physician Assistant Master’s Degree. Approved by GC June 11, *CCGA Approved Aug 22

21. Request from C.A.N.D.E.L for word change denied because it would have weakened normative requirements. Program agreed to resubmit degree requirements for full review in fall 2012.

22. Master of Business Administration – Degree Requirements (June 11)

C. Graduate Student Fellowship, Travel, & Summer GSR Awards:

See appendix A for detail report.

D. Graduate Program Review Actions:

1. Program Review Reports:
   i. Clinical Research (Feb 3)
   ii. Horticulture & Agronomy (Feb 3)
   iii. Performance Studies (Feb 3)
   iv. Animal Biology Graduate Program (March 2)
   v. Chemical Engineering (April 6)
   vi. Soils & Biogeochemistry (April 6)
   vii. Atmospheric Science (May 4)
   viii. DE – Native American Studies (May 4)
   ix. Native American Studies (May 4)
   x. Chemistry (May 18)
   xi. DE – Biotechnology (May 18)
   xii. International Agricultural Development (May 18)
   xiii. Applied Mathematics Graduate Program (June 1)
   xiv. DE – Studies in Performance & Practice (June 1)
   xv. German (June 1)
xvi. Master of Business Administration – acceptance of external accreditation in lieu of full program review (June 1)
xvii. DE – Feminist Theory & Research (June 11)
xviii. Dramatic Art (June 11)
ix. Materials Science Engineering (June 11)
xx. Transportation, Technology & Policy (June 11)
xxi. Program Reviews currently under review:
   Community Development (PRC review complete, report pending to Council)
   DE – Second Language Acquisition (PRC review complete, report pending to Council)

2. Program Review Closure Committee Recommendations:
   i. Anthropology Graduate Program (April 6) *closure approved
   ii. Genetics Graduate Group (April 6) *closure approved
   iii. Civil & Environmental Engineering Graduate Program (May 4) *closure approved
   iv. Sociology Graduate Program (May 4) *closure approved
   v. Geology Graduate Program (May 18) *closure approved
   vi. Computer Science Graduate Group (June 11) *closure approved
   vii. Agricultural and Resource Economics (July 9) *closure approved
   viii. Program Review Closures remaining open:
      1. Forensic Science Graduate Group
      2. Political Science Graduate Program

E. Program Review Initiations for 2013-14 Reviews (May 4): Biochemistry, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology; Biomedical Engineering; Biophysics; Biostatistics; Design; Entomology; Epidemiology; Master of Preventative Veterinary Medicine; Viticulture & Enology; DE – Biology of Vector-Borne Diseases; DE – International & Community Nutrition.

F. Proposals for New Graduate Programs, Designated Emphases, or Graduate Academic Certificates:
   1. Master of Professional Accountancy (MPAc) – new self-supporting program offered by the Graduate School of Management (October 1, November 5*) *approved by CCGA
   2. Master of Science in Pharmaceutical Chemistry – new graduate program offered by the Chemistry department (Feb 29, June 11) *approved by CCGA (August 14)
   3. New Designated Emphasis in Nuclear Science (June 11) *approved by GC

G. Graduate Courses Reviewed and Approved

A total of 189 course requests were reviewed by GCCS this year:
   • New course requests approved: 135 Graduate | 9 Professional
     New course requests denied/rejected: 44 Graduate | 1 Professional
   • Courses cancelled/discontinued approved: 0 Graduate | 0 Professional
     Courses cancelled/discontinued denied/rejected: 0 Graduate | 0 Professional
### H. Responses to Requests for AS Consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Description</th>
<th>Response Status</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPM 230-10 Publication Rights</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>7-Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM 200-25 Academic Degree Programs</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>7-Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC: Reconstitution of the Department of Spanish and Classics</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>7-Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC: Disestablishment of the Department of Applied Science and Anticipated Discontinuation of the Graduate Program in Applied Science</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>7-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC Proposal to Establish Department of Design</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>14-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC Proposed Course Evaluation Regulation DDR 534</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>18-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC PPM 668: Additional Compensation, Negotiated Salary Program</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>28-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Review Senate Regulation (SR) 610 (Senior Residency)</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>30-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC Report from Consortium of Women in Research</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>6-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Merger Proposal: Textiles/Clothing and Biological/Agricultural Engineering</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>9-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC SR610 on Residency</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>13-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals to Establish New Minors: Biomedical Eng. and Computational Biology and Bioinformatics</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>18-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Discontinue the Electronic Materials Engineering Major</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>4-Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE3: General Education Exception Request: College of Engineering</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>8-Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE2: General Education Exception Request: College of Engineering</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>8-Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Establish PPM 290-82: Boating Safety</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>8-Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to Temporarily Delete and Revise PPM 220-01: Organized Research Units</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>27-Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOARS Proposal: Transfer Admissions</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>27-Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Science Engineering (OSE) Major Discontinuation Proposal</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>6-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Review of the UC Observatories</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>7-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Supporting Degree Taskforce Report</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>22-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC: Proposed Insect Biology Undergraduate Honors Research Program</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>28-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC: Admissions Closure Request: Textiles and Clothing</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>3-Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Wide-Review: Faculty Salaries NEW INFO</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>10-Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCD Off-Scale Task Force Report on Faculty Salaries</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>10-Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Wide-Review: Faculty Salaries</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>10-Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC: 200-45 Review: GSM Registration and Payment System</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>11-Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC: Departmental Status Report: Religious Studies</td>
<td>did not opine</td>
<td>13-Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Change Request Proposal: Human and Community Development</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>19-Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC: PPM 200-45 Review: GradHub Concept</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>7-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC: Indirect Cost Recovery Whitepaper Version 1</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>8-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC: Indirect Cost Recovery Executive Summary</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>8-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM 035 and APM 190 Whistle Blower Policy</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>8-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC: APM 010 (Academic Freedom), 015 (Faculty Code), 016 (Administration of Discipline)</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>8-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC: UC Faculty Diversity Working Group Report</td>
<td>response submitted</td>
<td>31-May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Graduate Program Management

1. Disestablishment of the Applied Science Engineering ~ Request Withdrawn (June 11)

J. Administrative Committee Appeals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Split Decision on the 2nd take of a Qualifying Examination</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split Decision on the 1st take of a Qualifying Examination</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Exceptions Requested by a Program</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Appeal of a Denial of Admission</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstitution of Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Admission to the Individual Ph.D.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Appeal of a Disqualification</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to Repeat Coursework in Excess of Policy Allowance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K. Miscellaneous:

1. Review of the GC Policy on Service on Advanced Degree Committees (GC1998-01) – revised policy (Oct 7, May 4)
2. Review of the GC Policy on Residence and Transfer Units (GC2011-03) – revised policy (Oct 7)
3. Create new GC Policy on the Relation of ASR600(B) to Graduate Groups (GC2012-01) (May 4)
4. Create new GC Policy on UC Davis – Master’s Degree Capstone Requirement (GC2012-02) (June 1)
5. Professors for the Future: Teaching Opportunities for Postdoctoral Scholars (April 1)
6. Revised Fellowship Application Process for Prospective Students (June 11)
7. Restructuring of the Support Committee for 2011-12 (June 11)

Closing

In closing, Graduate Council wishes to thank all of those who have given of their time in support of graduate education and postdoctoral scholar issues during the past year. The contributions of the members of subcommittees and of the ad hoc program review committees have been extremely valuable and are deeply appreciated by the Council. Finally, we specifically appreciate the professional support and personal dedication provided by the administrative staff of Graduate Council.

Respectfully submitted,

André Knoesen, Chair
2009-2012 Graduate Council

Members: André Knoesen, Chair; Alan Buckpitt, Vice Chair and CCGA Representative; Enoch Baldwin; Patrick Carroll; Christiana Drake; David Fyhrie; Jeffery Gibeling, ex officio and non-voting (Dean); Rachael Goodhue, ex officio and non-voting (CCGA Chair); Lev Kavvas; Ari Kelman; Peter Lichtenfels; James Murray; Blake Stimson.
Academic Federation Representatives: Deanna Johnson and Carolyn Penny.

Graduate Studies Representatives: Associate Dean Lenora Timm; Faculty Assistant to the Dean Chris Calvert.

Graduate Student Representatives: Katie Kolesar, GSA Chair; Adam Costanzo, GSA Vice Chair; Nicole Moore, GSA Representative; and Lisceth Cruz, Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor.

Postdoctoral Scholar Representatives Lucrezia Miranda and Paola Prada, PSA Co-Chairs.

Graduate Studies Attendees: Steven Albrecht, Hector Cuevas, Helen Frasier, Cathy Jurado, and Richard Shintaku.

This report was prepared by the Graduate Council Analyst and the subcommittee chairs and staff. The report was reviewed and approved by the 2011-2012 Graduate Council during the period of August 1 to September 1, 2012.
APPENDIX A: GRADUATE STUDENT SUPPORT COMMITTEE REPORT 2011-2012

The Support Committee reviews applications for a variety of fellowships, including those from private and public sources. These fellowships cover research expenses, travel to present papers at national and international scholarly meetings, as well as full academic year support in designated fields. Committee members ALSO review applications for Graduate Student Travel Awards in November and April, for the Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Award, and for Summer GSR awards.

Core Committee members in 2011-2012: Enoch Baldwin, Chair (Molecular and Cellular Biology), Robert Fairclough (Biophysics), Sumathi Sankaran (Academic Federation Rep, Microbio & Immunology) and staff support provided by Steven Albrecht and Ruth Lee (Office of Graduate Studies).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award Information:</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Award Amount Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Fellowships:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby, Donald</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$27,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott, Marjorie and Charles</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$55,488.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulkner, Richard and Kate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibeling, Alfred H. &amp; Marie E.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$6,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden International Agriculture, William G. and Kathleen</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$41,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Scholars Fellowship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$525,029.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Fletcher</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$27,386.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft, Herbert</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,386.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krantz, Bert and Nell</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, George</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons, Austin Eugene</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$109,781.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahan, Laura Perrott</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McArthur, Frank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKeenan, Beatrice Oberly and S. Atwood</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$72,773.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards, Lillie May</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$16,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwalen, Emily</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwall Dissertation Year Fellowship, Floyd and Mary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwall Medical Fellowship, Floyd and Mary</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$272,525.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey, Malcolm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steindler, John F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tryon, Herbert</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCD &amp; Humanities Graduate Research</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$66,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCD Dissertation Year Fellowship</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$124,160.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velez, Miguel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Frank and Carolan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Elizabeth P.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Jarena</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,425.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Zolk, George and Dorothy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Fellowships to support Campus Diversity:</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Award Amount Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cota Robles, Eugene</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$328,401.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Year Fellowship</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$289,708.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Research Mentorship</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$248,108.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNair</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$55,488.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>333</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$921,707.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Travel Awards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Awards:</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Award Amount Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For professional meetings held July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For professional meetings held Jan 1 to Dec 31, 2012</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summer GSR Awards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer GSR Awards:</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Award Amount Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Graduate Student Researcher Award Engineering or Computer-related Applications and Methods</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$192,027.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$192,027.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grand Total All Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grand Total All Awards</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Award Amount Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2533</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>$2,664,457.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Report: Academic Year 2011-2012  
Davis Division: Academic Senate  
Committee on Information Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings:</th>
<th>Meeting frequency:</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>As needed</strong></td>
<td><strong>fluctuates</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total Requests for Consultation responses: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(courses, proposals, cases, etc.)</th>
<th>Total of reviewed proposals deferred from the previous year -- None</th>
<th>Total proposals deferred to the coming academic year – None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 Requests for Consultation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

None

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

None

Issues considered by the committee:

- Campus Committee Email Report
- New communication system (e-mail) launch
- Online Degree Certification Proposal (PPM 200-45)
- Pre-Purchasing System Review
- Campus Asset Management Planning & Information System (PPM-245)
- Review: GradHub Concept (PPM-245)
- Review: GSM Registration & Payment System (PPM 200-45)
- UC Davis Athletics Strategic Audit 2011
- Strategies for the Academic Senate Office to communicate with its members, but especially students
- Automated Course Evaluations

Committee’s narrative:

The committee met on average one time per quarter during the 2011-2012 academic year. During these meetings, we discussed issues that are part of the normal consultation process for the Academic Senate (AS) such PPM 200-45 reviews but also issue that came up because of campus events, such as the capability for the AS to communicate rapidly with students and other groups on-and off-campus about recent campus events. One of the responsibilities of the CIT is to provide advice to the Executive Committee and Representative Assembly on new IT systems being proposed. To that effect, the committee has used the following criteria, developed by Paul Gepts, Chair of the Committee: The points are not listed by order of importance, but can be used for future evaluations as well as new IT systems are proposed.
1. What is the need? How was this application prioritized among the activities of the unit?
2. What can be improved over existing systems, i.e., added functionalities?
3. Are there off-campus alternatives?
4. Who/what is the focus? Who are the “stakeholders”?
5. Who will be developing the application? What is their record?
6. Who will provide the budget? And for how long?
7. Who will administer the application/system after its release? How will it be improved?
8. How well is the application integrated with the other relevant applications?
9. What is the status of the application? At the concept stage, development, or implementation stage?
10. What will encourage potential users to adopt this application?

The committee has had several interactions with CCFIT; the chair of CIT is an active member of the CCFIT executive committee.

Among the topics to be discussed for next year are the online course evaluation system and the use of clickers.

Respectfully Submitted,

Paul Gepts, Chair
Anupam Chander, Member
Edward Dickenson, Member
Francois Gygi, Member
Felix Wu, Member
Keith Bradnam, AF Rep.
Pete Siegel, Ex-Officio
Matthew Blair, ASUCD Rep.
Mathew Lange, GSA Rep.
Debbie Stacionis, Analyst
Committee on International Education (CIE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings:</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: Typically, one meeting after each system wide UCIE meeting.</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week:</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 GE Petitions, 0 reports and 3 issues (pursuit of a change to the committee’s bylaw (i.e. removal of DD Bylaw 64.B.4.); committee letter in support of the ESL Task Force proposal; and the internationalization of the UC Davis campus) continued from the previous year.</td>
<td>0 GE Petitions, 0 reports and 2 issues continue to the coming academic year: the internationalization of the campus (including adequate resources for international students); and Education Abroad Programs that duplicate UCD Education Abroad Center programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed a total 41 GE Petitions, and one resubmitted GE Petition, in addition to the following: UC Davis Athletics Strategic Audit 2011; English as a Second Language Request for Proposal; and Korea University Exchange Agreement.</td>
<td>0 GE Petitions, 0 reports and 3 issues (pursuit of a change to the committee’s bylaw (i.e. removal of DD Bylaw 64.B.4.); committee letter in support of the ESL Task Force proposal; and the internationalization of the UC Davis campus) continued from the previous year.</td>
<td>0 GE Petitions, 0 reports and 2 issues continue to the coming academic year: the internationalization of the campus (including adequate resources for international students); and Education Abroad Programs that duplicate UCD Education Abroad Center programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: Pending.
Removal of Davis Division Bylaw 64.B.4.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None.

Issues considered by the committee that were also considered last year
Internationalizing the UC Davis campus
Chancellor’s vision document and 20/20 Plan
Criteria and protocol for getting GE credit for EAP coursework
Changes in the EAP funding model
Proposed openings and proposed closures for various EAP programs
Campus agreements with 3rd-party education-abroad providers
Restriction of EAP students from linguistic classes because of budget cuts
Academic Integration
Support for English as a Second Language program/courses
UCEAP Budget and Campus Funding
Drop in EAP student enrollments, especially in year-long programs

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
The proposed revision of the committee’s bylaw (Davis Division Bylaw 64, specifically section B.4.) remains pending.
Committee’s narrative:

The committee is charged with the responsibility to represent the Davis Division of the Academic Senate in all matters connected with the Education Abroad Program (EAP) and in all aspects of international education, exchange and internships. The committee is charged with the duty to initiate and assist in the formulation of policies and programs that affect international education, and that service to integrate it into campus academic programs, to designate approved Education Abroad Program Courses for General Education credit, and to provide academic approval and periodic review of the Campus Reciprocal Exchange Program.

