

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE
SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ



VIDEOCONFERENCE OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Wednesday, June 12, 2019
10:00 am - 1:00 pm

To participate in the videoconference, contact your divisional Senate office for the location of a central meeting place. If you are off-campus, you may join the video and internet audio at

<https://UCOP.zoom.us/j/6568908103>

Or by phone: 1 669 900 6833 Meeting ID: 656 890 8103

I.	ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS	3
II.	MINUTES [ACTION]	
	Approval of the Draft Minutes of the Meeting of April 10, 2019	4-10
	Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, April 10, 2019	11
III.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR	
	▪ Robert C. May	
	1. Apportionment of Representatives to the 2018-19 Assembly [INFORMATION]	12
IV.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE VICE PROVOST, ACADEMIC PERSONNEL	
	▪ Susan Carlson	
V.	UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT	
	▪ Sean Malloy, UCFW Chair	
VI.	REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES	
	A. Academic Council	
	▪ Robert May, Academic Council Chair	
	1. Election of the 2019-20 UCOC Vice Chair [ACTION]	12
	2. Modifications to Senate Regulation 636.E [ACTION]	13
	B. Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools	
	▪ Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair	
	1. UC Transfer Guarantee Policy [INFORMATION]	13
VII.	SPECIAL ORDERS	
	A. Consent Calendar	
	1. Variance to Senate Regulation 782 Requested by the San Diego Division	28
	2. Variance to Senate Regulation 630 Requested by the Santa Cruz Division	33

VIII. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XI. NEW BUSINESS

I. Roll Call

2018-19 Assembly Roll Call April 10, 2019

President of the University:

Janet Napolitano

Academic Council Members:

Robert May, Chair

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair

Barbara Spackman, Chair, UCB

Kristin Lagattuta, Chair, UCD

Linda Cohen, Chair, UCI

Joseph Bristow, Chair, UCLA

Kurt Schnier, Chair, UCM

Dylan Rodriguez, Chair, UCR

Robert Horwitz, Chair UCSD

David Teitel, Chair, UCSF

Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB

Kimberly Lau, Chair, UCSC

Eddie Comeaux, Chair, BOARS

Onyebuchi Arah, Chair, CCGA

Lok Siu, Chair, UCAADE

Daniel Farber, Chair, UCAP

Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, UCEP

Sean Malloy, Chair, UCFW

Andrew Baird, Chair, UCORP

James Steintrager, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (5)

Victoria Frede-Montemayor

Fai Ma

Richard Scheffler

Daniel Boyarin (alt for Suzanne Fleiszig)

Oliver O'Reilly (alt for R. Jay Wallace)

Davis (6)

Anne Britt

Richard Grotjahn

Jeffrey Williams

S.J. Ben Yoo

TBD (2)

Irvine (4)

Jacob Avery

Elliott Currie

Masashi Kitazawa

Amy Powell

Los Angeles (7)

Noel Boyle

Jessica Cattelino

Mansoureh Eghbali

Kym F. Faull

Sandra Loo

William Marotti

Peter Tontonoz

Merced (1)

Shawn Newsam

Riverside (2)

Thomas Cogswell

Manuela Martins-Green

San Diego (5)

Amy Bridges

Seth Cohen

Robert Kluender

Elizabeth Komives

Joseph Pogliano

San Francisco (5)

Elena Flowers

Marek Brzezinski

Steven Cheung

Jacqueline Leung

Vineeta Singh

Santa Barbara (3)

Charles Akemann

Eric Matthys

F. Winddance Twine

Santa Cruz (2)

David Brundage

Janette Dinishak

Secretary/Parliamentarian

George Mattay (alt for Andrew Dickson)

MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

April 10, 2019

MINUTES OF VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday, April 10, 2019. Academic Senate Chair Robert May presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Senate Director Hilary Baxter called the roll of Assembly members and confirmed a quorum. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of December 12, 2018.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**▪ Robert C. May**

Proposed APM 011: A Joint Task Force on Scholarly Obligations and Protections for Non-Faculty Academic Appointees has circulated a proposed APM 011 for systemwide review. The Task Force was co-chaired by UCSC Chancellor Blumenthal and Chair May, The new APM addresses academic freedom for non-faculty academic appointees, including the represented librarians by committing UC to recognizing the professional standards of non-faculty academic appointees who contribute to the academic mission of the University, and to ensuring they are respected. It also clarifies that the academic freedom protections outlined in in APM 010 adhere only to faculty who engage in teaching and research and are obligated by the commensurate responsibilities outlined in the Faculty Code of Conduct (APM 015).

Transfer Guarantee: At the request of President Napolitano, and in response to an MOU between UC and the California Community Colleges, BOARS has developed a proposed model for a guarantee of transfer admission to all qualified CCC students. The proposal is currently under review by Senate divisions and committees. The MOU commits the University to having the guarantee in place to accommodate students entering the CCC in fall 2019. The guarantee focuses on improving transfer preparation and completing UC Transfer Pathway majors. It requires no changes to campus admissions processes, and builds on existing campus-based Transfer Admission Guarantees (TAGs). CCC students who complete specified curricula in one of the 21 Transfer Pathway majors with a 3.5 minimum GPA, and a 3.5 overall GPA, and who complete a TAG will be guaranteed transfer admission at one of six TAG-participating campuses in the Transfer Pathway major.

Nonresident Tuition: The Board of Regents tabled a proposed 2.6% increase in nonresident tuition after several Regents expressed concern about its effect on affordability and diversity. Rejecting the increase will create a \$29 million gap in the 2019-20 UC budget. UCOP and campuses have been emphasizing that nonresidents provide more than financial benefits; they enrich diversity and the educational experience for all students.

Admissions: The University is responding to the recent national admissions scandal involving individuals accused of cheating on the SAT and accepting bribes to gain admission to universities, including UCLA. A group of California assembly members has proposed several bills in response, addressing special admissions for student athletes and others, the use of standardized tests, and preferential admissions treatment for donors and alumni. In addition, the California Assembly passed a Concurrent Resolution calling on UC and CSU to conduct a study of the usefulness, effectiveness, and need for the SAT and ACT in admissions, and asked the State Auditor to investigate the potential for fraud in UC's admissions process. The Academic Council's Standardized Testing Task Force is already examining the role of tests in eligibility and admissions.

Course Evaluations Task Force: A task force consisting of subject-matter experts and Senate representatives from UCAP, UCAADE, UCEP and CCGA will meet to discuss issues of reliability, validity, and bias in student evaluations, determine the scope of any problems, and make recommendations for possible remedies.

UCSF/Dignity Affiliation: The Regents Health Services Committee is discussing a proposed affiliation between UCSF and four hospitals managed by Dignity Health, a religiously-affiliated health care system subject to the Ethical and Religious Directives for Catholic Health Care Services. Many UCSF faculty, staff, and students oppose the affiliation over concerns that Dignity restricts some services, particularly those related to women's and LGBT healthcare, in ways that do not align with UC's public mission and philosophy. UCSF is at capacity and sees the affiliation as a way to meet demand and increase access to healthcare to UCSF patients as well as Dignity patients who want to access UCSF services. The UCFW Non-Discrimination in Healthcare Task Force has just released an interim report about UC's relationships with health services chains and hospitals. Chair May noted that broader input from the Academic Senate is needed about the affiliation and the extent to which it comports with the University's values.

- Several Assembly representatives expressed concern that the University's values could be compromised in an affiliation agreement with Dignity. A UCSF representative noted that the UCSF Academic Senate has been engaged in a careful, robust discussion about the affiliation, which the Senate supports, and believes is in alignment with the campus's public service mission. The affiliation is not motivated by financial considerations alone, but by a commitment to expanding patient care.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY UNIVERSITY SENIOR MANAGERS

- **Janet Napolitano, President**
- **Michael T. Brown, Provost and Executive Vice President**

Faculty Salaries: President Napolitano noted that the Governor's proposed 2019-20 budget provides UC with a \$242 million increase in permanent funding, short of UC's \$420 million request. She has proposed a 5% increase to the faculty salary scales in 2019-20, the second year of a three-year plan to close the faculty salary gap. However, the Governor's proposed 2019-20 UC budget does not fund faculty salaries, and the Regents have not acted on another potential funding source – a proposed 2.6% increase to nonresident tuition. The University will be forced to make difficult decisions if the state does not fund UC's full budget request and the Regents do not support the tuition increase. The President stated that she is holding firm on her commitment to

reducing the salary gap; however, she emphasized that the three-year plan may need to extend to four or five years.

