January 13, 2012

Robert Anderson  
Professor of Economics and Mathematics  
UC Systemwide Academic Senate  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Bob:

RE: SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF SR 610 (RESIDENCY) PROPOSAL

In response to your request, the UCR Senate Committees on Educational Policy (CEP), Graduate Council and Rules and Jurisdiction reviewed and commented on the proposed senate regulation noted in the header above.

The Graduate Council unanimously approved the changes as proposed and will also work on revising the internal UCR regulations to bring them in line with SR610.

The Committee on Rules and Regulation indicated that the “apparent inconsistency between the proposed revision to SR 610 and the existing language of SR 694, such as the meaning of “off-(and on-) campus” in contrast to residency needs to be clarified. As such, we recommend aligning the existing language of SR 694 with SR 610 residency requirement.”

The Committee on Educational Policy of the Riverside Division considered the proposed changes and the sentiment of the committee was not supportive of the proposed changes, in particular the first proposed clause that would expand residency to include a program of coursework “irrespective of physical location or mode of delivery.”

The primary concern expressed was that, as on-line education opportunities expand, this proposed definition could allow a student to earn a degree entirely on-line, never establishing a physical presence in a face-to-face community of learning on a campus of the University of California. Consequently, the committee’s reaction to this proposal reaffirms that its members place value in direct, unmediated social interaction as an important part of an undergraduate education. Committee members expressed concerns that allowing for a broad sense of virtual residence would reduce attachments to specific campuses and potentially encourage a destabilizing number of efforts to transfer enrollments from campus-to-campus in the system. Further, and most importantly, while students might find appealing the idea that they could establish virtual residency for their convenience, it fails to establish the kind of faculty guidance allowed by actually being in the same classroom, office, or laboratory with a faculty mentor. By
failing to envision, articulate, and justify a normative balance of virtual and physical presence for the purposes of instruction, the proposed change opens the door to unintended consequences that are inconsistent with our current instructional values. The system may need to revise its definition of residency to better accommodate innovative educational opportunities such as participation in the Education Abroad Program, UCDC, the UC-Center Sacramento, as well as a more narrowly cast access to on-line opportunities, but the proposed changes were viewed as too broad.

In short, the UCR CEP expressed a sentiment in line with the Dissenting Opinion expressed in the materials provided concerning the systemwide Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction divided vote on the matter.

As for the second proposed clause, intending to clarify residency with regard to enrollment versus residency for the purpose of establishing responsibility for supplemental tuition, members expressed few concerns about this addition. However, most felt this was not as ambiguous as the Academic Council may. This proposed revision appears to be redundant but benign.

Finally, members of the UCR CEP indicated the SR 610 residency rule would be improved to make clear that "six units of resident courses of instruction" were expected per term (i.e., per quarter or semester).

Sincerely yours,

Mary Gauvain
Professor of Psychology and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC:  Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
     Sellyna Ehlers, Director of UCR Academic Senate office