The committee held its 2011-12 meetings subsequent to the most recent University Committee on International Education (UCIE) meeting, with the exception of the UCIE January meeting. The committee was engaged in international-education issues of concern to UC Davis and UC system wide. The minutes of the committee’s three 2011-12 meetings capture the topics of discussion at the meetings and summaries of the four 2011-12 University Committee on International Education (UCIE) meetings.

The main focus of the committee was the internationalization of the UC Davis campus within the parameters set by the University of California Education Abroad Program (UCEAP), as authored by its office, the University Office of the Education Abroad Program (UOEAP). The committee used the Education Abroad Program’s new self-supporting business model and the constraints of the current budget crisis to guide discussion. The committee limited its interests and business items to those of the UCIE and to those subjects that supported, developed or promoted the internationalization of the campus. Committee actions were discussed with respect to all campus units.

The core 2011-12 CIE agenda items were the current status of: the suggested change to the committee’s bylaw, the support for English as a Second Language, the Korea University Exchange Agreement, the recruitment of international students, Academic Integration, the International Advisory Committee (IAC), the EAP, and the matters being discussed by the UCIE. Divisional concerns were: the similarity of UCEAP faculty led programs to UCD Summer Abroad programs; the apparent creation of these programs at UC Santa Barbara for the purpose of generating revenue and the lack of consultation with UC Davis authorities; the lack of mechanisms for interactions between international students and UC Davis students, the lack of student services for international students; assessment of international students’ experiences; and the need for greater membership participation in the review of General Education petitions for credit of EAP coursework.

The committee reviewed forty-one petitions for EAP coursework to be designated for General Education credit. Thirty-three petitions were approved, and eight were denied. Two petitions were returned unsigned because they were misdirected to the committee for review. Each of these petitions concerned a course that the petitioner took through a non-UCEAP program. There are no petitions pending and being carried forward to the next academic year.

The committee responded only to Requests for Consultation (RFCs) that were related directly to its charge. There was only one for 2011-12, the RFC concerned the Korea University Exchange Agreement.
Respectfully submitted,

Jeannette Money, CIE Chair and UCIE DD Representative
Leopoldo Bernucci
Kentaro Inoue
Sheldon Hsiao-Peng Lu
Julia Menard-Warwick
Halifu Osumare
Gang Sun
Hnin-Hnin (Ma) Aung, Academic Federation Representative
Eric Schroeder, ex-officio
Michelle Yeh, ex-officio
Wesley Young, ex-officio
Elizabeth Long, Graduate Student Association Representative
Zachary Frieders, Associate Director of the Education Abroad Center
Bryan Rodman, Committee Resource Analyst
September 28, 2012

ELLEN BONNEL, Chair
Academic Federation

BRUNO NACHTERGAELE, Chair
Academic Senate

MAUREEN STANTON, Vice Provost
Academic Affairs

RE: 2011-2012 Annual Report of the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC)

Please find enclosed the 2011-2012 Annual Report submitted by the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC). The JPC finished another challenging and productive year. The 2011-2012 JPC reviewed 233 personnel actions and four departmental voting group and peer review plans.

The workload of the JPC is extensive, and as such, the time commitment from all members is significant. I offer my sincere appreciation to the following members:

Bill Casey – Professor (Chemistry)
Gayle Crisosto – Specialist (Plant Sciences)
John Hess – Professional Researcher (SOM: Cell Biology and Human Anatomy)
Jack Hicks – Professor (English)
Bruce Lampinen – Specialist in Cooperative Extension (Plant Sciences)
Randy Southard – Professor (Land, Air and Water Resources)
Cliff Tepper – Professional Researcher (SOM: Biochemistry and Molecular Medicine)

Each member significantly contributed to the success of the committee. I am very grateful to them for their dedication, commitment and participation in the committee. As Chair, I am honored to have worked with such outstanding colleagues.

Sincerely,

James Oltjen, Chair 2011-2012

Enclosure
### Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 35</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: weekly</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each meeting week: 4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Total: 233 Actions Reviewed | Total # of reviewed or deferred from the previous year: 0 | Total deferred to the coming academic year: 0 |

**Listing of bylaw changes proposed:**
none

**Listing of committee policies established or revised:**
none

**Issues considered by the committee**

- **Appointments and Appointments Via Change in Title**
  Proposed appointments were generally supported by the JPC at the level proposed or higher. The JPC supported 28% of appointments as proposed (32 of 113). In 62 of the 81 appointments not supported (77% of those not supported, 55% overall), the JPC recommended a higher step than proposed. The JPC recommended a lower step appointment in only 16% (18 of 113) of the proposed appointments.

- **Deans Letters for Redelegated Actions**
  The committee was concerned that letters from some Deans were missing from personnel files in several of the cases reviewed by the committee. The committee now understands that letters are not required from the Dean for first merit after appointment and first merit after promotion since these are redelegated actions. However, some Deans do include letters for these actions in the personnel file. Therefore, there is not a consistent practice being followed among the schools and colleges. Furthermore, the JPC does find letters from the Dean quite useful when evaluating files.

- **Extramural Letters for SOM Professional Researcher Actions**
  In a couple cases reviewed by the JPC from the School of Medicine, it appeared that sections of solicited extramural letters were copied directly from the solicitation letter, especially in actions for the Professional
Research series. This suggests that the School of Medicine may potentially be suggesting how the recommendations from external referees should be written. This practice should not be allowed as it violates the integrity of the academic personnel process.

- **Position Descriptions**
  Many submitted Position Descriptions (PDs) were inappropriate for the proposed title. This has been a continuing problem, although it is improving. Most often the PDs lacked information, percent time assigned to each category evaluated, were not signed, or contained unclear or inappropriate expectations regarding independent research, publishing, or grant acquisition requirements for the specified series.

- **Criteria for Appointment and Advancement in the Project Scientist and Specialist Series**
  The committee continues to receive inquiries from Deans and departments regarding criteria and attributes for appointment and advancement in the Project Scientist and Specialist series. The JPC would like to reiterate that there is no separate written statement of policy that the committee uses to evaluate files. The committee reviews the entire record, including what is submitted in the dossier and the personnel file, and uses only the APM to evaluate files for appointment and advancement in all titles.

**Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:**
none

**Committee’s narrative:**
The Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC) met 35 times during this period to review packets. Of the 233 personnel actions reviewed, information on the corresponding final decision was available for 202 actions. The JPC also reviewed 4 departmental voting group and peer review plans. Table 1 in the Appendix provides a summary of all actions per title series and the corresponding committee recommendation.

The total number of actions (233) is 10 more than the caseload from the previous year (223). Table 2 below summarizes the number of actions reviewed by the JPC and the corresponding recommendation:
### TABLE 2  
**JPC Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments via Change in Title&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferral of Emeritus/a Status</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redelegated Accelerated Merits</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redelegated Merits&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Merits</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redelegated Promotions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Reviews&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>The JPC reviewed two 5-year review cases. In both cases the JPC recommended no advancement, performance satisfactory. In both cases, the final authority agreed with the committee recommendations.

<sup>2</sup>In one Redelegated Merit case for a Specialist, the JPC agreed unanimously that the candidate was appointed extremely too low and should have been appointed at the Associate level. Therefore the JPC recommended a promotion with a merit to move the candidate up one entire rank. The final authority was in agreement.

<sup>3</sup>In one Redelegated Merit Appeal case for a Project Scientist, the JPC recommended against the appeal. The final decision was not available.

<sup>4</sup>In one appointment via change in title with promotion case, the JPC voted against the proposed level and recommended a higher step. The final decision was not in agreement with JPC and did not approve the appointment via change in title and only approved the promotion.
APPOINTMENTS and APPOINTMENTS VIA CHANGE IN TITLE

Once again, most of the actions reviewed were for the relatively new Project Scientist series (effective July 1, 2004) – with 58 proposed appointments plus 2 appointments via change in title. The combined appointments to this series accounted for 53% of all appointments reviewed by the JPC.

The JPC supported 32 of 113 (28%) of all proposed appointments as submitted. Table 3 below shows the percentage of proposed appointments on which the JPC and the final authority agreed on the appointment level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3: Breakdown of Recommendations on Appointments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title Series/ JPC Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agronomist &amp; ---in the AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist in Cooperative Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Percent Agreement</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For proposed appointments not supported by the JPC, Table 3 breaks down these cases to three distinct possibilities:

1. **NO: Higher**: This means the JPC recommended a higher step (and/or rank) than the level originally proposed. The JPC and the final authority agreed on 85% of these cases.

2. **NO: Lower**: This means the JPC recommended a lower step (and/or rank) than the level originally proposed. The JPC and the final authority agreed on 63% of these cases.

3. **Other**: In one Specialist appointment action, the committee felt that the information submitted in the packet did not warrant appointment in the Specialist series as the candidate did not have the required degree or the required experience as stated in UCD-APM 330. The JPC agreed that a staff title may be more appropriate. The final decision agreed with the JPC recommendation.

**MERITS (including Accelerated Merits)**

The JPC supported 77 of the 86 (90%) proposed merits. Table 4 below shows the breakdown of the JPC’s recommendations regarding these merits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4: ACCELERATED AND NORMAL MERITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title Series/ JPC Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL DECISION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree w/ JPC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree with Original Proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Agreement between JPC &amp; Final Authority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agronomist or ___ in the AES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Split Appointment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Scientist</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Researcher</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialist</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialist in Cooperative Extension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Percent Agreement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes actions where the final decision has not been made or the data is unavailable. Not reflected in agreement percentage.*
Of the 9 merits which the JPC did not support, the final authority agreed with the JPC in 5 of the cases (56%).

**PROMOTIONS (including Accelerated Promotions)**

The JPC supported 23 of the 24 (96%) proposed promotions; the final authority agreed with the JPC on (88%) of all promotions. In the one case where the JPC voted against the promotion; the final authority did not agree with the JPC on this action and the promotion was approved. Table 5 below summarizes the JPC's recommendations on these promotions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Series/ JPC Recommendation</th>
<th>FINAL DECISION</th>
<th>Percent Agreement between JPC &amp; Final Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree w/ JPC</td>
<td>Agree with Original Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agronomist &amp; ---in the AES</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scientist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Researcher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist in Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes actions where the final decision has not been made or the data is not available. Not reflected in agreement percentage.*
CONFERRAL OF EMERITUS/A STATUS
The JPC received 7 requests for Conferral of Emeritus status. Six actions were for Specialists in Cooperative Extension and one action was for a Specialist. The JPC supported all 7 requests and the final authority agreed.

POSITION DESCRIPTIONS
The primary problem with position descriptions this year was unclear definition of responsibilities mainly in the Project Scientist, Professional Research, and Specialist series. Another problem was the breakdown of categories evaluated into percent time devoted to each. Table 6 below shows the breakdown of recommended position description revisions per title. In requesting the updated PD the JPC is looking for confirmation that the candidate and department have reviewed the expectations and they are still appropriate or they have been updated as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Series</th>
<th>Revisions Recommended</th>
<th>% of Total Actions per Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Split Appointments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scientist</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists in CE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOTING GROUP & PEER REVIEW PLANS
The JPC reviewed a total of 4 voting group and peer review plans. The JPC’s recommendations are summarized below:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted with Recommended Revisions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected; requiring revisions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The JPC found that 4 of 4 (100%) submitted plans were acceptable without the need for revision.
### APPENDIX - TABLE 1: Committee Recommendations per Title and Action 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>---in AES (Agronomist)</th>
<th>Split Appointments*</th>
<th>Professional Researcher</th>
<th>Project Scientist</th>
<th>Specialist in Cooperative Extension</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment via Change in Title</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferral of Emeritus Status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redelegated Merit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Merits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Report: Academic Year 2011/2012
Davis Division: Academic Senate
Library Committee

**CHARGE:** It shall be the duty of this committee to advise the Chief Campus Officer regarding the administration of the Library on the Davis campus, in accordance with the Standing Orders of the Regents, to advise the University Librarian regarding removal and storage of library holdings, and to perform such other duties relative to the Library as may be committed to the Senate by proper authority. The committee shall report at least once a year to the Representative Assembly. (Am. 6/10/93; effective 1/1/94)

**MEMBERSHIP:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department/Program</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian H. Kolner, Chair</td>
<td>Electrical and Computer Eng.</td>
<td>Alternate Representative to UCOLASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy B. Morton</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Representative to UCOLASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott R. Herring</td>
<td>University Writing Program</td>
<td>Academic Federation Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Revzin</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>Engineering Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley A. Blozis</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Letters and Science Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Ambrose</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>School of Education Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Elsbach</td>
<td>Grad. School of Management</td>
<td>Grad. School of Management Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alla Fomina</td>
<td>Physiology &amp; Membrane Bio.</td>
<td>School of Medicine Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munashe Chigerwe</td>
<td>Medicine &amp; Epidemiology</td>
<td>Veterinary Medicine Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan S. Carroll</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Graduate Student Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anupam Chander</td>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>Law School Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Stewart</td>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>College of Biological Sciences Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph M. Siverson</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Acting University Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Bekele</td>
<td>Academic Senate Office</td>
<td>Resource Analyst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS:** Once per quarter, additionally if necessary.

**PRINCIPAL ISSUES CONSIDERED:**

**University Librarian.** Professor Randolph Siverson has been acting University Librarian (UL) for the past year and the search for a permanent UL was begun in earnest in Fall 2011. Three final candidates were invited to visit the campus and the Library Committee was invited to meet with them. Several committee members attended these meetings and ultimately Mackenzie Smith, from MIT, was chosen and joined the campus on June 1, 2012.

**Budget Situation.** Acting UL Siverson informed the Senate Library Committee (SLC) that the library is running on a deficit and that this and recent cuts are going to be very problematic. In addition, it was reported that the UCD Library System has for a decade been underfunded and received no substantive funding increases. It now remains for the new University Librarian (see below) along with Academic Senate to lobby the administration for increases to the Library budget to restore excellence in our collections and our access to scholarly publications.

**Senate Library Committee Reorganization.** In an effort to provide better representation across campus to the SLC, a Senate task force proposed to reorganize the committee into the following form:

1. Chair plus two members from disparate disciplines to be responsible for representation at
   (a) Academic Senate Executive Council
   (b) University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC)
   (c) Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC)
2. Five representatives from the following discipline-based sub-committees:
   (a) Science & Engineering
   (b) Biology and Agricultural Sciences
   (c) Humanities
   (d) Social Sciences
   (e) Health Sciences

3. The University Librarian

4. One graduate and one undergraduate student representative (non-voting)

This proposed change of membership would necessitate a change in Davis Division Bylaw 83(A). A draft was prepared by the Senate Committee on Rules, Elections and Jurisdiction (CERJ) and is still in draft form. Some SLC members expressed reservations about the new structure and the issue was tabled for a future meeting.

Carlson Health Sciences Library. A committee member has noted that this library, which serves the faculty, staff and students of the School of Medicine and the School of Veterinary Medicine, has insufficient resources to cover electronic journals essential to the clientele. In addition, the library will be losing the entire first floor to office space for the new Dean of the School of Veterinary Medicine. In view of this dire situation with the Library, Professor Siverson (acting UL) indicated that as part of the first floor renovation, there is a plan for renovation of the Library in the near future. Although an architect has been chosen, there has been no input solicited from ladder faculty and this was a serious discussion point. Also, there was no indication that additional funds would be found to enhance the electronic journal subscriptions.

Nature Publishing Group Subscription Costs. It was reported last year to the campuses through the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) that Nature Publishing Group (NPG) was going to substantially increase the cost of subscription to the University of California for the package of more than 60 journals to which we subscribe. Although the UC negotiates subscription prices either on an individual campus basis or collectively (as in this case), the indicated increase was deemed so outrageous that the Chair of UCOLASC (Professor Richard Schneider, UCSF) and several representatives from the California Digital Library (CDL) and UCOP began negotiations with the NPG to find a mutually acceptable solution to this dilemma. As of May 2012, negotiations are still in progress with a new subscription model being developed that will preserve access to the desired Nature Group publications without incurring the large increase in cost originally planned. Owing to contractual limitations, the details of these negotiations cannot be made available to the faculty yet. However, the good news is that our current subscription contract has been extended and thus we maintain access to all previous NPG publications.