Multi-year Framework: President Napolitano noted that the University will be using the multi-year budget and enrollment Framework as an advocacy tool as it works toward more stable and secure funding to meet UC's priorities and to achieve the goals in the framework. Provost Brown added that the Framework emphasizes growing the professoriate, increasing graduate degree attainment, and supporting faculty research. He encouraged Assembly members to consider how faculty can support the diversity pipeline.

Admissions: In response to the national college admission cheating scandal, President Napolitano has initiated a critical review of UC's admissions policies— first, to determine what each campus is doing around Admissions by Exception (A by E) and Special Admissions, and then to determine if any areas require a deep dive. Campuses use A by E to admit students (often homeschooled) who are technically ineligible. Policy permits up to 6% of students to be admitted through this path, although less than 2% are actually admitted this way. Special Admission describes the admission of UC-eligible students to programs like athletics and performing arts who may not be competitive through the regular process. The University is coordinating with local and federal authorities to investigate and address specific circumstances at UC campuses, and is expecting a new State audit of UC admissions.

Free Speech: On March 21, President Trump issued an executive order directing federal grant-making agencies to require universities receiving federal funds to promote free inquiry on campuses. The order happened to coincide with the inaugural conference of the UC National Center for Free Speech and Civic Engagement, in Washington DC.

Open Access: President Napolitano thanked the Academic Senate, librarians, and faculty for their leadership during the recent negotiations with Elsevier for subscription contract renewals. She said she supports giving UC authors maximum flexibility in determining how to publish and protect public access to research, and noted that the University of California should be a leader on open access, an issue that affects scholars, researchers, and scientists across the world.

GO Bond: UC has been working with CSU to advocate for legislation that would place an \$8 billion General Obligation Bond on the March 2020 ballot to fund construction and maintenance of facilities at UC and CSU. UC is supporting Senate Bill 14 (Glazer), which recently passed out of key State Senate committees on its way to Appropriations and then to the State Assembly.

Restructuring: Provost Brown noted that an assessment report for the UC Center in Sacramento (UCCS) has been circulated to the Senate for review and feedback. The UCCS is a critical systemwide program that provides undergraduates with experiential learning opportunities, and links policy-relevant campus research to the Sacramento community. Other upcoming reviews will include the Innovative Learning and Technology Initiative and UCDC.

V. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

1. Nomination and Election of the Vice Chair of the 2019-20 Assembly

Chair May introduced Mary Gauvain, UC Riverside Distinguished Professor of Psychology, and the Academic Council's nominee for 2019-20 Assembly vice chair and 2020-21 chair. At Chair May's invitation, Professor Gauvain made a statement regarding her background, qualifications, and priorities, and then briefly left the videoconference meeting. Chair May asked for any additional nominations from the floor, and hearing none, asked for any objections to Professor Gauvain's nomination. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve her election. Hearing the motion and a second, he asked the Assembly to give its unanimous consent to her election.

ACTION: The Assembly voted unanimously to elect Mary Gauvain vice chair of the 2019-20 Assembly.

2. Ratification of Mid-Career Leadership Awards

An endowment has been created for an award for Mid-Career Leadership in the Academic Senate to honor individuals whose records demonstrate an exceptional ability to work effectively with different University constituents and exceptional promise for further service to the Senate. The award is planned to be given every other year. Nominations for the award are made through Divisional Committees on Committees to the University Committee on Committees (UCOC). UCOC, in turn, submits the names of two nominees to the Academic Council. At its March 20 meeting, the Academic Council chose to honor both Onyebuchi Arah of UCLA and Sean Malloy of UC Merced with the 2019 Award.

ACTION: The Assembly ratified the nominations of Professors Arah and Malloy as the 2019 recipients of the Mid-Career Leadership Award.

3. Assembly Approved Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (Area D)

In February 2008, the Assembly approved [revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3](#), proposed by BOARS, related to the Area D (laboratory science) requirement for freshman admission. The revisions increase the minimum Area D requirement from 2 units to 3 units (3 units are currently recommended), while continuing to require 2 units of coursework that "provide basic knowledge in at least two of the fundamental disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics". The amendments also change the name of the Area D requirement from "Laboratory Science" to "Science" to reflect the broader range of science disciplines to be accepted for the third unit under Area D. BOARS also approved a modification to the A-G Guide to include specific examples of courses that may fulfill the third unit requirement not explicitly mentioned in the Senate regulations, such as engineering, and computer science. These changes are consistent with the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) adopted by the State of California.

The Regents have delegated admissions policy authority to the Senate, subject to their approval; however, the Senate's recommendation on Area D has been placed on hold, because the Administration has reservations about one of its key elements – increasing the D requirement from 2 to 3 units. The Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) is undertaking an eligibility study to determine what effect if any the change would have. While BOARS supports further study of concerns raised, it wants to move ahead with approval of the other components of the proposal. BOARS has resubmitted the proposed revisions as separate items for Assembly approval. This course of action will allow for additional study while enabling renaming of the requirement and expansion of approved courses to proceed. In the meantime, UC's Area D requirement will remain at two years of laboratory science coursework required; three years recommended.

BOARS' approval of updated evaluation guidelines in the A-G Guide expand the courses eligible for approval in Area D as the third recommended year of the laboratory science subject requirement. Under the expanded course list, students will continue to be required to take two courses from biology, chemistry, physics, or integrated versions of these foundational disciplines. They can then take a recommended third science course from any and all approved Area D courses, which now includes the expanded list.

At its March 20, 2019 meeting, the Academic Council endorsed BOARS' request to separate the three elements of the policy. Chair May asked the Assembly to amend its prior policy as a technical change by breaking it into three motions (listed below).

Several Assembly members spoke in favor of postponing the vote on the third motion until completion of the PPIC study. Members also requested information about what resources and outreach would be provided to high schools that do not offer three Area D-level courses.

1. Rename the area d requirement from “laboratory science” to “science”.

ACTION: A motion to approve the change was made and seconded, and carried unanimously.

2. Endorse the expanded course list approved by BOARS.

ACTION: A motion to approve the change was made and seconded, and carried unanimously.

3. Encourage the administration to increase the course requirements from 2+1 recommended, to 3, in keeping with the NGSS.

ACTION: A motion to approve the change was made and seconded. It carried in a vote of 36 in favor, 11 opposed. There were 5 abstentions.

4. Proposed Policy on Awarding Degrees Posthumously

At its January 23, 2019 meeting, the Academic Council endorsed a proposal from the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) for a systemwide policy for awarding undergraduate and graduate degrees to students who pass away close to the completion of the degree. The Assembly is asked to endorse the policy and forward it to the president with a recommendation for review and final approval by the Board of Regents as a Regents Policy.

First drafted as a set of guidelines for campuses, Academic Council requested a re-draft as an integrative systemwide policy. The resulting policy reflects collaboration with CCGA to include graduate as well as baccalaureate degrees. To compose the policy, UCEP and CCGA collected and reviewed campus policies to develop a shared statement of priorities and processes. UCEP found that requirements for awarding posthumous degrees vary across campuses and the University should have a consistent systemwide policy, given that students receive University of California degrees, not campus degrees. Overall, the focus of this policy is to provide common definitions, parameters, and process guidelines to inform what are unusual and often tragic circumstances, while also allowing for some exercise of judgement given specific circumstances. These degrees and certificates acknowledge the established and potential achievements of UC students. To that

end, this policy provides criteria and procedures to campus leadership, while encouraging generosity. It can be a significant consolation for friends and families of a deceased student to receive formal recognition of the student's pathway to degree completion.