Open Access. Arguably the most significant and important event (since perhaps the introduction of electronic publishing) to happen in scholarly communication is implementation of Open Access as a policy directive. The University of California, through its faculty and researchers, has proposed that all scholarly articles destined for peer-reviewed journals shall be freely available to all people via a repository in the California Digital Library (CDL). The argument for this new policy stems from the fact that almost all university research is funded by the public and unless a taxpayer has a subscription to the journal(s) containing the scholarly work that they therefore have a right to access, they are shut out of the process. This is also true of the University system. The scholars who do the work, write the papers, review the work of others, sit on editorial boards, etc., are then required (usually through institutional subscriptions) to pay for access to their own work. With this in mind, a number of leading peer institutions (e.g., Harvard, MIT, Duke, Princeton, Kansas) have now implemented policies which require authors to provide copies of published work to be available in publicly accessible repositories.
UCOLASC has proposed a similar policy for the UC system based on the policies implemented by the aforementioned institutions. A preliminary version of this policy was circulated to the 10 campuses via the UCOLASC representatives in the spring of 2012. The UC Davis SLC asked the Senate Executive council that this policy, with much explanatory material and FAQ’s, be posted on a discussion forum for all researchers to read and comment. This was implemented


and the comments and general tone of the Davis response was fed back to the Chair of UCOLASC (Professor Chris Kelty, UCLA). With feedback from all 10 campuses, Chair Kelty revised the proposed policy and presented it to the July 25th Academic Council (AC) meeting. Academic Council was very supportive of the proposed policy and have asked that it now be sent to all 10 campuses for review. This will happen in the fall and AC Chair Anderson encouraged all campuses to discuss this important document widely, in town hall meetings, Academic Senate and Council meetings, etc. Feedback will be due December 1. UCD SLC Chair Kolner will plan to address the Senate and present details and field questions during the review period. The final draft is shown below.

**Final Draft, Open Access Policy, June 12, 2012:**

“The Faculty of The University of California is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In particular, as part of a public university system, the Faculty is dedicated to making its scholarship available to the people of California. In keeping with this commitment to open dissemination and public access, the Faculty adopts the following policy:

Each Faculty member grants to the University of California a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same. The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles published before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with Faculty authors under existing University of California policy. Application of the license will be waived for a particular article or access delayed for a specified period of time upon express direction by a Faculty member to the University of California.

To assist the University in disseminating and archiving the articles, each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of his or her final version of the article to the University of California by the date of its publication. The University of California will make the article available in an open access repository. When appropriate, a Faculty member may instead notify the University of California if the article will be freely available in another repository or as an open-access publication.

The Academic Senate and the University of California will be responsible for implementing this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending any changes to the Faculty. The Academic Senate and the University of California will review the policy within three years, and present a report to the Faculty. The Faculty calls upon the Academic Senate and the University of California to develop and monitor mechanisms that would render implementation and compliance with the policy as convenient for the Faculty as possible.”

Respectfully submitted by Brian H. Kolner, August 8, 2012
Annual Report: Academic Year 2011-12
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Planning & Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 16</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: biweekly; as needed</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: members: varies. Chair: 5-8 hrs/week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total proposals/items reviewed: 75 (TOEs-6, POPs-2, Endowments-8, others-59)</td>
<td>Total deferred proposals from the previous year: none</td>
<td>Total proposals deferred to the coming academic year: Three (two TOE proposals, one endowed chair proposal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: none

Listing of committee policies established or revised: none

Issues considered by the committee: see Committee’s Narrative below

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year, or general carry-over items:

CPB recommendations for 2012-13:

- **New Budget Model**: It is strongly requested that CPB be involved in both the funding streams and new budget model projects at UC Davis. The committee feels strongly that faculty participation and input is critical to help fulfill the UC Davis Vision for the Future.

- **Allocation of FTEs**: CPB should have a role in the allocation of FTEs. For planning purposes, CPB recommends that departments have a target size, understanding that due to the current budget situation, this may be a goal not a reality.

- **Faculty Appointment Data**: CPB would like to request data on all appointments (including TOEs and POPs) and retentions on an annual basis. These data must include information on salary, research support, start-up and retention packages, and teaching responsibilities.

- **College/School Budgets**: CPB would like to request overall budgets from the Deans for each College and School on campus including the Office of Research. CPB previously requested this information from the Provost and didn’t receive a response. In requesting the overall budgets for each college and school, CPB would also like the Deans to include a summary of the impact of the budget reductions over the last three years for their college or school including undergraduate enrollment, course cancellations, FTE reductions including staff, closed/cancelled majors and programs, etc. In addition, CPB would like to have an idea of the academic program impact associated with current campus planning efforts and the new budget model.

- **Consultation with the Academic Senate**: To establish a more collegial and productive relationship with the administration, CPB requests that each substantive matter sent for committee review be accompanied by a cover letter from the relevant administrator(s) providing some background. Ideally, CPB would be told candidly whether our suggestions could possibly have any effect, or whether the Senate is simply being informed of what the administration plans to do. When CPB provides suggestions, the committee would like to know how they were implemented or why they were ignored.
COMMITTEE’S NARRATIVE

The Academic Senate Davis Division Planning and Budget Committee (CPB) considered matters regarding policy on academic planning, budget, and resource allocations according to Davis Division Bylaw 48. Ann Orel, the Chair of CPB, also served as CPB’s representative to Representative Assembly and as a member on Executive Council. CPB member Chris van Kessel served as the Committee’s representative on the UC Systemwide Planning and Budget Committee (UCPB) and provided regular updates to the Committee. The two members appointed to CPB’s Instructional Space Advisory Group Subcommittee (ISAG) were: Susan Keen and Kent Wilken.

This section outlines the Committee’s activity in 2011-2012 regarding the following review items:

I. GUESTS WHO ATTENDED CPB 2011-12 MEETINGS

- Ralph Hexter, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
- Kelly Ratliff, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Resource Management
- Dave Maddox, Budget Consultant
- John Meyer, Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Resource Management
- Chris Carter, Budget Director, Administrative and Resource Management
- Harris Lewin, Vice Chancellor, Office of Research
- Harold Levine, Dean, School of Education

II. ENDOWMENT, PARTNER OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM, AND TARGET OF EXCELLENCE PROPOSALS

Endowment Proposals Reviewed (8 reviewed):
- Susan P. Baker and Stephen P. Teret Chair in Violence Prevention
- Helen Marian Bart Endowed Professorship in Burn Care
- Charles and Patricia Fullerton Endowed Chair in Pain Medicine
- Joel Keizer Endowed Chair in Theoretical and Computational Biology
- Victor and Genevieve Orsi Endowed Chair in Alzheimer's Research
- Julian R. Youmans Chair in Neurological Surgery
- Molecular Imaging Administrative Chair in Radiology
- School of Medicine Vice Chancellor's Chair in Violence Prevention

Partner Opportunity Program Proposals (2 reviewed)
- Dennis Hartigan-O'Connor, Department of Medical Microbiology and Immunology
- Susan Lott, Department of Evolution and Ecology

Target of Excellence Proposals Reviewed (6 reviewed)
- Paul Allen, Department of Molecular Biosciences
- Carol Hess, Department of Music
- Johanna Schmitt, Department of Evolution and Ecology
- Carl Schramm, Graduate School of Management
- Dr. Robert Seiringer, Department of Mathematics
- Jerry M. Woodall, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

III. BUSINESS ACTION REVIEW ITEMS FROM AS CHAIR AND/OR SYSTEMWIDE

1. Campus Email Committee Report
2. Revision of PPM 200-25 (Establishment or Revision of Academic Degree Programs)
3. Updated Proposal to Reconstitute the Department of Spanish and Classics
4. On Line Degree Certification Proposal
5. PPM 200-45: Campus Asset Management Planning and Information System
6. Proposal to Establish 3 New Chemistry Degree Programs
7. Proposal to Establish the Department of Design
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9. Proposed Revision to APM 670: Health Sciences Compensation Plan
10. UCAAD Salary Equity Study
11. BOARS Transfer Policy Revision Proposal
12. Systemwide Senate Regulation 610: Senior Residency
13. Systemwide APM 200 (General) and APM 205 (Recall for Academic Appointees)
14. UC Davis APM Revision: APM 120 and 140
15. Draft Guide to Research Compliance
16. PPM 200-45: Pre-Purchasing System Review
17. PPM 230-10: Sponsored Programs (Publication Rights)
18. UC Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs & Policy on Implementation of Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs
19. Proposed Minor: Materials Science
20. Proposals to Establish New Minors: Biomedical Engineering and Computational Biology and Bioinformatics
21. Departmental Merger Proposal: Textiles/Clothing and Biological/Agricultural Engineering
22. Report from Consortium of Women in Research
23. Proposal to Disestablish the Department of Applied Science
24. UC Davis Athletics Strategic Audit 2011
25. Proposal to Discontinue the Electronic Materials Engineering Major
26. Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) Reports
27. Proposal to Temporarily Delete and Revise PPM 220-01: Organized Research Units
28. Campus Research Investments in Science and Engineering (RISE) Program Proposal
29. Interdisciplinary Frontiers Program (IFP) Proposal
30. Self-Supporting Degree Program Task Force Report
31. Systemwide Review of UC Observatories
32. BGI Master Agreement
33. Academic Masters Tuition Pilot Program
34. Special Committee on Athletics Report
35. Faculty Salaries Task Force Report
36. UC Davis Off-Scale Task Force Report
37. Optical Science and Engineering (OSE) Major
38. UC Davis Federal Relations Update
39. Funding Streams Executive Summary and Working Paper
40. Incentive Based Budget Timeline
41. Indirect Cost Return Memo 2011-12, Executive Summary, and Whitepaper
42. Undergraduate Tuition Allocation Whitepaper
43. Korea University Exchange Agreement
44. Benefits Decentralization Issues Whitepaper
45. Departmental Status Report: Religious Studies
46. PPM 200-45: GradHub Concept
47. PPM 200-45: GSM Registration and Payment System
48. 2011-12 Budget Planning Document
49. LBNL Joint FTE and MOU
50. Admissions Closure Request: Textiles and Clothing
51. 2012-2013 Budget Planning Letter
52. Provost Allocation Executive Summary and Whitepaper
53. Target of Excellence Process Draft
54. MS in Pharmaceutical Chemistry Proposal
55. Joint Senate/Administration Task Force on the Future of Graduate Education at UC Davis
57. Frontiers in the Humanities and Arts Grant Program Proposal
58. Proposed Revisions to Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM) Section 230-05: Public Health Services Regulations on Objectivity in Research
59. CPB "Principles" regarding consolidating and merging departments and academic units
IV. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS AND TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

a. **Discussions with AVC Ratliff and Provost Hexter:** CPB discussed budget/planning with AVC Kelly Ratliff and Provost Hexter several times throughout the year. Discussion items included, but were not limited to, the following:
   - Discussed the New Budget Model and Funding Streams Proposal
   - Reviewed several versions of New Budget Model Whitepapers including Undergraduate Tuition Allocation, Indirect Cost Return, Benefits Decentralization, Provost Allocation, and Master’s Revenue Sharing Pilot Initiative
   - Compared the New Budget Model whitepapers, Funding Streams proposal, and systemwide rebenching documents with the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) reports from 2008-09

b. **Department Chair Survey:** In April 2012, the Division conducted a survey of Department/Program Chairs to better understand resource allocation and academic costs at the departmental level. This on-line survey originated based on concerns raised across campus by Department Chairs that instructional and mandated compliance and administrative costs were not being covered by allocations, and that the situation was worsening due to projected increased costs being passed along to departments and programs in the absence of any new resources. CPB was asked to compile and analyze the data with the hope of gaining a more comprehensive view of the gap between mandated costs and resource allocation for academic units and to identify best practices for resource management. Although the rate of return of the surveys was relatively small, CPB’s analysis noted several common themes that deserve scrutiny and suggest the need for reforms in the current way of doing things including the merit and promotion system, resource allocation and communication between departments and Dean’s offices, and a better understanding of how and why decisions are made centrally by the administration including the concern that departments have no sense of a common UC Davis culture.

c. **Funding Streams/ New Budget Model:** CPB discussed the systemwide funding streams project, new budget model, and rebenching at the systemwide level with Provost Hexter, AVC Ratliff, and Dave Maddox (budget consultant). CPB must continue to be involved in funding streams discussions and discussions regarding constructing the new budget model. Having faculty input and participation is critical to the new budget process.

d. **Revised TOE Procedures:** CPB was asked to review revised procedures and best practices regarding the TOE process on campus. The Chairs of CPB and CAP-Oversight worked with the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs to develop a revised process for the TOE process. Overall, CPB strongly supported the documentation of the procedures as outlined in the draft. CPB requested that a statement be added to the document that states that at all levels of review (including the department and Dean’s office), the review be done efficiently and as quickly as possible.

e. **Consultation with CPB/ Academic Senate:** CPB sent a letter to Senate Chair Bisson in February 2012 outlining concerns regarding Senate consultation on three important initiatives. These initiatives include (1) a TOE request from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, (2) the Master Agreement between BGI and UC Davis, and (3) the RISE and IFP proposals from the Office of Research. In each of these cases an unreasonable turnaround time was requested. Taken together, these events seem to suggest, variously, that CPB is being asked to rubber stamp decisions in which the committee has no actual part to play, or being provided with complex documents at the last minute (and sometimes after the last minute) which the committee has no hope of digesting properly in time to render an informed opinion. CPB’s main concern is that neither option seems to honor either the spirit or the letter of shared governance. In these specific cases, CPB was in a position where the consultation occurred ‘after the fact’ when all decisions had been made and/or the request for consultation was not sincere. It seems that CPB is expected to rubber stamp decisions in these cases so the administration can say they have consulted the Academic Senate.

f. **Department Merger/ Disestablishment Principles:** During the 2010-11 and 2011-12 academic years, CPB reviewed a number of proposals to merge and in some cases disestablish academic departments and
These proposals, in many cases, seem not to originate from academic planning in the Academic Senate, but from the Dean’s level, usually in response to budget issues. CPB acknowledges that in this time of budget crisis, there may be a need to prune academic programs. In response to the requests, CPB drafted principles to guide the process of merging and disestablishing departments and academic units. CPB revisited the principles in June 2012 and agreed that they still remain accurate.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ann Orel (chair), Greg Clark (member), Tom Famula (member), Jack Gunion (member), Jerry Last (member), Jonna Mazet (member), David Simpson (member), Michael Turrelli (member), Chris van Kessel (member), Linda Bisson (advisor), Bruno Nachtergaele (advisor), and Christophe Morisseau (Academic Federation Representative)
### Committee on Privilege and Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings</th>
<th>Meeting frequency</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigative: 4</td>
<td>Investigative: quarterly</td>
<td>Investigative: 6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearings: 1</td>
<td>Hearings: As Needed</td>
<td>Hearings: dependent on workload</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigative: Total grievances: 5</th>
<th>Investigative: Total grievances deferred from previous year: 1</th>
<th>Investigative: Total grievances continued: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearings: Total Hearings: 0; Total Disciplinary Matters Referred: 0</td>
<td>Hearings: Total hearings/matters deferred from previous year: 0</td>
<td>Hearings: Total hearings/matters continued: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Listing of bylaw changes proposed:**
  None

- **Listing of committee policies established or revised:**
  None

- **Issues considered by the committee**
  None beyond routine review of matters referred to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

- **Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:**
  None
Committee’s narrative:

Investigative:

As of August 31, 2011:

One grievance: not referred to a hearing
Two grievances: resolved informally
One grievance: closed
One investigation was carried over into 2012-13

Hearing:

One party’s availability for hearing remains an issue.
### Committee on Public Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings:</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: as needed; UCDE proposals reviewed electronically</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total UCDE Proposals Reviewed: 3 (See below.)</th>
<th>Total reviewed items deferred from the previous year: None</th>
<th>Total items deferred to the coming academic year: None.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Listing of bylaw changes proposed: 2.       |
| Davis Division Bylaw 88.A.                 |
| Davis Division Bylaw 88.B.3-5.             |

| Listing of committee policies established or revised: None. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues considered by the committee:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The elimination from the list of committee members the title of a position that no longer exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lack of specific language in the Davis Division Bylaws that charges the committee with the approval of certificate programs offered through University Extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction’s wish to submit a proposal to amend the Davis Division Bylaws to specify the authority with the approval of certificate programs offered through University Extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The determination of which committee has authority over programs offered solely through University Extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the committee have review authority over programs offered by University Extension in conjunction with Academic Senate programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the committee have jurisdiction over the programs that do not offer Graduate Academic Certificates and are not offered solely through University Extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest of an ex-officio committee member lending their expertise to draft a committee response to an issue that concerns the operation of a campus unit which the ex-officio member administers and the committee consensus to accept the ex-officio member’s volunteered service to help the committee in this regard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Division Bylaw 28.H. Should administrators who are ex-officio members of Academic Senate committees be given explicit authority to delegate their membership to a person who reports to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The voting rights of a person who has been delegated membership to an Academic Senate committee by an ex-officio member of an Academic Senate committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recourse to an on-line ballot because the requisite quorum for a legal meeting could not be reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair acceptance of appointment to an administrative position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: None. |
Committee’s narrative:

The overarching committee charge is “to review and advise on non-personnel matters relating to the involvement of faculty in public service activities.” The three principle tasks of the charge are to “Select up to four members of the faculty to receive the Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award (DSPSA) . . . review new offerings and the approval process for courses carrying University Extension credit . . . [and] establish policies and criteria for admission to University Extension courses.”