ACTION: A motion to approve the policy was made and seconded, and was carried unanimously.

5. Amendment to Senate Bylaw 336

Following a systemwide Senate review, the Academic Council at its March 20, 2019 meeting approved several revisions to Senate Bylaw 336 in response to Board of Regents Chair Kieffer's June 2018 request to the Senate to implement several California State Auditor recommendations related to improving UC's responses to sexual violence and sexual harassment (SVSH) complaints. Specifically, the Auditor recommended further defining Senate bylaws to require that 1) hearings on SVSH complaints against faculty respondents be scheduled before the Senate Privilege and Tenure (P&T) Committee no more than 60 days after the Chancellor files charges, unless an extension is granted for good cause; and that 2) P&T issue its recommendation to the Chancellor no more than 30 days after a hearing concludes. A Senate working group led by UCPT was formed to create a policy and respond to Chair Kieffer's request. The proposed revisions were released for systemwide Senate review in December 2018.

The revisions significantly compress and streamline current divisional P&T processes, and include a clause allowing extensions for "good cause," defined as "material or unforeseen circumstances related to the complaint and sufficient to justify the extension sought." In addition, while the Auditor's recommendations pertain only to disciplinary cases involving SVSH, Bylaw 336 defines a uniform procedure for handling all alleged violations of the Faculty Code of Conduct, irrespective of their nature. UCPT is developing an additional guidance document that elaborates on appropriate review criteria and timeframes, and circumstances that constitute "good cause" for an extension, which are expected to apply only to circumstances that truly impact the faculty members' ability to participate. The Academic Council has also endorsed a letter from UCPT noting that the changes cannot be implemented as an unfunded mandate, and outlining resources needs in detail. The Senate intends to monitor the implementation of the policy and review outcomes in 2-3 years to determine its effectiveness.

- Assembly members noted that it is important for hearings to proceed in a timely manner for the benefit of both the accused and the victim; however, there remains great concern on campuses that the compressed timelines are neither realistic nor feasible, and that the Senate is being set up to fail. It was noted that a flexible definition of "good cause" is needed, as are resources to support additional staffing and compensation for P&T members who work during the summer.
- Assembly members noted that the Senate has little choice but to respond to the Auditor, and that UCPT did an extraordinary job under difficult circumstances to develop a workable policy. Members recommended that the initial Senate review occur much sooner than three years – perhaps in six months.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the revisions. The motion carried in a vote of 41 in favor and none opposed. There were 6 abstentions.

B. Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

1. CCGA Recommendation to Approve New Flexible Master of Social Welfare self-supporting graduate degree program at UCB

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) recommends approval of a new Flexible Master of Social Welfare self-supporting graduate degree program at UC San Berkeley. The Flex-MSW will be a new degree program at UCB. As required by Senate Bylaw 116.C and Standing Order of the Regents 110.1, CCGA submits its recommendation to the Assembly for consideration. According to Senate Bylaw 116.C, “The Assembly shall consider for approval proposals for the establishment of new graduate degrees received from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and requiring approval by the President, to whom The Regents have delegated authority of approval. Proposals approved by the Assembly shall be submitted to the President.”

ACTION: The Assembly unanimously approved the Flex MSW as a new degree program offered by UCB.

VI. SPECIAL ORDERS

A. Consent Calendar [None]

VII. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [None]

VIII. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [None]

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [None]

X. NEW BUSINESS [None]

The meeting adjourned at 1:10 pm

Minutes Prepared by: Michael LaBriola, Academic Senate Analyst

Attest: Robert May, Academic Senate Chair

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of April 10, 2019

Appendix A – 2018-2019 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of April 10, 2019

President of the University:

Janet Napolitano

Masashi Kitazawa

Amy Powell

Academic Council Members:

Robert May, Chair

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair

Barbara Spackman, Chair, UCB

Kristin Lagattuta, Chair, UCD

Linda Cohen, Chair, UCI

Joseph Bristow, Chair, UCLA

Kurt Schnier, Chair, UCM

Dylan Rodriguez, Chair, UCR

Robert Horwitz, Chair UCSD

Sharmila Majumdar, Vice Chair UCSF (alt for David Teitel, Chair, UCSF)

Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB

Kimberly Lau, Chair, UCSC

Eddie Comeaux, Chair, BOARS (absent)

Amr El Abbadi (alt for Onyebuchi Arah, Chair, CCGA)

Lok Siu, Chair, UCAADE (absent)

Daniel Farber, Chair, UCAP

Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, UCEP

Sean Malloy, Chair, UCFW

Andrew Baird, Chair, UCORP

James Steintrager, Chair, UCPB

Los Angeles (7)

Noel Boyle

Jessica Cattelino

Mansoureh Eghbali

Kym F. Faull

Sandra Loo

William Marotti

Peter Tontonoz

Merced (1)

Shawn Newsam

Riverside (2)

Thomas Cogswell (absent)

Manuela Martins-Green

San Diego (5)

Amy Bridges (absent)

Seth Cohen

Robert Kluender

Elizabeth Komives

Joseph Pogliano (absent)

San Francisco (5)

Susan Chapman (alt for Elena Flowers)

Marek Brzezinski

Steven Cheung

Jacqueline Leung

Vineeta Singh

Santa Barbara (3)

Charles Akemann

Eric Matthys

F. Winddance Twine

Santa Cruz (2)

David Brundage

Janette Dinishak

Berkeley (5)

Victoria Frede-Montemayor

Fai Ma

Richard Scheffler

Daniel Boyarin (alt for Suzanne Fleiszig)

Oliver O'Reilly (alt for R. Jay Wallace)

Davis (6)

Anne Britt

Richard Grotjahn

George Mattay

Jeffrey Williams (absent)

S.J. Ben Yoo (absent)

--

Irvine (4)

Jacob Avery

Elliott Currie

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Andrew Dickson

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

- **Robert May**

1. Apportionment of Representatives to the 2019-20 Assembly [INFORMATION]

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 105.A.4](#), the Academic Council approved at its May 22, 2019 meeting the apportionment of the 40 Divisional Representatives for 2019-20. On the basis of Divisional Academic Senate membership as of March 2019, the Webster Method of Calculation was used to determine the number of Divisional Representatives as follows:

DIVISION	NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES
Berkeley	5
Davis	6
Irvine	4
Los Angeles	7
Merced	1
Riverside	2
San Diego	5
San Francisco	5
Santa Barbara	3
Santa Cruz	2

IV. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT

- **Sean Malloy, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare**

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST (11 A.M.)

- **Michael Brown**

VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

- **Robert May, Chair Academic Council**

1. Nomination and election of the 2019-20 UCOC Vice Chair [ACTION]

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 150.A.1. Committees](#), "...the members-at-large are to be named by the Assembly for two-year staggered terms. Each at-large member will serve as Vice Chair in the first year and shall normally succeed as Chair in the second year." At its May 22, 2019 meeting, the Academic Council endorsed the candidacy of Professor Cynthia Passmore (UCD). Professor Passmore is currently a professor specializing in science education in the UC Davis School of Education. She investigates model-based reasoning in a range of contexts and is particularly interested in understanding how the design of learning environments interacts with students' reasoning practices. She has been a member of UCOC since 2018 and has extensive divisional Senate service at UCD, including as a member of the Committee on Committees since 2016 and as its Chair in 2018-19.

ACTION REQUESTED: Elect the 2019-2020 UCOC Vice Chair.

2. Modifications to Senate Regulation 636.E [ACTION]

Following a systemwide Senate review, the Academic Council at its May 22, 2019 meeting approved a set of revisions to Senate Regulation 636.E, proposed by the Santa Barbara Division and endorsed by the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE), to address equity concerns related to how UC students are allowed to satisfy the University's Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR).

Justification for Amendment to Senate Regulation 636.E: Under current policy, a student at a given UC campus who fails to satisfy the Entry-Level Writing Requirement, takes a leave of absence for well-justified reasons, and takes a transferrable ELWR-satisfying writing course at a community college, is not given credit for the course if they re-enroll at the same UC campus. However, the same CCC writing course will satisfy the ELWR at a different UC campus, and a CCC transfer can satisfy the ELWR with the same writing course. The revision adds language stating that the Senate Division of the student's campus may approve an exception to 636.E in cases where a student has earned transferable credit while on an approved leave of absence.

ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly is asked to endorse the Academic Council's recommendation to amend Senate Regulation 636.E as noted below.

(<https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/regulations/rpart3.html#r636>)

636.E. Once enrolled at the University of California, ~~a student must satisfy the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement before earning transfer credit for the purpose of satisfying any subsequent University of California writing requirements by taking courses at other institutions.~~ students can earn transfer credit for a writing course taken at another institution only after satisfaction of the UC Entry Level Writing Requirement. Exceptions to this requirement may be made by the appropriate agency of the Academic Senate Division of the student's campus in cases where a student has earned transferable credit while on an approved leave of absence.

B. Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools [INFORMATION]

▪ Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair

1. Transfer Admission Guarantee

Following a systemwide Senate review, the Academic Council at April 24, 2019 meeting approved a proposal from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) for a systemwide transfer admission guarantee for California Community College students. The proposal responds to a Memorandum of Understanding between the University and the California Community Colleges to extend a guarantee of admission to all qualified CCC students. In keeping with this agreement and at the request of President Napolitano, the Senate devoted significant time over several months to examining the issues involved and considering various ways to implement a guarantee. The University must have the structure of the guarantee in place this fall to accommodate students entering community college then and transferring to UC as early as fall 2021. Under the proposal, CCC students who complete specified curricula in one of the 21 UC Transfer Pathway majors with a 3.5 minimum GPA and a 3.5 GPA overall, and who complete a Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) at one of six TAG-participating campuses, will be guaranteed transfer admission in the Transfer Pathway major at the TAG campus. BOARS will monitor yield, enrollment, and the student profile outcomes carefully, and will ask faculty to review TAGs in the 21 majors to ensure they align with the Transfer Pathways. BOARS notes that clear communication will be critical for successful implementation; a dedicated communications task force is conducting focus group interviews to identify effective messaging for CCC students and counselors.



BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)

Eddie Comeaux, Chair

eddie.comeaux@ucr.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate

1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor

Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Phone: (510) 987-9466

Fax: (510) 763-0309

January 16, 2019

**ROBERT MAY, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

RE: Transfer Admission Guarantees (TAGs) and Transfer Pathways

Dear Robert,

As you know, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) was tasked to revisit the University's transfer admission guarantee policy following UC's entering into an MOU with the California Community Colleges (CCCs) in spring of 2018. After considerable discussion, analysis, and consultation, BOARS voted unanimously at its December 2018 meeting to recommend a policy with the following features:

- Completion of a TAG with at least one of the six participating TAG campuses will ensure that qualified transfer applicants are guaranteed admission to the UC system;
- Completion of a Transfer Pathway with a minimum 3.5 GPA – based on Pathway-specific courses and overall GPA – will improve a transfer applicant's academic preparation, and thus increase the likelihood of admission (via Comprehensive Review) to more than one UC undergraduate campus, as well as increase the likelihood of baccalaureate degree completion with two years of matriculation at UC;
- BOARS will work with the campuses to align TAG requirements and Pathway requirements where necessary;
- BOARS will revisit this policy when adequate data are available.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Eddie Comeaux
BOARS Chair

cc: Members of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)
Executive Director Baxter

UC Transfer Guarantee Proposal – Senate Review, January 2019

Proposal

BOARS recommends UC establish a guarantee of admission to any eligible California Community College transfer student* who:

- 1) Completes coursework for any of UC's 21 Transfer Pathways majors (<http://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/transfer/preparation-paths/index.html>)
- 2) Achieves a GPA of 3.5 or above in both Transfer Pathway coursework and overall;
- 3) Completes a Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) agreement for one campus offering a TAG in the major of choice (<http://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/transfer/guarantee/index.html>)

Background

In early March 2018, President Napolitano wrote to the Academic Senate asking “what it will take to extend a guarantee of admission to all qualifying California Community College transfer students.” (*Attachment 1*) This request was followed by an MOU with the CCC requesting UC Senate recommendations for a guarantee to be put in place for students entering community college in fall 2019. (*Attachment 2*)

Crafting a transfer guarantee for implementation within specified timeframe represented a significant undertaking. Substantial thought already had been given to transfer issues by the President's Transfer Task Force (<https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/reports/SNW-JN-transfer-task-force-report.pdf>). Over the past several months Senate leaders deliberated in partnership with administrative colleagues on potential approaches to a guarantee, with BOARS taking a lead role in proposal development.

Considerations

A number of considerations arose in determining how best to proceed given challenges involved in any approach to guaranteed admission. Among these was the benefit of building on existing mechanisms, especially since the implementation timeline strained more fundamental reconsideration of community college transfer to the University. Also, it was felt the guarantee mechanism should promote strong major preparation that enables transfer students to graduate within 2 years; Transfer Pathway coursework ensures such preparation. Further, linking Transfer Pathway requirements to existing TAGs under a new guarantee creates an opportunity to re-evaluate preparation called for under those campus-based arrangements. This approach eliminates the need for a referral pool, which has several drawbacks when used for placement. Low-yielding and ineffective, the freshmen referral pool demonstrates the mismatch when there is no connection between student preference and assignment of a spot somewhere in the system. Finally, not all transfer students should be admitted through guarantees. Regents Policy 2104 stipulates Comprehensive Review for undergraduate admissions, and the University should maintain Comprehensive Review in admitting a sizeable portion of transfer student applicants.

* Eligible students are California residents who have completed UC transfer requirements:

<http://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/transfer/preparing-admission/minimum-requirements/index.html>.

Guarantee Parameters

All three elements of the guarantee are critical:

- 1) **Course requirements** specify the type of community-college preparation necessary to be prepared for study in the desired major on any of the nine UC undergraduate campuses.
- 2) The **GPA threshold** defines the level of performance for the new guarantee and incentivizes achievement of competitive academic records for students applying to the most selective campuses.
- 3) **Completion of a campus TAG agreement** secures a place on at least one campus—the preferred option among those available—within the system.

Notes on course requirements: Over a nearly two-year period in 2015 and 2016, UC faculty developed sets of lower-division courses for major preparation that comprise the 21 UC Transfer Pathways. Each Transfer Pathway consists of the superset of courses identified as necessary major preparation for transfer to any of the nine undergraduate campuses. It provides uniform guidance and common expectations to transfer students. In addition to the 21 original majors represented by the Pathways, a number of closely related majors adopted Pathway coursework as recommended preparation (e.g., the Biology Pathway applies to both Aquatic Biology and Pharmacology majors at UCSB, <http://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/transfer/preparation-paths/biology-majors/index.html>).

Notes on GPA threshold: The 3.5 GPA threshold was set with two aims in mind: to ensure UC can accommodate all those who qualify for the new guarantee and can continue to admit other transfer students via Comprehensive Review. Analysis of data on transfer enrollees indicates that setting the GPA minimum at 3.5 will allow the University to admit at least/about half its transfers through existing admissions policy and to implement the new guarantee within existing capacity constraints in the near term. Moreover, a 3.5 minimum GPA signals to students a level of academic performance to be competitive for admission on all campuses. Currently, the minimum GPA for campus TAGs ranges from 2.9 to 3.4; the 3.50 minimum for the new guarantee would not affect these requirements and is set at a level that reflects a desire not to have to raise it in the future. *However, it is important to note that the 3.50 figure is a policy variable subject to further study.* BOARS will routinely review relevant data and adjust the threshold accordingly based, among other things, on student response to a new guarantee. Such adjustment could include establishing different GPA minimums by major. The Academic Senate will work in cooperation with administrative colleagues to develop procedures for such reviews.