The committee’s charge, Davis Division Bylaw 88, can be found via the following link: http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/cerj/manual/dd_bylaws.cfm?CFID=24354&CFTOKEN=67079693#88-

Only one committee meeting needed to be scheduled for the academic year. At this meeting, Chair Marc Schenker welcomed those attending, initiated introductions, explained the committee’s charge, facilitated the selection of up to four recipients for the 2012 Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award, and focused the committee’s attention on two amendments to the committee’s charge. The established procedures for the committee’s review of UCD Extension proposals, including the committee’s recommendation letter, were presented and accepted by consensus.

The 2011-12 Call for DSPSA Nominations was distributed on October 17, 2011, via the Academic Senate list serve.

The discussion of the nominations for the Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award that had been received by the November 10, 2011, deadline began with a conversation on the criteria to be used in selecting award recipients. The conversation included a summary of what previous committees had considered and deliberated. (The committee’s 2009-10 annual report is referenced for this information.) The discussion of the nominations concluded with the selection of four recipients for the 2012 DSPSA: Elizabeth Applegate (Department of Nutrition), Mark Mannis (Ophthalmology and Vision Science), John Largier (Bodega Marine Laboratory), and Robert Washino (Department of Entomology). A recommendation of each selected recipient was submitted to the Representative Assembly for approval.

On February 28, 2012, the Representative Assembly approved the committee’s recommended recipients.

On May 2, 2012, at the Academic Senate and Academic Federation Awards Reception, each of the recipients was presented an honorarium and a certificate mounted on a plaque. Each recipient was also publically recognized in a brochure that was distributed at the reception. Each will be added to the DSPSA list of recipients maintained on the Academic Senate, Davis Division website.

The committee conducted electronic reviews of three new UCD Extension proposals.

The committee voted by electronic ballot to amend its charge, Davis Division bylaw 88, in two respects. One respect was to eliminate the ex-officio committee membership of the Director of the Public Service Research Program, as this director’s position no longer existed. The other respect concerned the incorporation of specific language that would give the committee explicit authority for the approval and review of post-baccalaureate certificate programs offered solely through a University Extension program.

Mid-year, Chair Schenker accepted the position of Associate Vice Provost for Outreach and Engagement. By this time, the selection of the 2012 DSPSA recipients had been completed. Subsequently, no new committee business arose that required the formal installation of a replacement chair.

Respectfully submitted,

Marc Schenker, Chair
Trish Berger
Robin Erbacher
Philip Martin
Michael O’Mahony
Ravi Dasu, Academic Federation Representative
Simon George, Academic Federation Representative
### Committee on Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 8</th>
<th>Meeting frequency</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: 4 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approx. 3 meetings/quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Grant Proposals Reviewed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Grants (2K): 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Grants (10-25K):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Initiative/Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary: 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Grants ($800): 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FY 2011-12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total of reviewed grant proposals deferred from the previous year: 0 |
| Total projects deferred to the coming academic year: None. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Grant Proposals Approved for Funding in 2011-12:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Grants (2K): 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Grants (10-25K):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Initiative/Collaborative Interdisciplinary: 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Grants ($800): 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FY 2011-12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None |

| Listing of committee policies established or revised: Funding cutoffs for all programs will be determined by availability of funds. The committee will examine the policies again during the 2012-2013 academic year and will consider other revisions. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues considered by the committee:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COR received and discussed the following reports and proposals from other Academic Senate or administrative committees and provided comments and responses for each of them as appropriate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. PPM 200-45: Pre-Purchasing System Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Campus Email Committee Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COR Items Discussed/Reviewed During 2011-12:

The Committee on Research dealt with a number of issues of substantial importance to the campus during the 2011-2012 academic year. The Committee on Research Chair attended Senate Executive Council meetings, Representative Assembly meetings, and Provost Senate Chair’s meetings. The Vice Chancellor for Research (or a representative from his office) regularly attended Committee on Research Policy meetings and provided information and updates on campus and systemwide issues, including the ongoing reorganization of the Office of Research.

2012-2013 COR Grant Awards
The Committee on Research Grants (CoRG) subcommittee awarded 147 Small Grants in Aid and 18 New Initiative/Collaborative Interdisciplinary Grants to Promote Extramural Funding. The committee also awarded 372 Research Travel Grants during the 2011-2012 academic year. The relative distribution of monies across campus remained consistent with an approximately 50/50 distribution between the “hard” and “soft” disciplines. Travel grants remain the first priority of the grants program. Overall, the Committee on Research was able to award all small grant and travel grant applications and stay within budget.
However, any further budget reductions will make it nearly impossible for the committee to sustain its grant programs. Over the last four academic years, the Committee on Research budget has been reduced cumulatively by $442,845.00.

Committee on Research Grant Report
In May 2012 a report was sent to Provost Hexter, Chancellor Katehi, and Vice Chancellor Lewin regarding the success of the Committee on Research grants program. The report was also distributed to the Senate membership and presented at an Executive Council meeting. Overall, the COR grants program has been a resounding success. Both the small and large grant programs have helped UCD faculty to win outside grants, publish books and articles, perform creative work, present research at conferences, and get favorable publicity in the mainstream press. The large grant program has served its intended purpose of helping faculty acquire the data they need to get larger, externally funded grants. In June, Provost Hexter sent a response to Chair Olmsted acknowledging the grant program’s positive effect on professors’ morale at a time when the campus faces difficult institutional challenges and applauds the grant program for demonstrating the immense usefulness of these awards to the faculty.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Olmsted, Chair
Zhaojun Bai
Sue Bodine
Gino Cortopassi
Kent Erickson
David Hwang
Judy Jernstedt
Mike Kleeman
Marjorie Longo
Mark Matthews
Nelson Max
Sally McKee
Marty Privalsky
Dan Ragland
Subhash Risbud
Ed Taylor
Bella Merlin
Xiangdong Zhu
Zeljka Smit-McBride, Academic Federation Representative
Harris Lewin, Vice Chancellor for Research (Ex-officio)
Kimberly Pulliam, Analyst
### Undergraduate Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 15</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: Meetings were held every other week during the fall, winter and spring quarters, or as needed.</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: Chair can expect up to 5 hours per week; committee members, approximately 1 hour per week.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Business items Reviewed: 55 (6 procedural changes; 5 policy reviews; 1 audit; 6 items for consideration; 2 reviews; 2 requests; 7 program reviews; 1 agreement; 1 allocation; 2 reports; 22 proposals.)</td>
<td>Total proposals deferred from the previous year: 3 (Proposed Engineering Minors in Materials Science; Computational Biology &amp; Bioinformatics; and Biomedical Engineering)</td>
<td>Total projects deferred/continued to the coming academic year: 5 (Standardization of Emphases Transcript Notations; Standardization and Consistency of Listings of Majors in General Catalog; Meetings with Dean re: Cluster 3 Undergraduate Program Review; endorsement of centralized testing center; continued discussion of standardization of honors programs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: Amendment to the UGC charge, Davis Division Bylaw 121, to state that any pre-baccalaureate program that is not offered by the UCD University Extension or the Education Abroad Program must be reviewed by the UGC.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None.

Procedural changes recommended for the coming year:
1. Guidelines for Governing the Creation of Honors Programs
2. Standardization of Emphases Transcript Notations
3. Standardization and Consistency of Listings of Majors in General Catalog
4. Creation of testing center to accommodate student exam issues

Issues reviewed and considered by the committee:
1. Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs (Informational)
2. Implementation Guidelines for the Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs
3. PPM 200-25 Revision Proposal
4. Proposal to Reconstitute the Department of Spanish and Classics
5. Proposed Minors in Engineering: Biomedical Engineering and Computational Biology and Bioinformatics
6. Proposed Minor in Engineering: Materials Science
7. On-line Degree Certification Proposal (PPM 45)
8. Proposal to Establish 3 New Chemistry Degree Programs
9. Proposal to Establish the Department of Design
10. UC Davis Athletics Strategic Audit 2011
11. BOARS Transfer Policy Revision Proposal
12. Proposed Course Evaluation Regulation DDR 534
13. Proposal to Merge the Departments of Textiles/Clothing and Biological/Agricultural Engineering
14. Proposal to Disestablish the Department of Applied Science
15. Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulation 610
16. Student Led Courses
17. Professional Schools Offering Undergraduate Degrees
18. Teacher Coach Role in Athletics
19. Proposal to Discontinue Electronic Materials Engineering Major
20. Review of the American History and Institutions Catalog Galley
21. Proposed Revision to Davis Division Regulation 538 – Disability Accommodations for Final Exams
22. Proposed Revision of Davis Division Bylaw 28 (H)
23. GE2 Exception Request from the College of Engineering
24. GE3 Exception Request from the College of Engineering
25. LUMINA Degree Qualifications Profile
26. Association of American Colleges and Universities Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education
27. Association of American Colleges and Universities Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education: VALUE Rubrics
28. Cluster #3: College of Letters and Science Undergraduate Teaching Programs in Anthropology, Communications, East Asian Studies, History, Jewish Studies, Linguistics, and Philosophy
29. Special Committee on Athletics Report Review
30. Proposed Name Change Request: Expository Writing to Professional Writing
31. Proposal to Discontinue Optical Science (OSE) Engineering Major
32. Proposal for Religious Studies Departmental Status
33. Korea University Exchange Agreement
34. Undergraduate Tuition Allocation – Version 3
35. Proposed Name Change Request: Human and Community Development to Human Ecology (includes proposal to merge Human and Community Development and Environmental Design)
Committee’s narrative:

Undergraduate Council (UGC) has statutory authority over undergraduate education and programs. This includes establishing policy for undergraduate education on the Davis campus, as well as developing and reviewing campus-wide educational objectives and criteria for evaluating educational effectiveness; establishing policy and exercising authority to approve or not approve establishment and discontinuation of undergraduate programs; authority on academic disqualifications and or/dismissals, and authority over undergraduate transcript notations. Undergraduate Council also considers and reports on matters referred to it by the Chief Campus Officer, the Chair of the Division, the Representative Assembly or any other standing committee of the Davis Division, or by the Faculty of any college or school located wholly or in part on the Davis campus; initiates appropriate studies and makes reports thereon involving undergraduate educational policy; and identifies one of its members for nomination to serve as the divisional representative to the University Committee on Educational Policy and one of its members for nomination to serve as the divisional representative to the University Committee on Preparatory Education.

Four subcommittees report to the UGC. The Committee on General Education was active this year responding to questions following in the wake of the implementation of the new GE requirements in Fall 2011 and discussing an assessment plan to determine the student learning outcomes from the implementation. The GE Committee, chaired by Maggie Morgan, addressed campus unit GE administrative questions and formalized answers to develop clear understanding. The differences between the old GE requirements and the new GE requirements were addressed as was the application of each to continuing, transfer and newly enrolled students. The UGC commends and thanks Professor Morgan and the GE Committee for facilitating the continued successful transition to the new GE requirements.

The Special Academic Programs Committee, chaired by Diane Strazdes, focused on honors programs. Participation by students in the social sciences, humanities and arts at the annual Undergraduate Research Conference has
fallen. Many qualified students are not seeing themselves as honor students. Advisors were contacted to encourage students to participate. When the Insect Biology Undergraduate Research Honors Program was proposed, Professor Strazdes analyzed the proposal. Her analysis and subsequent report led to a discussion of the Davis Honors Challenge. A request to change DHC 195 to something other than "Honors" that was sent to the Chair of the DHC. Recommendations outlining honors program requirements were sent to the Chairs of the Faculty Executive Committees of the campus colleges and schools. Another outcome was the reformulation of the Insect Biology Undergraduate Research Honors Program as a research mentoring program.

The Undergraduate Instruction Program Review Committee, chaired by Carl Whithaus, completed the scheduled reviews of the Cluster #3 College of Letters and Science undergraduate teaching programs in Anthropology, Communications, East Asian Studies, History, Jewish Studies, Linguistics, and Philosophy. Each completed review included a UIPR summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the respective program, the conclusions reached, formulated recommendations, and in one program’s case, a request for an update on the status of issues raised by the respective department report and the UIPR summary. The UGC forwarded all materials to the Provost and looks forward in the coming year to reviewing these cluster reports with the relevant deans in order to foster increased dialogue with departments and greater synchronization between program review and resource allocation by administration. We hope that the undergraduate program review process will both become more efficient and also more effective in providing timely and useful information to facilitate better undergraduate learning and efficient and effective deployment of resources.

The Committee on Preparative Education, chaired by Christiana Drake, focused on the impact that increasing the enrollment of international students would have on entry level writing exams, English Second Language courses and funding during the current budget crisis. Service of non-English proficient students will be increased with the greater international student recruitment that is an integral part of the 20/20 Initiative. The Committee discussed this concern and those associated with the fact that the entire UCD curriculum is open to international students. Graduate ESL training was distinguished as another and separate issue.

UGC’s counterpart at the UC system-wide level is the University Committee on Education Policy (UCEP). This committee meets once per month at the University of California Office of the President in Oakland. UGC Chair Jon Rossini served as the Davis Divisional representative to UCEP, and in this capacity he provided regular updates to the UGC about issues relating to undergraduate education on UC campuses system wide. UCEP spent a great deal of time working with issues of system-wide courses in relationship to the developing UCOE (UC Online Education) project through the office of the
Other key issues included providing WASC (Western Association of Schools and Colleges) with advice and suggestions regarding proposed changes to the accreditation process.

The most problematic issue that came before UGC was the increasing number of requests from Departments and Colleges to discontinue or consolidate majors. The trend towards major closings or consolidations continues from last year and is largely driven by financial constraints. The UGC responded to concerns that administrative decisions driven by budgetary anxiety are not necessarily the most appropriate decisions from a campus or system-wide viewpoint. And UGC encourages early dialogue with involved parties as appropriate in order to intervene early enough in the process to facilitate solutions. We would hope that concerns about programs would emerge explicitly through review processes and that program reviews would be used in making decisions about changes in undergraduate programs. However, it might be appropriate in specific cases to engage the UGC along with other appropriate bodies to assist programs that are important for the campus as a whole or might be a place for a synergy of faculty investment in a way not organized by a traditional department or college configuration. The UGC would like to see proposals to eliminate majors clearly describe the academic rationale for such actions. The UGC believes that proposals need to include plans for students continuing in the major once admissions are suspended. Because existing students are allowed to finish in a major being closed, the UGC also believes it is generally necessary to suspend admissions to a major initially and eventually close admissions prior to its formal discontinuance. Requests to suspend admissions to a major should therefore include the information and rationalization required to discontinue the major if that is the true intent of the suspension. The UGC’s response to the trend was the creation of Guidelines for Requesting Suspension of Admissions to a Major.

At a voluntary meeting of faculty teaching in large lecture convened by Susan Keen, a member of the UGC, with support of the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, the idea of a centralized testing center as a way of facilitating the testing of students who have special accommodations was introduced. The UGC will likely propose this to the Senate for further endorsement in the Fall.

In the moments where the UGC has had to determine contentious issues, we have tried to support the will of the majority of local faculty when possible, although we have also facilitated review processes to help better inform the academic grounds of decision making about majors and programs. We plan to continue to work to standardize certain processes across departments and colleges including honors programs, catalog copy, and the use of emphases within a major, and will be in dialogue with the colleges about these issues in the coming year.
There were no ASUCD representatives on the UGC, and there was no GSA representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Rossini, Chair
Colin Carter
Gregory Dobbins
Christiana Drake
Patrick Farrell
Susan Keen
Maggie Morgan
Janet Roser
Diana Strazdes
Matthew Traxler
Carl Whithaus
Jeffrey Williams
Victoria Cross (Academic Federation Representative)
Patricia Turner (Ex-Officio – Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies)
Elias Lopez (Ex-Officio – University Registrar)
Nancy Kilpatrick, Undergraduate Council Analyst (September to January)
Bryan Rodman, Undergraduate Council Analyst (January to August)

The following remarks are from the outgoing Undergraduate Council chair:
The Undergraduate Council is a relatively recent entity on the UC Davis campus and its primary role is providing a campus-wide perspective on change in undergraduate instruction and policy. Historically, many of these responsibilities were delegated to the Colleges, but there is little or no record of these relegations. The Undergraduate Council sees its role as engaging with questions of undergraduate education at a campus level and as such sometimes appears to act counter to the desires of individual colleges or departments in making changes to majors or other curricular decisions. One role of the Undergraduate Council is to help remind the faculty and the administration that some undergraduate programs may be important to the campus as a whole, even if they are peripheral to a single unit. And, given the increased energy to consolidate driven by financial exigency as well as a positive desire to facilitate interdisciplinary programs, it is crucial for the campus to begin thinking critically about ways to support programs that cross colleges and interests without employing a “lead dean” model. In addition, with the new budget model providing a relatively transparent picture of the allocation of undergraduate tuition based on enrollment and number of majors at the unit level, it is important that a central body review substantive changes that may emerge to serve one unit but which may not serve the interests of the campus as a whole.

Respectfully,
Jon Rossini
Annual Report: Academic Year 2011-12
Davis Division: Academic Senate

General Education Committee

Total Meetings: 7  Meeting frequency: Monthly  Average hours of committee work each week: 6

Reviewed the following:  (See Committee Narrative.)  
  2 Questions (Criteria used for determining topical breadth and core literacy courses; and the committee’s role in developing an assessment of the effectiveness of the new GE requirements); 0 reports; and 0 issues continued from the previous year.

  2 Questions (Criteria used for determining topical breadth and core literacy courses; and the committee’s role in developing an assessment of the effectiveness of the new GE requirements); 0 reports; and 4 issues (Posting FAQs and responses to the GE web page; the student catalog rights respective to the old GE and their catalog rights respective to the new GE; faculty who want to opt-out of making their courses compliant with the new GE; and getting faculty to make their courses compliant with the new GE) continue to the coming academic year.

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:  None

Listing of committee policies established or revised:  None

Issues considered by the committee that were also considered last year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval criteria applied by Committee on Courses of Instruction when determining Topical Breadth and Core Literacies for proposed courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed changes to Davis Division Regulation 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and initial testing of procedures for ongoing assessment of the new General Education requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of assessment design with the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: None.

Committee’s narrative:

The General Education Committee (GEC) is a subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council. The committee is charged with the responsibility of supervising the General Education (GE) program by establishing the criteria that govern certification of courses for the GE program, periodic review of the rosters of courses that are approved for GE credit and the inclusion of these courses in the General Catalog along with other appropriate information regarding General Education, determining the extent to which multidisciplinary individual majors satisfy GE requirements in the components of the GE program, actively promoting the development of new GE courses and clusters, continuous review of the effectiveness of the GE program, and of advising the Representative Assembly on matters relating to the GE program including desirable changes to regulations and bylaws.

The committee met seven times during the 2011-12 academic year. It reviewed surveys drafted and designed to get a sense of how instructors were implementing the new General Education requirements. It reviewed and formalized responses to questions that campus units had regarding the implementation and application of the new GE requirements and the continuance and application of the old GE requirements, which remain in effect but are being phased out as the student population to which they apply graduates. The committee discussed the purpose, character, nature, targets and goals of plans designed to assess the implementation of the new GE requirements and the resulting student learning outcomes. It reviewed and discussed the GE assessment tools, approaches and rubrics of other institutions of higher education. It reviewed and commented on General Catalog text edits regarding transfer students, Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) policy and new and old GE requirements. The committee also responded to two exception request proposals from the College of Engineering: one proposal concerned the old GE requirements; and one proposal concerned the new GE requirements.

The committee’s work revealed inconsistencies in General Education language on different web pages used to describe, define and/or interpret general education requirements and led to the committee’s clarification of the Davis Division Regulations concerning Requirements for Undergraduate Degrees. The committee’s work also revealed that two separate GE web links/tools characterized the same course differently. The committee determined that the new GE course approval processing procedures need to be defined. The committee also pointed out the discrepancy between old GE topical breadth descriptions and new GE topical breadth descriptions. When the Registrar’s Office made the Internal Transcript Guide (ITG) available (designed to help faculty and staff decipher the UC Davis internal transcript document), the committee brought to the attention of the Registrar’s Office that embedded links to general education information were confusing and provided inaccurate information. Working with the Registrar’s Office, the committee resolved the ITG issues. The committee determined that General Education information needed to be located at one web site/page and that the link to this site/page needed to be used on any other web site/page as the link to General Education information.
The committee provided recommendations for improving the Integrated Curriculum Management System (ICMS).

The committee discussed and determined its role in the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation process that is scheduled to begin in the Fall of 2012.

The GEC Chair, together with the chair of the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI) and the chair of the Undergraduate Council (UGC), agreed during a meeting mid-October, 2011, that all GE questions were to be passed along to COCI. During the same meeting, the procedure for passing GE questions to COCI was outlined and agreed upon.

The committee formalized responses to questions and inquiries posed by campus units seeking clarification of the application of the new GE requirements and the old GE requirements and submitted its formalized responses to the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction for review and comment. The committee plans to post the final formalized responses to the General Education web site under the heading “FAQs.”

Priorities for 2012-13:
Clarification of GE information for benefit of students.
Clarification of Davis Division Regulations 521-523.
Clarification of non-submission of courses for Topical Breadth approval.
Clarification of rejection of courses submitted for Topical Breadth approval.
Clarification of status of courses submitted for Topical Breadth approval.
Availability of a search tool that would report on GE information on all courses and was not restricted by quarter parameters.
Update GE web page, especially with FAQs.
Catalog rights respective to the old GE requirements.
Catalog rights respective to the new GE requirements.
COCI criteria for determining topical breadth and core literacy courses.
The committee’s role in developing an assessment of the new GE student learning outcomes.
Navigation of new Registrar Office web site.

Respectfully submitted,

Maggie Morgan, Chair
Marta Altisent
Steven Carlip
Ronald Hess
Terry Nathan
John Smolenski
Craig Warden
Gail Martinez, Academic Federation Representative
Bryan Rodman, Committee Resource Analyst
Committee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review

Total Meetings 9
Meeting frequency: as needed – avg. 1/month
Average hours of committee work each week: varies

Total of Undergraduate Programs Reviewed 15
(courses, proposals, cases, etc.)
Total deferred from the previous year: 7 (cluster 3 CLAS)
Total deferred to the coming academic year: 0

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
None.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:
None.

Issues considered by the committee:
● agreed to request for an expedited review for Clothing & Textiles and Polymer Science programs
● members voted and agreed to accept the use of external reviewers for Exercise Biology and University Writing Program

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
The use of external reviewers for programs that may benefit from them

Committee's narrative:

BIA is the office of record for the appendices (data) and is responsible for sending the data reports to the home departments with a courtesy copy to the Academic Senate office and home department college.

UIPR receives reviews from the colleges upon completion of program, department and college review.

For each program, UIPR committee members review the following materials: the self-review by the home department of the program, the report on the program by the College's Undergraduate Program Review Committee, and the responses from the department chair and/or master adviser, the Dean, and the College Executive Committee. For each program, UIPR committee members prepare a report providing a summary of the program’s major strengths and weaknesses, and recommendations on how to address the weaknesses.
The reports are then posted for review by all members of the committee, finalized and forwarded to Undergraduate Council with a summary for discussion.

In January, the committee held a meeting of representatives from SARI /ARM and Cluster 6 programs in January to discuss anything specific to their programs that should be addressed in the data supplied to them.

Working throughout the year (Oct. through May), the committee completed and submitted reports to Undergraduate Council on reviews of fifteen undergraduate teaching programs:

Seven of these fifteen programs were deferred from 2010-11, so this completes Cluster 3 reviews:

- CLAS:
  - Anthropology
  - Communications
  - East Asian Studies
  - History
  - Jewish Studies
  - Linguistics
  - Philosophy

The remaining eight programs that were reviewed complete Cluster 4:

- CAES:
  - Community & Regional Development
  - Human Development
  - Managerial Economics

- CLAS
  - Economics
  - International Relations
  - Political Science
  - Psychology
  - Sociology

Cluster 5 reviews from CAES, CBS and CLAS are currently in process. It is anticipated that Cluster 5 program reviews will be submitted to UIPR in the upcoming 2012-13 academic year, along with the expedited review from Textiles & Clothing and Fiber & Polymer Science.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl Whithaus, University Writing Program, UIPR Chair
Susan Ebeler, Viticulture & Enology
Michele Igo, Microbiology
Timothy Lewis, Mathematics
John Smolenski, History
Resmi Karalassseril Ravindran, AF Representative
Winder McConnell, Ex-Officio, German & Russian and Director, CETL
Debbie Stacionis, Academic Senate Analyst
Updated Response to the UC Davis Academic Senate’s Executive Council Request for an Action Plan

October 1, 2012
(REVISED)
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Executive Summary: Draft Action Plan

The UC Davis Academic Senate’s Executive Council report of May 2, 2012, requested that the campus administration submit a detailed action plan by June 1, 2012, in response to the recommendations of the Executive Council Special Committee on the November 18th Incident. The council also asked the administration to issue a follow-up report by Oct. 1, 2012. With the submission of this report, the administration has honored both requests.

This updated plan reflects accomplishments to date. Progress has been particularly noteworthy and robust in two categories: Police Operations and Administrative Leadership and Decision Making. Progress in other areas will accelerate with resumption of the academic year. The Executive Council’s recommendations, and the administration’s response, have been guided by recommendations contained in the Reynoso Task Force Report and Kroll Report (to be referenced as the Reynoso-Kroll report in this document). In addition, campus work teams have been monitoring and examining formal recommendations received from other sources, including those contained in the final report prepared by UC Berkeley law Dean Christopher Edley and UC General Counsel Charles Robinson, “Response to Protests on UC Campuses,” released on Sept. 13, 2012, and the UC Davis Graduate Student Association.

As was mentioned in the initial action plan, responses to some recommendations require input from the broader campus community. Those recommendations will receive greater attention and focus now that the campus community has re-convened for the fall. It would not have been constructive nor consistent with academic tradition to press forward absent input, reflection and response from faculty and students. Consequently, a number of meetings, forums and discussions will be scheduled in the fall and next spring to enable interested parties to learn more about specific recommendations and to provide necessary input and reaction. The administration remains open to comment and criticism and will invite the participation of the entire campus community in these processes.

In the initial report to the Academic Senate, a number of actions were detailed that had already been undertaken. This report reflects additional actions that have been taken since the submission of the initial June 1, 2012, report. This report is then, cumulative, and reflects the span of activities, programmatic decisions, etc., that have been made to date.

Significant actions include:

- Creation and posting of an on-line matrix that enables viewers to track the origin of a recommendation, where that recommendation currently resides, who or what office is responsible for acting on the recommendation and the current status of the recommendation. http://demonstrationreviews.ucdavis.edu/combined-report-recommendations/index.html

- All members of the Council of Vice Chancellors (COVC) and the Event and Crisis Management Team (40 individuals in all) have completed the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Introduction to the Incident Command System, ICS-100, for Higher Education.

- The campus Event and Crisis Management Team participated in a tabletop exercise designed to review a scenario of a demonstration on campus, review the plans/impact of the demonstration with the team and have the team work through strategic guidance to develop a staff response to/or support of the demonstration.  The team used a standard National Incident Management System and Standardized Emergency Management System (NIMS/SEMS) structure for the exercise.
• All UC Davis police officers completed a use of force training in September 2012: half of the officer completed the training on Sept. 21 and the other half completed the training on Sept. 26. Officers were taught an innovative approach to control and restraint called the CDT System – which stands for Compliance, Direction and Take Down.

CDT is a “soft-handed” control/restraint system that is easy to learn, maintain and apply. The key to the CDT System is that it addresses personal well-being and subject safety while decreasing the liability factors of all concerned. By covering these three major aspects, CDT allows for safer control and less risk of potential liability factors. That alone makes it different than any other soft-handed system available today for the proper use of force.

• The Davis Campus Emergency Operations Plan has been updated to conform to NIMS/SIMS and includes standardized procedures for planning, managing, communicating and collaborating on event or incident management.

• The UC Davis Police Department, with the assistance of a risk management consultant, LEXIPOL, is in the process of updating its policies to be consistent with all federal and state laws and best practices.

All policies will be shared online once the review is complete.

  o Three updated policies placed online in February 2012 included:
    ▪ Use of force
    ▪ Hate-based incidents
    ▪ Authorized weapons and tools

• The Police Department and UC Davis students have developed an information card to distribute during demonstrations and protests prior to direct interaction with police, offering advice on what students should do and expect during such incidents. Student participation helped ensure that the information on the card was presented in the clearest possible manner.

• All Police Department operations plans now identify the difference between passive and active resistance and are specific as to the appropriate use of force in each category.

• All operations plans are required to be completed and reviewed by the provost or other designated campus executive prior to the Police Department implementing any plan.

• Free speech policies have been collected and reviewed from the Davis campus, as well as the nine other UC campuses and 24 other large public universities. In addition, more than 20 law review articles and other legal resources addressing free speech on university campuses have been compiled to provide references for review bodies.

Still other changes include:

• Regular postings on-line of documents related to the recommendations to ensure transparency, openness and availability of information to interested parties.

• A large number of changes in police procedures, policy and orientation to the campus community.

• Ongoing training and education for administrative leadership in incident response or event management and public safety protocol.

• Education in decision making, group facilitation, inclusiveness and designation of specific individuals with specific responsibilities in responding to a campus incident or event.
• Evolution of a campus perspective toward peaceful demonstrations that views such activities as normal campus events consistent with the exchange of viewpoints in an intellectual and academic environment that requires dialogue and relationship building.

• A welcome proposal from the Academic Senate to exercise leadership around campus discussions of free speech and free speech issues.

As we begin the fall quarter, we look forward to entering into a range of discussions with the Academic Senate and the student body that will provide additional insights and perspectives on engaging in productive campus dialogs on issues of importance to the campus community, including protest and demonstration activity conducted in a safe, collegial environment.
Section I: Academic Senate Recommendations

In April 2012, the UC Davis Academic Senate’s Executive Council Special Committee on the November 18th Incident issued a “Special Committee Report.” The Executive Council endorsed seven recommendations contained in the special committee’s report, most of which were based on or used as a point of departure from the Reynoso-Kroll report. On May 2, 2012, the UC Davis Academic Senate’s Executive Council endorsed a number of recommendations in response to the events of November 18, 2011, and requested that Chancellor Katehi provide a detailed written action plan by June 1, 2012, and a progress report by Oct. 1, 2012.

This report is in response to that request for an action plan and is an update to the plan submitted to the UC Davis Academic Senate on June 1, 2012.

As previously noted, UC Davis has established a campus team to review, synthesize and analyze the formal recommendations it has received in response to the events of November 18, and to implement the action plan in response to the recommendations. The campus administration has played a lead role in the overall strategic direction of analysis and assignment of work related to recommendations submitted to date. The campus administration is also actively considering emerging policy directives, fostering the open circulation of such potential directives for public comment and input, and will guide implementation of adopted policies and directives.