Notes on TAG requirements: To ensure that the guarantee is delivered and to avoid using a referral pool, applicants will select and fulfill requirements of a campus Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) in the desired major. This approach works because none of the current campus-based TAGs require more than Transfer Pathway coursework. The applicant will document courses used to meet guarantee requirements, including those yet to be taken prior to transfer. *To maximize opportunities available to prospective transfers, application to other campuses of interest will be strongly encouraged.* In contrast to those meeting only the campus-specific TAG requirements, students qualifying for the new guarantee will be highly competitive and likely to be

admitted to multiple campuses. (Currently, approximately 50 percent of the students completing a TAG agreement at one of the six UC campuses offering them to all CCC students end up enrolling at a different UC campus than the one with whom they established a guarantee.) By relying significantly on normal campus review processes at each additional campus to which the student applies, this approach is mindful of resource constraints and ensures participation of all nine undergraduate campuses while strengthening major preparation.

Since this proposal builds on TAG agreements, it will be important in implementing a new transfer guarantee that Senate faculty in respective majors on each campus review TAG requirements and update them where necessary. Additional information about this effort will follow. Because the MOU pertains to students who enroll at a CCC campus beginning fall 2019 and who would expect to transfer as early as fall 2021, any changes in TAG requirements must be in place by fall 2019.

Key Features of BOARS' proposal

Notwithstanding the fact that all options for implementing an admission guarantee for transfer students present difficulties, the recommendation from BOARS has the following attributes:

- Establishes guarantees to 21 Transfer Pathway majors that have adopted Pathway curricula as the recommended transfer preparation. Already endorsed by Senate, Transfer Pathways coursework provides strong academic preparation to succeed with 2 years as the normative time to degree.
- Leverages existing TAGs to:
 - give students the greatest number of campuses from which to choose (among available options) and incentivize strong academic performance for students applying to most selective campuses
 - focus faculty attention on transfer preparation expectations as well as refinement of campus-based TAG programs.
- Sets academic performance requirements (minimum GPA) that can be modified as necessary to support student success and manage enrollment.
- Creates a clear signal to all CCC students, including those from low-sending community colleges, that UC has a place for them.
- Provides a guarantee that is relatively straightforward to administer (no referral pool) and that specifies clear parameters (required course pattern, GPA minimum, and TAG completion) for students to enter the system.
- Under this approach, existing campus review and admissions policies are essentially unchanged from the status quo.



1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9074
<http://www.ucop.edu>

March 7, 2018

ACADEMIC SENATE CHAIR WHITE

Dear Shane:

Today I was honored to be joined by you, Vice Chair May, and other members of the University community to deliver the first in a series of speeches to mark the 150th anniversary of the University of California. Thank you for making time to be there in person.

Over its 150 years, the University of California has become a foundational institution for the State of California and the nation as a whole. We have grown from one campus in Berkeley to a system of 10 top-ranked universities, five exceptional medical centers, three affiliated national laboratories, and a Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources that reaches every county in the state. We are recognized as both the best and the most accessible university system in the United States.

As we mark this anniversary, however, we should do so with one eye on the present and another on the horizon. Since its inception, UC has not just helped California prepare for the future; we have helped shape it. We must do the same today, for tomorrow. UC must find new ways to continue to lead and excel, despite the enormous challenges facing public higher education institutions.

As part of my vision for how UC can continue to fulfill its teaching, research, and public service mission in the future I laid out a series of calls to actions, including:

- A call to the UC Academic Senate to determine what it will take to extend a guarantee of admission to all qualifying California Community College transfer students.
- A call to the Chancellors to explore how we can streamline the degree pipeline, and ensure that at least 70 percent of our undergraduates, across the system, earn their degrees within four years by the year 2030.

- And, finally, a challenge to the Legislature and the next Governor to work with us and CSU to tackle the college graduate gap and make sure our state is producing the educated workforce it needs for the decades ahead.

Nearly one-third of UC's undergraduates begin their higher education path at a community college. These students succeed at the same rate as those who arrive at UC as undergraduates, and they contribute to the diversity of experiences among our student body. Within a decade of completing their UC degrees, 51 percent of those who transferred from a community college, and who work in California, are earning salaries that place them among the top one-third of income-earners in the state.

Early in my presidency, I made a commitment to increase the number of community college transfer students at UC. Thanks to partnerships with the Academic Senate, campus leadership, and our counterparts at the California Community Colleges, we have accomplished this and continue to simplify the transfer process for students. In the fall of 2017, UC had 6,000 more California Community College transfer students enrolled at our campuses than we did in the fall of 2013.

However, our work is not yet done. My call to action to the Academic Senate is to determine what it will take to extend a guarantee of admission to all qualifying California Community College transfer requests.

Some proposals that are worth considering include:

- The guarantee can use the current 21 Transfer Pathways as a key building block. Successful completion of a Pathway, along with obtaining the requisite GPA, should entitle a community college student to a guaranteed place in the UC system.
- Where the community college Associate Degree for Transfer equates to or exceeds the major preparation required in a UC Transfer Pathway, it should be considered for acceptance in lieu of a Pathway for purposes of a guarantee.
- Enhancing the current Transfer Admission Guarantees (TAGs), and allowing prospective students to have more than one TAG, should also facilitate transfer. Encouraging those campuses that currently do not offer TAGs to do so, perhaps in less impacted majors, is also worth exploring.

I am asking you and the Academic Senate to review these and other proposals to facilitate transfer and transfer preparation so that the guarantees are in place by the fall of 2019, at the outset of the University's 151st academic year.

Academic Senate Chair White

March 7, 2018

Page 2

This would be a major leap for the University of California – one that must be implemented carefully to achieve its desired effect. I am committed to working closely with the Academic Senate, leaders at the California Community Colleges, and other stakeholders to make sure we get this right.

I trust that you agree to this call to action and I look forward to working together to make it a reality.

Yours very truly,



Janet Napolitano
President

cc: Vice Chair May, Academic Senate
Provost Brown
Executive Vice President and Chief of Staff Nava
Vice President Holmes-Sullivan
Chief Policy Advisor Kao



**ENHANCING STUDENT TRANSFER—
A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE CALIFORNIA
COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

The California Master Plan for Higher Education establishes transfer as a priority for California's colleges and universities and emphasizes that this function is a shared responsibility of the State's public postsecondary higher education institutions.

The California Community Colleges (CCC) and the University of California (UC) recognize student transfer from community colleges to public universities as central to providing accessibility to a baccalaureate education for the citizens of California. This Memorandum of Understanding ("Agreement") initiates an effort to guarantee admissions to all qualifying California Community College transfer students to the University of California. These efforts will also continue to streamline the transfer process for students and strengthen the transfer pipeline, resulting in more CCC students who are academically prepared and provided the opportunity to transfer to UC and ultimately earn a UC baccalaureate degree.

This Agreement has historical precedent and is designed to build on current collaborative efforts. In 1996, UC and the CCC Chancellor's Office entered into an MOU to increase the enrollment of CCC students at UC. During the period of this agreement (1997—2004), UC increased its enrollment of CCC students by over 50 percent (exceeding the initial goal by 15 percentage points). The proportion of students from underrepresented groups who enrolled as transfers at UC *exceeded* that of freshman applicants for the first time in the institution's history.

Moreover, from Fall 2013 to Fall 2017, UC increased its enrollment of transfer students by 20%, with an all-time high transfer enrollment of 20,000 in Fall 2017.

More recently, the CCC's *Student Success Initiative* and its recently released *Vision for Success* report show a segment focused on strengthening its traditional mission of access and completion for all students. UC's Transfer Action Team strategic plan—*Preparing California for its Future*—has been institutionally transformational, resulting in a number of pivotal changes to strengthen transfer, including the creation of UC's Transfer Pathways.