These efforts will also now incorporate additional aspects of the UC system’s final report prepared by Dean Edley and General Counsel Robinson, titled “Response to Protests on UC Campuses,” which addresses systemwide issues associated with campus policing and civil disobedience. UC President Mark Yudof announced on Sept. 13, 2012, that he was calling on administrators throughout the UC system to undertake active consideration of the report’s 49 recommendations. He also pointed out that some of the recommendations may be adapted for systemwide use, while others may be modified to fit individual campus cultures and still others may be deemed to be unworkable.

Recommendations from the UC Davis Graduate Student Association will be addressed as well.

The campus administration has divided all the recommendations from the UC Davis Academic Senate and the Reynoso-Kroll report into four specific categories for the purposes of analysis, organization and implementation. These include:

- Administrative Leadership and Decision Making
- Protest Policies and Engagement
- Community Engagement
- Police Operations
I.1 Academic Senate Recommendation AS-1: Benchmarks and Metrics

To enhance accountability and responsiveness, the Academic Senate called for the establishment of benchmarks and metrics to measure progress on the administration’s response to its recommendations and those from the Reynoso-Kroll report. The senate recommended that quarterly reports be submitted to an oversight committee constituted by the Executive Council that describes progress in meeting the goals of each recommendation.

**Category:** Administrative Leadership and Decision Making

**Academic Senate Benchmark:** Benchmarks and metrics shall be established to measure progress on the administration’s response to its recommendations and those from the Reynoso-Kroll reports. The senate also recommended submission of quarterly reports describing progress in meeting goals of each recommendation.

**Action status:** Benchmarks and metrics for assessing the administration’s progress in responding to the Academic Senate’s recommendations and those from the Reynoso-Kroll reports can be found in this report as well as online at [http://demonstrationreviews.ucdavis.edu/combined-report-recommendations/index.html](http://demonstrationreviews.ucdavis.edu/combined-report-recommendations/index.html).

---

I.2 Academic Senate Recommendation AS-2: Freedom of Expression Group

The special committee endorsed a Reynoso-Kroll report recommendation calling for the campus to develop a broadly accepted agreement on rules and policies that regulate campus protests and instances of civil disobedience (Reynoso, 26). The committee specifically called for the “formal constitution of a Freedom of Expression Group” to:

- Address the need for new policies and procedures that clearly define the appropriate time, place and manner of freedom of expression on campus.
Create and implement guidelines that enable appropriate parties to recognize civil disobedience and student protest as specific categories of action, with reference to a Reynoso-Kroll report recommendation that university policy guidance distinguish between protest activity that becomes “serious enough to warrant police response and the application of the criminal law, instead of administrative sanctions and referral to internal campus enforcement mechanisms.” (Kroll, 128).

Address the need for student responsibility, by making clear to students the guidelines for protest activity protected by the First Amendment and the consequences when these guidelines are violated.

“The group should be attentive to the needs that pertain to the special nature of a campus community. Freedom of expression in a campus community should go far beyond the protections of the First Amendment.”

The Senate Executive Council approved this recommendation and plans to form that committee through senate action. In parallel to the Executive Council’s decision, the campus administration, in response to a recommendation in the Reynoso-Kroll report, proposed the creation of a task force with broad representation of the various campus constituencies, including representatives of the following:

- UC Davis faculty members with expertise in specific policy areas.
- UC Davis staff members with experience addressing past campus protest activity and knowledge about the needs of campus constituencies.
- UC Davis undergraduate, graduate and professional students.
- External subject-matter experts as needed.

with the charge to:

- Collect and evaluate existing systemwide and campus policies and procedures concerning freedom of expression; time, place and manner regulations; protocols for response to protest activity, including legal bases for such response; and available remedies for conduct found in violation of university policies or the law.
- Collect and evaluate best practices from other universities.
- Develop recommendations for revised and/or new campus policies concerning the recommendations of the task force in a manner that is clearly articulated, regularly communicated, readily understood, easily accessible and capable of being consistently practiced.
- Provide robust opportunities for input from the campus community.

Initially, the administration proposed that the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the campus administration work together to create one task force/committee that represents a broad constituency and is charged with providing guidance for the adaptation of new campus policies and practices.
In the interim, the Academic Senate has offered to exercise leadership over this activity and has proposed the formation of a Freedom of Expression Group to independently undertake duties associated with clarifying and evaluating campus policies and procedures, identify best practices and solicit input from the campus community. The administration welcomed this proposal and asked that students be included and represented on the group, and that work proceed on a defined timeline to ensure completion of the task prior to the start of the spring quarter. The group will then develop recommendations and forward them to the administration for consideration.

**Proposed Action**

**AS-2:** The UC Davis Academic Senate formed a Freedom of Expression Special Committee to conduct an independent, scholarly review of freedom of expression at UC Davis. The review will likely include a review of existing policies, legal precedents, community discussions, etc. Creation of the Academic Senate Special Committee supersedes an earlier suggestion of an administration task force on the same subject.

The Senate's special committee is charged with generating a report by December 1, 2012 that outlines observations and recommendations for consideration by the Davis Division of the Academic Senate and by the campus administrative leadership. The Executive Council of the Academic Senate may vote to extend the term of this Special Committee.

Based upon the recommendations of the Senate's Special Committee, the campus administration will determine the need for development and implementation of new policies and/or procedures that define the appropriate time, place, and manner of freedom of expression on campus. These procedures could also include educating UC Davis students on the disciplinary consequences associated with violating the campus' free speech policies.

**Category:** Protest Policies and Engagement

**Academic Senate Benchmark:** This group should be established by fall 2012. Recommendations should be submitted to campus administration by Jan. 31, 2013.

**Action status:** Ongoing. In support of the planned efforts of the Senate’s Freedom of Expression Group, the campus administration has collected and reviewed free speech policies and guidelines from the Davis campus, as well as the nine other UC campuses and 24 other large public universities. In addition, more than 20 law review articles and other legal resources addressing free speech on university campuses have been compiled to provide references for review bodies.

**I.3 Academic Senate Recommendation AS-3: Decision Making**

The senate recommended a specific definition of “consultation” that recognizes the need for dissenting opinions to be offered without fear of retaliation and to be heard without prejudgment. In particular, the senate described meaningful consultation as requiring that decision makers “reserve judgment, consider all options, and state clearly the reasons for their ultimate decisions.”
**I.4 Academic Senate Recommendation AS-4: Leadership**

In reference to the “Leadership Team” described in the Reynoso-Kroll report that evaluated administration responses to protest activity during the week of Nov. 14, 2011, the senate agreed with the following Kroll finding: “The creation of the Leadership Team, an inter-disciplinary team to address developing campus issues and potential crises, was an excellent idea, but the Leadership Team must include a clearly defined structure and set of operating rules.” (Kroll Report, page 127).

The senate recommends that such a team include representatives from administration, Academic Senate, Academic Federation, staff and students, and that these representatives should be selected by their respective groups.

**UC Davis Proposed Action**

**AS-4:** The campus administration also agrees with the Kroll recommendation that its “inter-disciplinary” teams addressing potential campus crises have “a clearly defined structure and set of operating rules.” We also agree that members of the campus community should be consulted.

In response to Reynoso-Kroll report recommendations, the Davis Campus Emergency Operations Plan is being updated to ensure full compliance with the National Incident Management System/Standardized Emergency Management System (NIMS/SEMS) and standardized procedures for planning, managing, communicating and collaborating to manage any size event or incident.
Category: Administrative Leadership and Decision Making and Police Operations

Timeline: July 30, 2012

Summary: The Davis Campus Emergency Operations Plan is being updated with procedures and protocols to clearly delineate:

- Thresholds for activating the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and leadership roles
- The role of the Event and Crisis Management Team
- Coordination and communication between field operations and policymakers

In addition, efforts are underway to increase familiarity with NIMS/SEMS procedures and protocols. For example:

- The campus emergency manager has provided an overview of NIMS/SEMS to policymakers.
- Campus leadership has already participated in one tabletop exercise and will participate in additional tabletops as well as a full-scale emergency exercise annually. The first tabletop exercise for campus leadership was successfully conducted on Sept. 14, 2012.

Response to Kroll Recommendation 8-1: UC Davis has developed and implemented an integrated, multi-level emergency management team with clear delineation of roles and responsibilities; arranged for executive-level police training; identified senior administrators to be present at major events or incidents where direct police involvement is contemplated; and begun a systematic weekly review by a policy-level team of emerging (potentially crisis) issues.

Category: Leadership and Administrative Decision Making and Police Operations

Timeline: Completed and ongoing.

Summary: Refer to A-3 for details on emergency management plans. In addition, the campus has initiated the following:

Systematic Policy Guidance: Under the direction of the provost and executive vice chancellor, a team of policy-level senior administrators – supported by other key university functions including Campus Counsel, Student Affairs and University Communications – meets weekly to discuss campus-level policies for issue and crisis management, assess their applicability to current issues and events and, after significant incidents, debrief to identify areas for improvement.

Incident Management: Leadership presence. Protocols have been established to ensure that designated campus officials – principally the provost and executive vice chancellor and the vice chancellor of student affairs or specific designees – are present at any events that have reached a point where direct police involvement might be contemplated.

Executive Education on Policing: Campus leaders are receiving executive-level training from the state Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), specifically oriented to the challenges facing policy-level university administrators.
The chancellor is charged with the responsibility for the operation and administration of the campus, including campus safety and ensuring an environment conducive to achieving the university’s mission. (Regents Standing Order 100.6) The administration’s response to imminent potential crises requires the ability to be nimble and act on short notice, circumstances that are not always conducive to broad consultation with representatives of all campus constituencies before relevant decisions can be made in a timely manner. However, such broad consultation and input on these issues will be obtained in less urgent circumstances through the creation of the Freedom of Expression Group and Campus Community Council, described above, as well as existing forums.

**Category:** Administrative Leadership and Decision Making

**Academic Senate benchmark:** This group should be established by fall 2012.

**Action status:** Completed and ongoing.

Formation of the Campus Community Council was announced on April 6, 2011. The Council has held meetings in May and in June, 2012.

### I.5 Academic Senate (AS) Recommendation AS-5: Communication

The senate committee endorsed the creation of a set of procedural guidelines to provide a framework for ensuring that all parties possess a common understanding of commands and other communications.

**UC Davis Proposed Action**

**AS-5:** The National Incident Management System/Standardized Emergency Management System (NIMS/SEMS) is designed to provide a common vernacular and decision-making process for all situations. It will enable campus administrators to respond more efficiently and effectively. NIMS/SEMS training is planned for the summer and a schedule for periodic practice exercises will be established.

Update of AS-5 Actions:

- By Sept. 14, 2012, all members of the Council of Vice Chancellors (COVC) and the Event and Crisis Management Team (40 individuals in all) had completed the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Introduction to the Incident Command System, ICS-100, for Higher Education.

- On June 24, 2012, the COVC and the Event and Crisis Management Team members (40 individuals) completed a course in Event Management Training.

- Over the course of the summer of 2012, the campus’s emergency manager provided a series of training modules designed to acquaint COVC and the Event and Crisis Management Team members with NIMS/SEMS vernacular and decision-making processes. These modules are ongoing.
The campus Event and Crisis Management Team participated in a tabletop exercise on Sept. 14, 2012. Twenty-five members of the Event and Crisis Management team participated. The exercise was designed to review a scenario of a demonstration on campus, review the plans/impact of the demonstration with the team and have the teamwork through strategic guidance to develop a staff response to/or support of the demonstration. Standard NIMS/SEMS structure was used for the exercise.

A guide for the Event and Crisis Management team has been adopted that provides a framework for reviewing campuswide issues and documenting the decision-making process and decisions related to the response, and to ensure procedural guidelines are in place for a decision-making process and appropriate and effective communication to the campus community.

Category: Administrative Leadership and Decision Making

Action Status: Significant progress and ongoing training

Academic Senate Benchmark: Procedural guidelines for checking comprehension of the NIMS/SEMS structure, its decision making process, and communication processes under this model should be established by fall 2012. Complete.

I.6 Academic Senate (AS) Recommendation AS-6: Police and Emergency Management Board

The senate recommended the following:

- Creation of a police and emergency management review board specific to the Davis campus.
- Whenever possible and appropriate, alternatives to police force should be used, such as Student Judicial Affairs.
- Establishment of a clear structure that defines and delineates the limits of civilian and police authority.

UC Davis Proposed Action

AS-6: The campus has secured a nationally recognized expert on police accountability and will schedule forums in the fall with campus groups to discuss what best practices exist for oversight of police departments and how best to review police actions, including the merits of a review board.

The review and revision of campus policies addressing free expression and consequences for engaging in conduct in violation of these policies will address the appropriate role of police and administrative responses to campus protest activity.
Category: Administrative Leadership and Decision Making

Academic Senate Benchmark: A review board should be established by fall 2012. An updated Emergency Plan (characterized by transparency, effectiveness and accessibility consistent with NIMS/SEMS) should be established as soon as possible.

Action Status: Ongoing. The UC Davis Police Department has contracted with a nationally recognized expert in the areas of accountability and police oversight to engage members of the campus community in a discussion of establishing a police commission or police auditor position. An on-campus meeting has been scheduled for Oct. 11, 2012. Additionally, the Office of Student Affairs is reviewing the campus’ Student Judicial Affairs processes to determine if and how those processes can effectively be used as an appropriate and viable alternative to police intervention.

1.7 Academic Senate (AS) Recommendation AS-7: Organizational and Administrative Structures

The senate committee noted its perception of campus unrest as occurring within a wider context. It also called upon the administration to initiate a healing process and to establish patterns of behavior consistent with the campus’s Principles of Community (http://occr.ucdavis.edu/poc/).

The committee recommended that the administration engage in a form of open dialogue with the campus community consistent with its aforementioned principle of consultation. It also noted that the Academic Senate and Academic Federation faculty have a key role to play in providing guidance and alternative perspectives in the healing process.

UC Davis Proposed Action

AS-7: Campus administration has charged a Campus Community Council to develop an action plan for deliberation and discussion. The campus will hold a number of forums designed to elicit feedback on specific policy changes and other related issues throughout the fall. Forums and groups will be organized to promote dialogue and the search for common ground.

Category: Community Engagement

Academic Senate Benchmark: Open forums for dialogue and real communication and consultation with evidence of attendance and impact by fall 2012.

Action Status: Ongoing.

- The campus will schedule fall, winter and spring quarter campus community forums, developed in collaboration with the newly formed Campus Community Council.
- The Office of Campus Community Relations (OCCR), in collaboration with the UC Davis Police Department, has organized a Campus Community Orientation Program for newly hired UC Davis Police officers. The first program was provided on August 27.
• Associated Students of the University of California, Davis (ASUCD) and other student organizations will be encouraged to initiate, sponsor or collaborate on an annual event that is supportive of the UC Davis Principles of Community.

• Faculty and staff constituent groups will be encouraged to initiate, sponsor or collaborate with others annually on a campus community event or activity supportive of the UC Davis Principles of Community.

• The online Principles of Community Training Module for faculty and staff will be updated on a regular basis, and all employees will be strongly encouraged to complete the training by the end of 2012-13 academic year.

• A new online Principles of Community Orientation Module will be developed for students. And all new students (freshmen and transfers) will be encouraged to complete the online Principles of Community Module during their first enrolled quarter at UC Davis.

• All new student leaders will be required to complete the new online Principles of Community Modules for students as a part of their orientation for student leadership positions and responsibilities.

• The campus will develop a marketing and communications plan to inform the community about the UC Systemwide Hate and Bias Incident Reporting System.

• The Office of Student Affairs is exploring the use of the Restorative Justice Program as a tool to address differences among members of the campus community.

• The campus will develop educational materials (i.e. policies, resources, and informational brochures) and programmatic activities related to the issues of free speech and freedom of expression at UC Davis.
Section II
Summary of Reynoso Report Recommendations

Expectations: Implement recommendations through a consultative process with campus community stakeholders. Develop interim actions until all stakeholder groups are consulted. Pursue recommendations vigorously and evaluate as to effectiveness and intended objective.