CCC-UC Transfer Agreement – Enhancing Student Transfer

The challenge today, however, is more formidable than before—and requires collective solutions and support. Increasing transfer rates have never been more important for the State’s economy. The changing face of the California populace requires a renewed commitment to higher education in ways that advantage students who wish to begin their educational journey at a community college.

The goal of this Agreement is two-fold: increasing inclusive access to a four-year college degree at UC for CCC students and ensuring their academic preparation and support to succeed and earn their degrees in a timely manner. First, it provides a clear pathway for CCC students who wish to transfer to UC, guaranteeing these students an opportunity to obtain a baccalaureate degree if they meet clearly articulated requirements. Second, it aims to ensure that once at UC, these students have taken the courses and met the requirements deemed by the University’s faculty to best prepare them to succeed and earn their four-year degree.

Increasing the number and diversity of students attending a CCC who prepare for and transfer to a UC campus is a strategic priority for the state and the University. For a transfer-affirming culture to flourish, the response of both segments must be a strategic, long-term initiative that will achieve what has always been the goal of California’s investment in public higher education: a high-quality, low-cost, postsecondary system that provides access that is inclusive of all Californians who wish to pursue a four-year degree and the associated academic challenges—and discover the educationally transformative qualities of—a four-year college degree.

This Agreement outlines a series of mutual activities to be conducted by the California Community Colleges and the University of California to strengthen the transfer pipeline to UC and guarantee admissions to the UC system for all qualifying CCC students. Understanding that each segment has a key responsibility—CCCs in preparing and supporting students for transfer and UC in admitting qualified applicants to its campuses in a manner that best supports their eventual success—this Agreement’s theory of action focuses on the collective expertise and dedication of leaders of both segments to increase the transfer rate and the number of CCC students who earn a baccalaureate degree.

In addition, in 2010 SB 1440 established the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) between the CCC and the CSU. In 2015, in an effort to streamline the transfer path for CCC (and other transfer) students, UC developed its Transfer Pathways that established a set of courses – or “pathway” – for each of the 21 most popular majors at UC whereby a student who took the courses and achieved a certain GPA would have met the requirements for that major at any UC campus. In developing these pathways, the UC faculty started with the relevant ADT and in all cases where ADT preparation was appropriate for UC, the Pathways were modeled on the ADT requirements. If UC develops additional new Transfer Pathways, UC shall again start with the relevant ADTs as the model.

Once executed, this Agreement will further the goals envisioned in the California Master Plan for Higher Education.

COLLECTIVE ACTION

1. UC President’s Request to UC Academic Senate for a Guarantee of Admissions to UC for All Qualified CCC Students

The President of the University of California shall request of the UC Academic Senate their recommendations for extending a guarantee of admission to all qualified California Community College transfer students with such guarantee to be in place for students entering the CCCs in Fall 2019. This guarantee does not displace or supplant any existing campus-based admissions guarantees (such as the existing Transfer Admission Guarantees, or TAGs) but is intended to be additive.

Should the guarantee of admission result in increased transfer enrollment at UC, the UC and CCC leadership will together seek additional enrollment funding from the State—a pre-requisite for transfer students’ success at the University.

- A. Such a guarantee should use as its basis the 21 UC Transfer Pathways so that UC would guarantee admission to CCC students who successfully complete one of the 21 Pathways, along with obtaining the requisite GPA as determined by the UC Academic Senate, to a place in the UC system.

UC will also admit all California resident applicants from CCCs who are qualified for transfer admission at the junior level in one or more of the following ways:

- B. Where the California Community College Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) equates to or exceeds the major preparation required in a UC Transfer Pathway for the same major, as determined by the UC Academic Senate, in consultation with the CCC Academic Senate, it will be accepted in lieu of a Pathway for purposes of the guarantee as described in Section A.
- C. In addition, UC will continue to guarantee admission to a campus and a major to all students who apply for and meet all requirements for a Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) at participating UC campuses. The TAG program, currently available at six UC campuses, now constitutes one-third of UC’s entering transfer class. The UC Academic Senate is also called on to review, in concert with campus leadership and faculty, all aspects of current TAG agreements, including whether the requirements for a TAG continue to serve students well and provide for inclusive access. The Academic Senate will also consider various modifications or enhancements, for instance, by expanding TAGs in non-impacted majors at the three UC undergraduate campuses that currently do not offer them or by offering new agreements for any majors not currently participating on the other six campuses. Finally, the UC Academic Senate, in concert with campus leadership and faculty, will recommend whether students may have more than one TAG for purposes of facilitating transfer, removing the current restriction to

one TAG per student.

- D. UC will include every student who is otherwise qualified for admission but not selected to the campuses to which he or she applied in a Systemwide Transfer Guarantee Pool where he or she will be offered a place at another campus that has space in the student's major or related program of study.
- E. The UC Transfer Pathways solve the problem of preparing for applying to multiple campuses, but they do not confer a degree. Recognizing that an associate degree is a significant milestone valued by students and their families, which also helps with students' academic planning as they progress toward a bachelor's degree, the UC Academic Senate will continue to work with the CCC Academic Senate to develop associate degrees based on the UC Transfer Pathway requirements that will aim to adhere to the 60 unit maximum at both institutions where possible.
- F. Finally, as part of its delegated authority to formulate and monitor admissions policy and outcomes, the UC Academic Senate (through its Board Of Admissions and Relations with Schools committee, or BOARS) shall include data on the campuses' experience with guarantees in annual reports to the UC Board of Regents. This report will also be shared with the CCC Chancellor, Board of Governors, and Academic Senate. Based on the outcomes over time, refinements that preserve the broad provisions in this agreement but better address its goals would be considered to be within the scope of the agreement in consultation with the Chancellor's Office, the UC Academic Senate, the CCC Academic Senate and the UC Office of the President.

2. Advancing Transfer Student Academic Preparation

Many UC majors are among the most academically rigorous and sought after in the nation, and students need to be well prepared for this challenge, especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds and from low college-sending communities. Data reveal that CCC students can and will meet this exacting challenge if properly supported. The CCCCO and UCOP will develop and support CCC–UC campus partnerships that prepare students academically for transfer to UC. These partnerships will include, but not be limited to, UC campus summer experience programs for prospective CCC transfer students and summer bridge programs for newly admitted CCC transfers, additional academic advising appointments for current CCC students, organized UC campus tours for CCC students, and enhanced online transfer resources.

Proper and adequate support for students who transfer from CCC to UC will require additional resources. UC and CCC leadership will determine if additional resources are needed by the UC and CCC systems, identify the resources available at each system, and work together to secure any identified additional resources required.

3. Highlighting Access, Affordability, and a Professional Calling

The California Community College Chancellor’s Office and the UC Office of the President will develop joint messages designed for all students attending a CCC about the value and benefits associated with preparing for transfer to a UC campus. These communications will be targeted in their messaging to the general CCC student population, as well as particular student subgroups (e.g., low-income, first-generation, historically underrepresented, disabled, current/former foster youth, and current/former military students) and CCCs with historically low rates of students transferring to UC.

4. Serving the Professionals Who Serve Students

Teaching instructors, counseling faculty, and transfer advisors are key influencers helping students to prepare for transfer. UC will offer targeted professional development for CCC counselors and advisers, especially for those working with targeted populations identified in Section 2 above. Offerings include enhanced Ensuring Transfer Success (ETS) spring transfer counselor conferences, monthly professional development webinars focusing on time-relevant CCC–UC transfer topics (e.g., UC major requirement changes, profiles of previous UC fall applicant pools), and regional summits to discuss CCC–UC programmatic goals, hurdles, and solutions. Clear communications about the Pathways and the guarantees UC will provide are an essential part of providing support to CCC advising staff.

UC and CCC leadership will identify what additional resources are needed to support the added counseling and advising services, and work together to secure those resources.