II.1 Reynoso Recommendation A-1: Agreement on policies regulating protests and civil disobedience

The Reynoso Task Force recommends that the campus develop a broadly accepted agreement on rules and policies that regulate campus protests and instances of civil disobedience. This broadly accepted agreement should be grounded in our campus culture and regularly communicated to students. These rules and policies should be subject to regular review, and:

- Be consistent with free speech doctrine;
- Recognize the importance of debate to institutional function and identity;
- Respect rights and interests of non-protesting students, faculty and staff;
- Respect needs of the university to operate without undue interference;
- Recognize that purpose of protest is to inform and persuade, not to coerce;
- Define "non-violent" vs. "active resistance" and "violent" protests and clarify use of force;
- Communicate legal basis for university’s response; and
- Identify consequences for breaches of rules and policies.

Category: Protest Policies and Engagement

Timeline: Feb. 1, 2013

Summary: Members of the proposed task force will include representatives of the following:

- UC Davis faculty members with expertise in specific policy areas.
- UC Davis staff members with experience addressing past campus protest activity and knowledge about the needs of campus constituencies.
- UC Davis undergraduate, graduate and professional students.
- External subject-matter experts as needed.

UC Davis Proposed Action

A-1: Collaborate with the senate Executive Council to charge a campus task force to review and revise campus policies concerning protest activity, social justice and civil disobedience, consistent with campus culture and free-speech doctrine, and make recommendations as to their implementation. See AS-2 above.

UCDAVIS
Its charge:

- Collect and evaluate existing systemwide and campus policies and procedures concerning freedom of expression; time, place and manner regulations; protocols for response to protest activity, including legal bases for such response; and available remedies for conduct found in violation of university policies or the law.
- Collect and evaluate best practices from other universities.
- Develop recommendations for revised and/or new campus policies concerning the recommendations of the task force in a manner that is clearly articulated, regularly communicated, readily understood, easily accessible and capable of being consistently practiced.
- Provide robust opportunities for input from the campus community.

Category: Protest Policies and Engagement

Academic Senate Benchmark: This group should be established by fall 2012. Recommendations should be submitted to campus administration by Jan. 31, 2013.

Action status: Ongoing. In support of the planned efforts of the senate’s Freedom of Expression Group, the campus administration has collected and reviewed free speech policies and guidelines from the Davis campus, as well as the nine other UC campuses and 24 other large public universities. In addition, more than 30 law review articles and other legal resources addressing free speech on university campuses have been compiled to provide references for review bodies.

II.2 Reynoso Recommendation A-2: Improve communication between leadership and campus

The Reynoso Task Force recommends that the campus Leadership Team engage in (1) proactive communication and consultation with the Academic Senate, Academic Federation, Staff Assembly, Graduate Student Association, Associated Students of UC Davis and student governments of professional schools to build relationships and identify issues early; (2) invest in prevention through engagement in community dialogue and community building; and (3) develop a structure for campus constituents to raise issues (such as holding regular office hours).

UC Davis Proposed Action

A-2: A Campus Community Council has been formed, with broad student, academic, staff, emeriti, alumni, community and administrative representation. The Council is imagined as one of the key venues for communication between leadership and campus constituencies on strategic issues facing the campus and the campus community.
Summary: The council, along with the Office of Campus Community Relations, intends to proactively engage in community dialogue and community building. Steps under consideration include:

- Increasing the number of inclusive campus community programming activities, such as the Campus Community Book Project and Dialogues on Diversity professional development, and extending such initiatives to staff and students.
- Establishing a race and gender institute with a mission of encouraging faculty to engage in research at the intersections of race, gender, ethnicity and such public policy issues as access to affordable education, health care, diversity, economic development/disparities, internationalization of higher education and other related issues.
- Leverage faculty expertise to sponsor campus lectures or forums on current topics of importance, including free speech, freedom of expression and civil disobedience.
- Hold annual meetings between the chancellor and/or provost and administrative advisory committees — such as the Status of Women at Davis, the Staff Affirmative Action and Diversity Committee, the Disability Issues Advisory Committee, and the Campus Council on Community and Diversity.
- Encourage the administrative advisory committees to hold campus forums on topical issues, and engage in year-round efforts to help foster dialogue, discussion and recommendations for action in real time.

Category: Administrative Leadership and Decision Making

Action status: Completed and ongoing. The Campus Community Council, established on April 6, 2011, will serve as the foundation for this effort. The council will hold a series of meetings throughout the fall and spring quarters to enhance and reinforce the campus’s commitment to consultation as an active practice.

II.3 Reynoso Recommendation A-3: Develop standardized policies for managing campus events and incidents

The Reynoso Task Force recommends that campus leadership develop procedures and protocols compliant with the National Incident Management System/Standardized Emergency Management System (NIMS/SEMS) in order to achieve standardized procedures for planning, managing, communicating and collaborating to manage a large scale event or incident.

- Delineate engagement of administrative procedures vs. law enforcement; define thresholds for activation and leadership roles in an Incident Command System; rehearse emergency preparedness; familiarize Leadership Team with NIMS/SEMS.
- Designate senior administration official to manage all matters related to such incidents, including protocols and procedures for collecting and validating information.
- Establish procedures that delineate policy making and decision making from tactical implementation, and train both administrators and police.
**Summary:** The Davis Campus Emergency Operations Plan is being updated with procedures and protocols to clearly delineate:

- Thresholds for activating the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and leadership roles;
- The role of the Campus Emergency and Crisis Management Team;
- Coordination and communication between field operations and policymakers.

**Category:** Administrative Leadership and Decision Making

**Timeline:** July 30, 2012

**Action Status:** Complete and ongoing.

- By Sept. 14, 2012, all members of the Council of Vice Chancellors (COVC) and the Event and Crisis Management Team (40 individuals in all) had completed the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Introduction to the Incident Command System, ICS-100, for Higher Education.

- On June 24, 2012, the COVC and the Event and Crisis Management Team members (40 individuals) completed a course in Event Management Training.

- Over the course of the summer of 2012, the campus emergency manager provided a series of training modules designed to acquaint COVC and the Event and Crisis Management Team members with NIMS/SIMS vernacular and decision-making processes. These modules are ongoing.

- The campus Event and Crisis Management Team participated in a tabletop exercise on Sept. 14, 2012. Twenty-five members of the Event and Crisis Management team participated. The exercise was designed to review a scenario of a demonstration on campus, review the plans/impact of the demonstration with the team and have the teamwork through strategic guidance to develop a staff response to/or support of the demonstration. Standard NIMS/SEMS structure was used for the exercise.

- A guide for the Event and Crisis Management team has been adopted that provides a framework for reviewing campuswide issues and documenting the decision-making process and decisions related to the response, and to ensure procedural guidelines are in place for a decision-making process and appropriate and effective communication to the campus community.
II.4 Reynoso Recommendation A-4: Heal the campus and apply Principles of Community in a practical fashion

The Reynoso Task Force recommends that the Leadership Team devote itself to a healing process for the university community, including steps to operationalize the Principles of Community, and that the administration consider restorative justice – repairing the harm caused or revealed by criminal behavior through a process that includes all stakeholders – among other tools to address behavior that negatively impacts the campus climate.

**UC Davis Proposed Action**

**A-4:** Under the guidance of the Office of Campus Community Relations, campus leaders will carefully review the Principles of Community and develop concrete steps to make certain that these principles are the foundation for all future actions.

**Category:** Community Engagement

**Timeline:** TBD

**Action status:** Ongoing

- The campus will schedule fall, winter and spring quarter campus community forums, developed in collaboration with the newly formed Campus Community Council.
- The Office of Campus Community Relations (OCCR), in collaboration with the UC Davis Police Department, has organized a Campus Community Orientation Program for newly hired UC Davis Police officers. The first program was provided on August 27, 2012.
- Associated Students of the University of California, Davis (ASUCD) and other student organizations will be encouraged to initiate, sponsor or collaborate on an annual event that is supportive of the UC Davis Principles of Community.
- Faculty and staff constituent groups will be encouraged to initiate, sponsor or collaborate with others annually on a campus community event or activity supportive of the UC Davis Principles of Community.
- The online Principles of Community Training Module for faculty and staff will be updated on a regular basis and all employees will be strongly encouraged to complete the training by the end of 2012-13 academic year.
- A new online Principles of Community Orientation Module will be developed for students. And all new students (freshmen and transfers) will be encouraged to complete the online Principles of Community Module during their first enrolled quarter at UC Davis.
- All new student leaders will be required to complete the new online Principles of Community Modules for students as a part of their orientation for student leadership positions and responsibilities.
- The campus will develop a marketing and communications plan to inform the community about the UC Systemwide Hate and Bias Incident Reporting System.
- The campus will develop educational materials (i.e. policies, resources, and informational brochures) and programmatic activities related to the issues of free speech and freedom of expression at UC Davis.
II.5 Reynoso Recommendation B-1: Chancellor should employ outside assistance to review police department protocols and procedures

The Reynoso Task Force recommends that the chancellor employ outside assistance to review UC Davis Police Department protocols and procedures. Once the review is completed, specialized training should occur with all members of the Police Department to assure compliance with modern and contemporary practices for a campus-based police department.

UC Davis Proposed Action

B-1: We have secured the assistance of the state Commission on Police Officer Standards and Training (POST) to conduct a top-to-bottom review of the UC Davis Police Department. This will include a review of all training and personnel background files for compliance and recommendations for improvement. When complete, these reviews will be made public.

Category: Police Operations

Timeline: Initial meeting took place in May 2012

Action status: Ongoing.

The UC Davis Police Department, with the assistance of a risk management consultant, LEXIPOL, is in the process of updating its policies to be consistent with all federal and state laws and best practices (process began May 14, 2012).

All policies will be shared online once the review is complete. Three updated policies placed online in February 2012 included:

- Use of force
- Hate-based incidents
- Authorized weapons and tools

The Police Department will establish its first crowd management policy consistent with guidelines of the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST).

A daily training system will be designed to routinely educate Police Department staff on policy and keep all employees current.

All operations plans, effective March 2012, are required to be completed and reviewed by the provost or other designated campus executive prior to the Police Department implementing any plan.

The Police Department has invested in a new software program, “IAPro,” which is designed to ensure the most efficient and effective handling of citizen complaints, administrative investigations, use-of-force reporting and other types of incidents, while providing the means to analyze and identify areas of concern. IAPro assists public safety agencies in identifying potential problems early on, so that proactive action can be taken. Installed and implemented effective Sept. 18, 2012.
As of Jan. 9, 2012, all sworn and civilian Police Department supervisors have completed a 40-hour small group leadership course.

Incident Command System (ICS) training:

- All Police Department supervisors have completed ICS training, as of January 2012; ongoing, refresher training will continue.
- We have requested and received assistance from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and the California Emergency Management Agency to provide refresher ICS training to all Police Department supervisors, to be completed by September/October 2012.
- All Police Department employees will have completed ICS training by Dec. 1, 2012.
- This will lead to a tabletop exercise on campus in February 2013. Other campus partners will be invited to attend. This tabletop exercise will then lead to a full-scale exercise in 2014 and, again, all campus partners will be invited to attend.

Use of force training:

- All UC Davis police officers completed a use of force training in September: half of the officers completed the training on Sept. 21 and the other half completed the training on Sept. 26. Officers will be taught an innovative approach to control and restraint called the CDT System – which stands for Compliance, Direction and Take Down.
- CDT is a “soft handed” control/restraint system that is easy to learn, maintain and apply. The key to the CDT System is that it addresses personal well-being and subject safety while decreasing the liability factors of all concerned. By covering these three major aspects, it allows for safer control and less risk of potential liability factors. That alone makes it different than any other soft-handed system available today for the proper use of force.
- The CDT System is viewed as minimal justifiable force and is based on a proven theory that less is better.

Police Department management met with representatives from the Museum of Tolerance to discuss campus community matters. (Jan. 18, 2012)

Review by the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST).

- Chief of police met with POST executives to discuss its review of UC Davis Police Department. (April 24, 2012)
- POST presentation to Police chief and campus executives. Topic covered how to provide oversight and what to expect when having responsibility for a police department. (May 11, 2012)
- POST conducted a compliance audit of all police department training and background files. (June 8-12, 2012) Background files found to be out of compliance will be corrected no later than Sept. 20, 2012.
- POST in July 2012 approved the Police Department’s participation in a three-day, team-building workshop in December 2012. The Team Building Workshop (TBW) Program provides specialized consultant services to assist a local agency’s management team with program solving, developing organizational goals and objectives, and team building.
II.6 Reynoso Recommendation B-2: Police Chief should evaluate role of students in police functions

The Reynoso Task Force recommends that the police chief evaluate the appropriate role of student involvement in police functions, such as increasing the size and utilization of the Aggie Hosts. The focus should be on fostering a deeper sense of community.

**UC Davis Proposed Action**

**B-2:** Review of the Aggie Host Security Service continues. As such, the chief will begin a pilot program that will increase the size of student involvement on campus and in the police community. This pilot program will potentially divert officer funding to a nighttime facility security patrol that will only utilize students. This will require the hiring of additional students for the Aggie Host program, which currently employs approximately 80 students.

At the direction of the provost and executive vice chancellor, the police chief also will direct the coordinator of the Volunteers in Police Service (VIPS) program to seek increased student involvement by working directly with the Office of Student Affairs and other student groups on campus.

**Category:** Police Operations

**Timeline:** Ongoing with annual assessment.

**Action status:** Ongoing.

Funding originally designated for two police officer positions has been redirected to help support a student facility security program (June 1, 2012). Students now patrol campus seven nights a week to help ensure that campus facilities are secure. The Police Department is in the process of adding 20 new student positions.

Our nationally recognized Volunteers in Police Service program (VIPS) will launch a new volunteer cadet program in January 2013 to help prepare UC Davis students interested in a career in law enforcement. Marketing for this program will begin in fall 2012.

- The Police Department will select 15 to 20 students to serve as volunteer cadets. This rigorous program is similar to a pre-police academy. To be a cadet, an applicant must be a UC Davis student, a senior in good standing and graduate on or before June 2013. At the completion of their service, three of the cadets will receive a sponsorship to attend the Police Academy. The Police Department will then hire one of those cadets as a police recruit and, upon successful completion of the academy, reclassify the recruit as a police officer.
- This program seeks to expand the diversity of the Police Department’s hiring pool, seek community partnership and encourage campus community members to apply to be UC Davis Police Officers.
- The VIPS program will also be seeking to grow its student volunteer patrol program. This group provides support to patrol officers in the field and improve safety on campus.
II.7 Reynoso Recommendation B-3: UC Davis Police Department should strive to be a model of policing

The Reynoso Task Force recommends that the UC Davis Police Department should strive to be a model of policing for a university campus and ensure best practices are followed.

**UC Davis Proposed Action**

**B-3:** UC Davis will strive to become a model for campus law enforcement and regain its position as a respected and trusted member of the community.

**Category:** Police Operations

**Timeline:** Ongoing with annual assessment.

**Summary:** By accomplishing the aforementioned goals, and under the direction of the provost and executive vice chancellor, the police chief will evaluate the success of the strategic plan on an ongoing basis, while continuing to foster community involvement. Formalized department policy that is regularly reviewed and updated utilizing POST and consultant LEXIPOL guidelines will ensure best practices are implemented and followed. The department will actively seek formal input from community stakeholders and use that feedback to drive continuous improvement.

**Category:** Police Operations

**Timeline:** Initial meeting took place in May 2012. Efforts ongoing.

**Action status:** Ongoing. Because these accomplishments correspond to and overlap with Reynoso Recommendation B-1, please refer to the response to B-1, above.

II.8 Reynoso Recommendation C-1: Adopt UC campus-specific policies regarding the UC Police Departments

The Reynoso Task Force recommends that the University of California study, evaluate and adopt policies involving the training, organization and the operation of UC Police departments to ensure that they reflect the distinct needs of a university community and utilize best practices and policing adapted to the characteristics of university communities.

**UC Davis Proposed Action**

**C-1:** Systemwide changes are still pending UC Office of the President review.

**Category:** Police Operations

**Timeline:** Ongoing.
**Action status:** UC President Mark Yudof announced on Sept. 13, 2012, that he was calling on administrators throughout the UC system to undertake active consideration of the 49 recommendations in the report prepared by Dean Edley and General Counsel Robinson, titled, “Response to Protests on UC Campuses.” The report addresses systemwide issues associated with campus policing and civil disobedience. UC President Mark Yudof announced on Sept. 13, 2012, that he was calling on administrators throughout the UC system to undertake active consideration of the report’s 49 recommendations. He also pointed out that some of the recommendations may be adapted for systemwide use, while others may be modified to fit individual campus cultures and still others may be deemed to be unworkable. UC Davis is actively considering these recommendations at the present time.