5. Coordinating Transfer Policy to Serve Students

The CCCCO and UC will develop coordinated transfer policies and practices that provide prospective transfer students with information and advising that help to minimize challenges in the transfer process, especially at those CCCs that have historically sent low numbers of students on to four-year higher education institutions.

6. Building a Transfer-Affirming Culture and Research Agenda

The CCC and UC will jointly employ data-analytic and data sharing techniques to develop strategies toward the identification of likely “UC transfer-ready” students in the CCCs. CCC and UC will collect and share data for communicating with potential transfer students in the pursuit of monitoring and evaluating the usefulness and inclusivity of agreed upon transfer activities and student progress toward the baccalaureate degree. This data sharing will directly help CCC and UC better tailor information, services, and resources to students with transfer aims.

IMPLEMENTATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY


The CCC and UC recognize that additional resources will be needed to fully realize the goals and activities specified in this Agreement. Further, it takes time to build relationships at the CCCs, and sustained presence “on the ground” at the CCC is necessary to build the strongest possible pipeline that will generate transfer applicants for UC long into the future. **The leadership of the two segments will work together to identify and secure the necessary resources.**

Further, UCOP and the CCCCCO will convene a task force consisting of senior leadership as well as campus administrators, Academic Senate representatives, and students to monitor implementation of the provisions of this Agreement and to assess progress and effectiveness of activities. This task force will provide a report to the Chairs of the UC and CCC governing boards and undersigned system leaders that includes, but is not limited to, the number of transfers, major, accumulated units, time to degree, transferring and receiving institutions, and student demographic information (ethnicity, age, gender, etc.).

TIMELINE AND GOALS

This Agreement, to be initiated immediately, will culminate at the end of the academic year 2021-22. During this time, the CCCs will increase the number of students who are fully prepared for transfer to the UC system. For its part, the University of California will admit sufficient numbers of CCC students such that the UC system will enroll at least one transfer student for every two first-year students and guarantee admission to the UC system for all qualifying CCC students per Section 1. The UC Academic Senate (through BOARS) and as part of its delegated authority to formulate and monitor admissions policy and outcomes, working with the UC campuses and the California Community Colleges, including the CCC Academic Senate, has been requested to develop proposals to facilitate transfer and transfer preparation so that the guarantees are fully in place for students starting their CCC education in the fall of 2019. That process is requested to begin immediately, guided by recommendations from BOARS, with most of the individual-campus efforts occurring in Fall 2018. Any guarantees of admission that are available before they would be exercised by the class entering the CCCs in Fall 2019, for students who are already following the Transfer Pathway recommendations, will be implemented as soon as they are available.


SIGNATURE AGREEMENTS



Eloy Ortiz Oakley, Chancellor
California Community Colleges

4/10/18

Date



Janet Napolitano, President
University of California

4-9-18

Date

VII. SPECIAL ORDERS

A. Consent Calendar

1. Variance to Senate Regulation 630.D Requested by Santa Cruz Division

The Academic Council approved a proposed amendment to Santa Cruz Division Regulation 10.1.3.D. The amendment will i) give the Committee on Courses of Instruction the authority to waive the Senior Residency requirement (in accordance with Santa Cruz Bylaw 10.1, after approval by the Faculty), similar to Bylaw 312.A.3; ii) extend the special provisions in Regulation 630.D for UCEAP and related programs to other programs for which the rationale for the special provisions is equally valid; iii) adapt the 12 credits in residence required of a student returning from such a program to the 5 credit courses at Santa Cruz, without which adaptation such a student — unlike at any other campus — has to complete a full term's coursework after returning to campus; iv) remove some general language borrowed from Regulation 630, e.g. references to semester units. The University Committee on Educational Policy approved the request. Approved variances appear in Appendix III of the Systemwide Academic Senate Manual on the Senate website (<https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/appendix3.html>).

2. Variance to Systemwide Senate Regulation 782 Requested by San Diego Division

The Academic Council approved the following proposed amendment San Diego Division Regulation 500(D). The amendment will to allow the San Diego Division to exempt the units earned in upper division independent study courses (all courses numbered 199) from the calculation of an undergraduate student's total Pass/No Pass units. The University Committee on Educational Policy approved the request. Approved variances appear in Appendix III of the Systemwide Academic Senate Manual on the Senate website (<https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/appendix3.html>).

**Committee on Educational Policy
Amendment to Regulations for Chapter 10
Senior Residency Requirement**

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) proposes the following changes to the regulations governing the Senior Residency Requirement:

- i. To state that petitions requesting variations to the requirement are decided by the Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI) following approval from the student’s college, consistent with the changes proposed for Santa Cruz Bylaw 10.1 and 13.16.5 and systemwide Bylaw 312.A.3.
- ii. To replace the enumerated lists of off-campus study programs with “an off-campus study program approved by the Academic Senate or the Division”, simplifying the regulations and allowing programs approved by UCSC to be included.
- iii. To allow students in such an approved off-campus study program to complete their final 10 credits in residence at UCSC instead of 12 credits. At other campuses, 12 credits corresponds to one standard course less than the normal load for one quarter, but because of UCSC’s 5-credit courses, this is effectively a full quarter’s worth of work. We believe that changing this to 10 credits makes the *effect* of the regulation the same as for other UC campuses.

If this legislation is approved by the Division, it will need an Assembly-approved variance to come into effect.

Existing Regulation

Proposed Regulation

<p>10.1.3 A Except as otherwise provided in this section and SR 614, candidates for the Bachelor’s degree must have been registered students at the University of California, Santa Cruz, for at least three quarters. Of the final 45 credit hours completed by a candidate for the Bachelor’s degree, 35 credit hours must be regular courses of instruction offered by the University of California (including during the summer session) and taken as a registered student at the University of California, Santa Cruz. The right to waive the provisions of this requirement is vested with the provost of the student’s college or the provost’s designee.</p>	<p>10.1.3. A Except as otherwise provided in this section and SR 614, candidates for the Bachelor’s degree must have been registered students at the University of California, Santa Cruz, for at least three quarters. Of the final 45 credit hours completed by a candidate for the Bachelor’s degree, 35 credit hours must be regular courses of instruction offered by the University of California (including during the summer session) and taken as a registered student at the University of California, Santa Cruz. The right to waive the provisions of this requirement is vested with the provost of the</p>
---	--

	<p>student's college or the provost's designee the Committee on Courses of Instruction, as per SCB 10.1 and SCB 13.16.5</p>
<p>10.1.3 B When two or more campuses of the University of California have approved a joint program of study, a student enrolled in such a program may meet the Requirement stated in Paragraph A by completing the requisite number of units in courses offered at any or all of the participating campuses. The student's program of study must be approved by the Provost, Dean, or equivalent officer of the School of College in which the degree is to be awarded.</p>	<p>10.1.3 B No changes.</p>
<p>10.1.3 C A further exception to the rule stated in paragraph (A) above is made in the case of students who meet the residence requirement as provided in SR 614</p>	<p>10.1.3 C No changes.</p>
<p>10.1.3 D Except when Divisional Regulations provide otherwise, a student in the Education Abroad Program; the UC Washington, D.C. Program; the UC Center in Sacramento Program; or courses offered by the UC Natural Reserve System (NRS) California Ecology and Conservation Field program may meet the residence requirement in accordance with the following provisions:</p>	<p>Except when Divisional Regulations provide otherwise, A student in the Education Abroad Program; the UC Washington, D.C. Program; the UC Center in Sacramento Program; or courses offered by the UC Natural Reserve System (NRS) California Ecology and Conservation Field program one or more off-campus study programs approved by the Division or the Academic Senate (listed on the website of the Committee on Educational Policy) may meet the residence requirement in accordance with the following provisions:</p>

<p>1. A student who completes the graduation requirements while in the Education Abroad Program; the UC Washington, D.C. Program; the UC Center in Sacramento Program; or the UC Natural Reserve System (NRS) California Ecology and Conservation Field program, may satisfy the requirements stated in paragraph (A) in the final 45 (or 30 semester) units preceding the student's entrance into the Education Abroad Program; the UC Washington, D.C. Program; the UC Center in Sacramento Program; or the UC Natural Reserve System (NRS) California Ecology and Conservation Field program.</p>	<p>1. A student who completes the graduation requirements while in the Education Abroad Program; the UC Washington, D.C. Program; the UC Center in Sacramento Program; or the UC Natural Reserve System (NRS) California Ecology and Conservation Field one or more approved off-campus study programs, may satisfy the requirements stated in paragraph (A) in the final 45 (or 30 semester) units preceding the student's entrance into the Education Abroad Program; the UC Washington, D.C. Program; the UC Center in Sacramento Program; or the UC Natural Reserve System (NRS) California Ecology and Conservation Field approved off-campus study program(s).</p>
<p>2. Subject to the prior approval of the department concerned, a student who is enrolled in the Education Abroad Program; the UC Washington, D.C. Program; the UC Center in Sacramento Program; or the UC Natural Reserve System(NRS) California Ecology and Conservation Field program, may satisfy the residence requirement by earning 35 (or 24 semester) of the final 90 (or 60 semester) units, including the final 12 (or 8 semester) units, in residence in the college or school of the University of California in which the degree is taken.</p>	<p>2. Subject to the prior approval of the department concerned, a student who is enrolled in the Education Abroad Program; the UC Washington, D.C. Program; the UC Center in Sacramento Program; or the UC Natural Reserve System(NRS) California Ecology and Conservation Field one or more approved off-campus study programs, may satisfy the residence requirement by earning 35 (or 24 semester) of the final 90 (or 60 semester) units, including the final 10 credits 12 (or 8 semester) units, in residence in the college or school of the University of California in which the degree is taken. at UC Santa Cruz.</p>

Respectfully submitted;
 COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
 Needhi Bhalla
 Elisabeth Cameron

Bruce Cooperstein
Noah Finnegan
Dongwook Lee
Micah Perks
Megan Thomas
Tchad Sanger, *ex-officio*
Noriko Aso, *ex-officio*
Onuttom Narayan, Chair

November 14, 2018



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
9500 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0002
TELEPHONE: (858) 534-3640
FAX: (858) 534-4528

February 26, 2019

Professor Robert C. May
Chair, Academic Senate
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

SUBJECT: San Diego Division Variance to Systemwide Senate Regulation 782

Dear Robert:

On behalf of the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate, I am requesting formal review of the Division's request for a variance to Systemwide Senate Regulation 782 to allow the San Diego Division to exempt the units earned in upper division independent study courses (all courses numbered 199) from the calculation of an undergraduate student's total Pass/No Pass units.

To assist in your review, I have attached a memo from Educational Policy Committee Chair Timothy Rickard and the proposal approved by the San Diego Division's Representative Assembly. Both include the tracked-changes version of our local Senate Regulations with the proposed amendments. Thank you for reviewing this request. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Horwitz, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

cc: B. Abrams – Committee Analyst, University Committee on Educational Policy
J. Banaria – Committee Analyst, University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction
H. Baxter – Executive Director, UC Academic Senate
M. Corr – Vice Chair, San Diego Division
J. Glater – Chair, University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction
L. Hullings – Associate Director, San Diego Division
M. LaBriola – Committee Analyst, Academic Assembly
T. Rickard – Chair, San Diego Division's Educational Policy Committee
R. Rodriguez – Director, San Diego Division
A. Zanzucchi – Chair, University Committee on Educational Policy

February 20, 2019

PROFESSOR ROBERT HORWITZ, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

SUBJECT: San Diego Division Variance to Systemwide Senate Regulation 782

Dear Robert,

The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) requests that the San Diego Division submit a formal request to the Systemwide Academic Senate seeking a variance to Systemwide Senate Regulation 782 (SR 782).

San Diego Senate Regulation 500(D)(1) limits the number of units a student may take on a P/NP basis to be no more than one quarter of a student's total UCSD units. In 2012, the San Diego Division's Representative Assembly approved a proposal to amend SD 500(D)(1) to exempt the units earned in upper division independent study courses (all courses numbered 199) from the calculation of an undergraduate's total P/NP units. It was approved with the understanding that the proposed change requires systemwide Academic Assembly approval of a variance based on the divisional Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction's (CRJ) finding. CRJ noted that SR 782 states that students may "undertake up to an average of one course per term on Passed or Not Passed basis" but includes no special provisions that permit Divisions to exclude certain types of courses from this "average" count.

A request for a variance was not sent to the Systemwide Senate following the Division's approval in 2012 and the change to SD 500(D)(1) was not implemented. When this was discovered last year, it was brought forward to EPC for review. In Fall 2018, EPC voted unanimously to resume the process for seeking a variance from the Academic Assembly because the Committee supports that rationale for exempting 199 courses from students' total P/NP units. In recent years, EPC has considered a number of individual student petitions requesting an exception to the P/NP limits. The majority of these petitions are due to students reaching the limit because they were enrolled in 199 courses over multiple quarters. EPC believes that the intellectual work conducted by students in independent study courses should be promoted and the current inclusion of 199 courses in the P/NP calculation discourages students from engaging in long-term research projects. The proposed amendment approved by Representative Assembly is as follows:

San Diego Senate Regulation 500(D) P and NP Grades (<http://senate.ucsd.edu/Operating-Procedures/Senate-Manual/Regulations/500>)

1. *Consistent with college policy, an undergraduate student in good academic standing may elect to be graded on a P/NP basis in a course. With the exception of units earned in independent study courses (numbered 199), nNo more than one fourth of an undergraduate student's total UCSD course units may be in courses taken on a P/NP basis. Departments may require that courses applied toward the major be taken on a letter grade basis.*

The 2012 proposal approved by the Representative Assembly is attached. Please let me know if I can provide additional information.

Sincerely,

Timothy Rickard, Chair
Educational Policy Committee

cc: M. Corr
R. Rodriguez

REPORT OF THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Currently, Divisional Senate Regulation 500(D)(1) limits the number of units a student may take on a P/NP basis to be no more than one quarter of a student’s total UCSD units. Last year, the Committee on Educational Policy and Courses (now the Educational Policy Committee) unanimously approved amending this Regulation to remove the units earned in upper division independent study courses (all courses numbered 199) from the calculation of an undergraduate’s total P/NP units.

The Committee believes that the intellectual work conducted by students in independent study courses is the very kind that should be promoted widely in a research university. The limit stipulated in Senate Regulation 500(D)(1) makes good sense for general undergraduate coursework. We believe, however, that independent study courses are pedagogically distinct and applying the restrictions currently in place for general courses is not always appropriate. The limitation discourages students from engaging in long-term research projects and participating in the kind that of work that best prepares them for graduate work.

The proposal was submitted to the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction for review. The Committee indicated their support of the measure but found that the proposed amendment will require systemwide Academic Assembly approval. They noted that Systemwide Senate Regulation 782 states that students may “undertake up to an average of one course per term on Passed or Not Passed basis.” The Regulation includes no special provisions that permit Divisions to exclude certain types of courses from this “average” count. Additionally, Regulation 782 states, “Divisions wishing to undertake more extensive grading experiments shall submit individual proposals for consideration by the Assembly.” It was the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction’s assessment that the proposed amendment represents a “more extensive grading experiment” and requires Academic Assembly approval.

The Educational Policy Committee requests that the Division approve the proposed amendment to Senate Regulation 500(D)(1) and submit this proposal to the Academic Assembly for final approval.

William G. Griswold, Chair
Educational Policy Committee

Senate Regulation 500(D) P and NP Grades

- (1) Consistent with college policy, an undergraduate student in good academic standing may elect to be graded on a P/NP basis in a course. With the exception of units earned in independent study courses (numbered 199), nNo more than one fourth of an undergraduate student's total UCSD course units may be in courses taken on a P/NP basis. Departments may require that courses applied toward the major be taken on a letter grade basis.