### II.9 Reynoso Recommendation C-2: *Create a systemwide inter-agency support system*

The Reynoso Task Force recommends that the University of California adopt a systemwide policy for inter-agency support that requires responding agencies to respect the local campus’s rules and procedures, including specifically those for the use of force.

**UC Davis Proposed Action**

**C-2:** Systemwide changes are still pending UC Office of the President review.

**Category:** Police Operations

**Timeline:** Pending

**Action status:** See response to C-1, above.

### II.10 Reynoso Recommendation C-3: *UCOP should review Police Officers Bill of Rights*

The Reynoso Task Force recommends that the UC Office of the President should review provisions of the Police Officers Bill of Rights that appear to limit independent public review of police conduct and make appropriate recommendations to the Legislature.

**UC Davis Proposed Action**

**C-3:** Systemwide changes are still pending UC Office of the President review.

**Category:** Police Operations

**Action status:** Complete. The UC systemwide report by Dean Edley and General Counsel Robinson, “Response to Protests on UC Campuses,” did not contain a recommendation on the Police Officers Bill of Rights. This does not, however, preclude the system from at some point in the future engaging on this issue.
II.11 Reynoso Recommendation D-1: *All members of the campus community adhere to the Principles of Community*

D-1: Please refer to response AS-7.

Category: Community Engagement

Timeline: TBD
Section III  
Kroll Report Recommendations

The Kroll report has identified recommendations for both the UC Davis administration and for systemwide policing throughout the University of California. On the civilian side, improved institutional decision-making processes and a coherent culture are critical. On the law enforcement side, the report also calls for systemwide improvements to police practices and procedures.

III.1 Kroll Recommendation 8.1: UC Davis Leadership Team

Establish a clearly defined structure and set of operating rules for the Leadership Team.

1. Develop a statement of membership and designate chair to guide meetings.
2. Schedule and communicate meeting times; identify if meetings are mandatory or can be attended by substitute.
3. Summarize decisions at conclusion and ensure decision makers have opportunity to state opinion.
4. Create “listserv” for team-wide communications.
5. Provide Leadership Team with tailored training in California Standardized Emergency Management, especially relating to public protest.
6. Review legal options including administrative violations and criminal violations.
7. (UC should) provide policy guidance on what is acceptable protest behavior and what is not.

**UC Davis Proposed Action**

*Kroll Recommendation 8.1:*
*In addition to the reforms spelled out in the previous sections of this action plan, the Davis Campus Emergency Operations Plan is also being updated to ensure full compliance with the National Incident Management System/Standardized Emergency Management System (NIMS/SEMS) and standardized procedures for planning, managing, communicating and collaborating to manage any size event or incident.*

**Category:** Police Operations and Administrative Leadership and Decision Making

**Timeline:** TBD

**Action status:** Completed and ongoing.

- The Davis CampusEmergency Operations Plan has been updated to conform to NIMS/SIMS and includes standardized procedures for planning, managing, communicating and collaborating on event or incident management.
- A statement of membership and designation of chair are complete.
- Meeting times are clearly scheduled. Attendance by primary or alternate members is mandatory.
- Minutes are kept of each meeting and circulated among members.
• A “listserv” for team-wide recommendations has been created and instructions issued on how to use it.

• Legal options, including administrative violations and criminal violations have been scheduled for review by the group.

• The systemwide report, “Response to Protests on UC Campuses,” examined the role of protest behavior on campuses and proposed a number of ways to engage protests and protest behaviors.

• By Sept. 14, 2012, all members of the Council of Vice Chancellors (COVC) and the Event and Crisis Management Team (40 individuals in all) had completed the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Introduction to the Incident Command System, ICS-100, for Higher Education.

• On June 24, 2012, the COVC and the Event and Crisis Management Team members (40 individuals) completed a course in Event Management Training.

• Over the course of the summer of 2012, the campus emergency manager provided a series of training modules designed to acquaint COVC and the Event and Crisis Management Team members with NIMS/SIMS vernacular and decision-making processes. These modules are ongoing.

• The campus Event and Crisis Management Team participated in a tabletop exercise on Sept. 14, 2012. Twenty-five members of the Event and Crisis Management team participated. The exercise was designed to review a scenario of a demonstration on campus, review the plans/impact of the demonstration with the team and have the teamwork through strategic guidance to develop a staff response to/or support of the demonstration. Standard NIMS/SEMS structure was used for the exercise.

• A guide for the Event and Crisis Management team has been adopted that provides a framework for reviewing campuswide issues and documenting the decision-making process as well as decisions related to the response as well as to ensure procedural guidelines are in place for a decision-making process and ensuring appropriate and effective communication to the campus community.

**Category:** Administrative Leadership and Decision Making

**Action Status:** Significant progress and ongoing training

### III.2 Kroll Recommendation 8.2: Systemwide Policing at the University of California

1. Institute policing changes systemwide, and not just at UC Davis.

2. Transition from 10 police departments to a unified, standardized police force.

3. Create position of chief safety administrator with functional authority over 10 police chiefs and authority to audit core functions.

4. Create, implement, review and establish standardized “public safety” policies

5. Develop an annual statewide training plan on critical policing issues/skills for the UC campus police.

6. UC policing apparatus should strive to be leader in constitutional policing of public protest.
**UC Davis Proposed Action**

**Kroll Recommendation 8.2:**

1. **Train all UC police officers in alternative force applications (passive arrest team tactics); include command approval authority for use of specialized munitions and OC (Oleoresin Capsicum, or pepper spray) dispersal methods. (All UC Davis police officers completed the “soft hands” Compliance, Direction and Take Down (CDT) training in September.)**

2. **Review UC Davis protocols for use of force reporting and investigation; include supervisory review of force reports with command and executive review; include threshold triggers to identify employees prone to multiple use of force applications and training and/or remediation. (LEXIPOL provides a standard for policy and means for ensuring all staff are trained on policy daily, IA PRO provides the early warning system and CDT provides the other tool for use of force.)**

**UC Davis is undergoing a complete review and change of the Police Department policy manual. This includes the review of use of force guidelines to ensure consistency with federal and state law and general best practices. This will be accomplished through the use of POST guidelines and other outside experts.**

**As an example, the UC Davis Police Department crowd management policy will be modeled after the recently updated POST guidelines on crowd management. The UC Davis Police Department now requires command approval before the use of chemical agents during a protest or crowd management event. This is formalized through the completed operations plan prior to any event that now requires the provost’s approval.**

**The UC Davis Police Department is currently undergoing a complete training compliance audit that will include a training needs assessment. This assessment will be consistent with new policy and the department’s soon-to-be completed strategic plan that will help to identify the needs of the community and the professional needs of the police organization.**

**Category:** Police Operations

**Action status:** Completed

**Summary:** Completed

All policies will be shared online once the review is complete. Three updated policies placed online in February 2012 address:

- Use of force
- Hate-based incidents
- Authorized weapons and tools

- The Police Department will establish its first crowd management policy consistent with POST guidelines (POST is the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training.)
  - POST guidelines are available now for public view.
The Police Department and UC Davis students have developed an information card to distribute during demonstrations and protests prior to direct interaction with police, offering advice on what students should do and expect during such incidents (project completed March 1, 2012.)

Student participation helped ensure that the information on the card was presented in the clearest possible manner.

All Police Department operations plans, effective March 2012, now identify the difference between passive and active resistance and are specific as to the appropriate use of force in each category. These plans also include guidelines for police use of chemical weapons, including when police can deploy chemical weapons and when officers need prior authorization to deploy such weapons.

All operations plans, effective March 2012, also are required to be completed and reviewed by the provost or other designated campus executive prior to the Police Department implementing any plan.

The Police Department has invested in a new software program, “IAPro,” which is designed to ensure the most efficient and effective handling of citizen complaints, administrative investigations, use-of-force reporting and other types of incidents, while providing the means to analyze and identify areas of concern. This program has been implemented.

All UC Davis police officers completed a use of force training in September 2012: half of the officer completed the training on Sept. 21 and the other half completed the training on Sept. 26. Officers were taught an innovative approach to control and restraint called the CDT System – which stands for Compliance, Direction and Take Down.

CDT is a “soft-handed” control/restraint system that is easy to learn, maintain and apply. The key to the CDT System is that it addresses personal well-being and subject safety while decreasing the liability factors of all concerned. By covering these three major aspects, CDT allows for safer control and less risk of potential liability factors. That alone makes it different than any other soft-handed system available today for the proper use of force.

The CDT System is viewed as minimal justifiable force and is based on a proven theory that less is better.

III.3 Kroll Recommendation 8.3: Additional Recommendations for UC Policing

Conduct a review or gap analysis of UC system’s approach to policing.

1. Provide standardized training involving 21st century crowd management strategies and develop supervisory and executive level crowd management training.


1. Ensure campus emergency personnel comply with state-mandated standards for Incident Command SEMS, especially for documentation.

2. Conduct and evaluate periodic Emergency Operations Center exercises with sworn and civilian personnel according to SEMS and NIMS standards.
3. Train all UC police officers in alternative force applications (passive arrest team tactics); include command approval authority for use of specialized munitions and OC (Oleoresin Capsicum, or pepper spray) dispersal methods.

4. Review UC Davis protocols for use of force reporting and investigation; include supervisory review of force reports with command and executive review; include threshold triggers to identify employees prone to multiple use of force applications and training and/or remediation.

5. Monitor UC progress in meeting above-stated objectives and report progress to the public regularly.

UC Davis Proposed Action

Kroll Recommendation 8.3:
UC Davis Police are reviewing internal processes and procedures, and will participate in NIMS/SEMS trainings. Progress will be reported out to the public on a quarterly basis.

Category: Police Operations

Action status: Complete. See item 8.2.
Randolph Siverson, Chair (Political Science)
Hailey Caparella (ASUCD Representative)
Colin Carter (Agricultural & Resource Economics)
Jack Chin (School of Law)
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Shaun Geer (GSA Representative)
Laura Grindstaff (Sociology)
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To be named (Academic Federation Representative)

RE: Appointment: Freedom of Expression Special Committee

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the Freedom of Expression Special Committee. As you know, the special committee was created following the Executive Council’s Resolution of Censure: http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/documents/Executive-Council-Motion-and-Letter-including-Nov-18.pdf. The special committee charge is enclosed.

The Freedom ofExpression Special Committee is asked to conduct a scholarly review of freedom of expression at UC Davis. This review may include review of existing policy, legal precedent, community discussions, etc. The special committee is asked to generate a report by December 1, 2012, outlining observations and recommendations for consideration by the Davis Division of the Academic Senate as well as campus administrative leadership.

Please feel free to contact Special Committee Chair Siverson rmsiverson@ucdavis.edu or the analyst assigned to the Special Committee, Edwin Arevalo emarevalo@ucdavis.edu with questions.

On behalf of the Committee on Committees, thank you for agreeing to share your valuable time in supporting shared governance at UC Davis.

Sincerely,

Pablo V. Ortiz, Chair
Committee on Committees
Professor of Music
Jan and Betta Popper Professor of Opera

Enclosure

c: Davis Divisional Chair Nachtergaele (w/enclosure)
Associate Director Arevalo (w/enclosure)
Executive Council Special Committee: Freedom of Expression

Overview: In response to the report of the Executive Council Special Committee on the November 18th Incident, the Executive Council hereby establishes the Executive Council Special Committee on Freedom of Expression.

Duration: The Executive Council Special Committee on Freedom of Expression will complete its task by December 1, 2012. The Executive Council may vote to extend the term of the Special Committee as it deems appropriate.

Purpose: The Executive Council Special Committee on Freedom of Expression (Freedom of Expression Special Committee) will address the need for development and implementation of new policies and procedures that clearly define the appropriate time, place and manner of freedom of expression on the campus. The Freedom of Expression Special Committee will develop guidelines that enable appropriate parties to recognize civil disobedience and student protest as specific categories of action. Understanding freedom of expression in a campus environment should go far beyond the protections of the First Amendment. In recognition of the need for student responsibility, the Freedom of Expression Special Committee will provide guidance to assist members of campus administration and faculty in educating UC Davis students concerning policy related to these activities and to specify the disciplinary consequences when they are violated.

Membership

Chair: To be selected by Committee on Committees

Members:
- The Committee on Committees will appoint scholars with disciplinary experience in the areas of freedom of expression and the first amendment.
- One member representing the Academic Federation
- One member representing the Staff Assembly
- One member representing the Graduate Student Association
- One member representing the Associated Students of UC Davis
- Three (ex-officio/non-voting) members to be appointed by the Chancellor

Staff support for the committee will be provided by the Academic Senate Office
Andre Knoesen, Chair (Davis Divisional Vice Chair)  
John Hall, Sociology (CAP Chair 2012-13)  
Jerold Last, School of Medicine (CPB Chair 2012-13)  
Lauren Menz (ASUCD Representative)  
Kathryn Olmsted, History (COR Chair 2012-13)  
Eric Rauchway, History (UCOP Task Force Member)  
Cruz Reynoso, Law (UCOP Task Force chair)  
Julia Simon, French/Italian (Davis Division Special Committee on November 18th Chair)  
Rebecca Sterling (ASUCD Representative)  
Victoria White (GSA Representative)  
To be named (Undergraduate Council representative)  
To be named (Academic Federation Representative)  

RE: Appointment: Administrative Oversight Special Committee

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the Administrative Oversight Special Committee. As you know, the special committee was created following the Executive Council’s Resolution of Censure: http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/documents/Executive-Council-Motion-and-Letter-including-Nov-18.pdf issued spring quarter 2012. The special committee charge is enclosed.

Please feel free to contact Special Committee Chair Knoesen ASVChair@ad3.ucdavis.edu or the analyst to the special committee, Debra Stacionis dstacionis@ucdavis.edu if you have questions.

On behalf of the Committee on Committees, thank you for agreeing to share your valuable time and participating in shared governance at UC Davis.

Sincerely,

Pablo V. Ortiz, Chair  
Committee on Committees  
Professor of Music  
Jan and Betta Popper Professor of Opera

Enclosure

c: Davis Division Chair Nachtergaele (w/enclosure)  
Analyst Debra Stacionis (w/enclosure)
Executive Council Special Committee: Administrative Oversight

Overview: The report of the Executive Council Special Committee on the November 18th Incident has identified a need for the creation of an Executive Council Special Committee: Administrative Oversight (Administrative Oversight) to assure oversight of the Chancellor’s efforts to implement the report's recommendations. The Executive Council hereby establishes said committee. Administrative Oversight will provide a report to the Executive Council at least quarterly. The Executive Council Oversight Special Committee will provide a formal report to each Representative Assembly meeting held during the 2012-2013 academic year. The formal report will be forwarded to the UC Academic Council following presentation to the Representative Assembly. The UC Academic Council will share the formal report with the UC President as it deems appropriate.

Duration: Administrative Oversight will expire on August 31, 2013 unless the Executive Council votes affirmatively to extend its term.

Purpose: Administrative Oversight is charged to interact routinely with the Chancellor and other key administrators to assure that the Executive Council and Representative Assembly receive periodic updates concerning the Chancellor’s progress toward achieving the recommendations outlined in the report of the Special Committee on the November 18th Incident to:

- Improve administrative decision making that includes actively listening to dissenting opinion
- Redefine the administrative leadership team
- Develop and implement procedural guidelines for checking comprehension and communication
- Establish a police and emergency management review board

Membership

Chair: Davis Division Vice Chair 2012-2013

Members:

Five 2012-2013 Standing Committee Chairs to be appointed by Committee on Committees
One Representative from the Reynoso Task Force
One Representative from the Executive Council Special Committee on the November 18th Incident
One member representing the Academic Federation
One member representing the Staff Assembly
One member representing the Graduate Student Association
One member representing the Associated Students of UC Davis

Staff support for the group will be provided by the Academic Senate Office