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November 13, 2007

A.S. Jacobs, Secretary-Parliamentarian
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR AND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION

MEETING: The Riverside Division of the Academic Senate met on Tuesday, May 22, 2007, at 2:10 p.m. 1500 Humanities. Chair T. Cogswell presided.

MINUTES: The minutes of the Regular meeting of February 20, 2007 were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR:

Chancellor Córdova said farewell and thanked the Faculty for five wondrous years at UCR.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR: Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Wartella was not able to attend.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SECRETARY PARLIAMENTARIAN: Professor R.L. Russell announced that the election report was found on page 6 of the full agenda.

For the office of Vice Chair of the Division, a single nomination was received for Professor W. Beyermann. The Secretary Parliamentarian was instructed to cast a single ballot for the nominee.

For the office of Representative to the Assembly, Professor M. Molle was elected to serve a two-year term beginning September 1, 2007.

Professor F. Vahid was elected to serve as Chair of the Faculty of the Bourns College of Engineering.

Professor J. Silva-Risso was elected to serve on the Executive Committee of the A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management.

Professor P. Green was elected to serve as Chair of the Faculty of the Graduate School of Education and Professors J. Levin and M. Vanderwood were elected to serve on the Executive Committee.

Professors B. Arnold and R. Debus were elected to serve on the Committee on Committees from the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences. Professor M. Sperling was elected to serve on the Committee on Committees as representative of the Graduate School of Education and the A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR: Chair T. Cogswell reported on what has been happening in the Senate. The Senate web site has been revived. Chair Cogswell thanked Shanshan Liao for her hard work.

The exhibition in the new Senate gallery is up and running. Chair Cogswell thanked Jonathan Green for his technical help and willingness to make the Senate an outpost of the Museum of Photography.

This year brought the Senate together whenever possible. The Chili Cook-Off was a tremendous success and won't be our last.

CAP was finally brought back to the Senate and UCR will be like all the other UC campuses with CAP being housed in the Senate. Professor Cogswell thanked Vice Provost Lord for her help in arranging this transfer. Cindy Palmer will be a formal Senate employee coming next Fall.

The Committee on Research's budget, with help from the Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor, has grown from $360,000 to $660,000. The Regent's Fellowships, which are so vital to the assistant professors, will now be at a steady $5,000. Ten of the tenured faculty will receive start up grants for new projects totally $10,000 each
and amounts for summer grants will be more generous.

The Senate handled a question about RE-89 and possible restrictions on tobacco funding. This was done in an open and equitable manner with 658 Senate members making the decision. The Senate asked for the opinion of the Committee on Research, Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom and then allowed every faculty member to vote their consciences on this matter. There were 124 UCR Senate members that exercised their right. If you count the committees involved and the total faculty vote, 25% weighed in on RE-89.

Thanks to Professor N. Schiller and the Health Affairs Committee curricular plans for the new medical school should up be and running by the end of summer and ready for the Division early next year as well as the plans for the School of Public Policy.

Chair T. Cogswell thanked Chancellor Córdova for all her efforts at UC Riverside.

SPECIAL ORDERS:

Consent Calendar: The Consent Calendar was adopted with unanimous consent.

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ASSEMBLY: Professor J. Childers reported on the meetings of the Assembly held on February 14, 2007 and May 9, 2007. The report in its entirety can be found on pages 116 and 118 of the full agenda.

At the meeting of February 14, 2007, the Assembly nominated and elected by unanimous consent Mary Croughan (UCSF) as Vice Chair of the Assembly for 2007-2008.

The other important issue to UCR was the requested action regarding RE-89’s Proposed Restriction of Research Funding from the Tobacco Industry. Almost the entire February 14th meeting was taken up with discussion of this topic.

Highlights of the May 9, 2007 meeting in Oakland:

(1) The Department of Energy announced that the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory will be partnered with UCs.

(2) President Dynes spoke of a planned organizational review of the University. It’s an opportunity to rethink our structure and lines of reporting/responsibility. President Dyne’s primary goal in this arena is to produce greater clarity on Presidential, Regental, and campus authority. The second goal is to create greater operational efficiencies. The plan for implementing this reorganization and evaluation is to use consultants which will be paid for from an endowment which will be paid back from money saved after efficiencies are implemented.

(3) Faculty Salaries – According to President Dynes, a plan is now being finalized that will increase faculty salaries by about 26% over the next three or four years. Goals are to get rid of (or at least greatly reduce the use of) off scale, make salaries competitive, and address salary compression at the associate and early full professor ranks. The goal is to get 80% of the faculty back onto the scale. When questioned as to how this increase would be funded, President Dynes replied (a) through a compact with the Governor, (b) some use of the student fee increases, and (c) a savings of up to $100m/year from increased efficiency of the reorganization plan, which will go to salaries and graduate support.

Two items that are important to our campus are: (1) a resolution passed by the Assembly calling for the rejection of the Senior Leadership Compensation Group Salary Structure that differentiates grades by campus (salary slotting) which the Assembly adopted with only 1 dissenting vote (Berkeley); and (2) the resolution to reject the Regental Proposal 89 passed by an overwhelming majority.
REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND FACULTIES:

A. Professor B. Hyman, Chair of the Committee on Distinguished Teaching, presented and moved adoption of the nominations of Professor C. Amrhein, Professor W. Ashmore, and Professor M. Marsella as recipients of this year’s Distinguished Teaching Award.

B. Professor S. Stewart, Chair of the Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer, presented and moved adoption of the nomination of Professor N. Raikhel, Department of Botany & Plant Sciences as the recipient of the Faculty Research Lecturer Award for 2007-2008. Dr. Raikhel’s distinguished career is summarized and reported on page 145 of the full agenda. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved. Vice Provost E. Lord accepted the award on her behalf.

C. Professor N. Beckage, member of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Distinguished Service, presented and moved adoption of the nominations of Professor R.A. Redak, Department of Entomology and Professor G.W. Scott, Department of Chemistry for this honor. The extensive contributions of these two dedicated campus citizens are summarized in the report of the Committee found on pages 126 and 127 of the full agenda. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted. Congratulations were extended to Professor Redak and Professor Scott and a round of applause followed showing approval.

D. Professor A. Norman, Chair of the Planning & Budget Committee, presented an award to Vice Chancellor Gretchen Bolar for her dedication, length of service and the extraordinarily high quality of her assistance to the Planning and Budget Committee and the Senate in its responsibilities related to the budget and the finances of the campus. VC Bolar thanked the Faculty for the award. Congratulations were extended to VC Bolar.

E. Professor J. Cioffi, Chair of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, presented and moved adoption of the Proposed Change to Riverside Division Bylaw 2.2 (Division Chair), which can be found on page 129 of the full agenda. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

F. Professor J. Cioffi, Chair of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, presented and moved adoption of the Proposed Change to Riverside Division Bylaw 2.3 and 2.5 (Division Vice Chair), which can be found on page 130 of the full agenda. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

G. Professor J. Cioffi, Chair of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, presented and moved adoption of the Proposed Change to Riverside Division Bylaw 4 (Rules or Order, Authority in Questions or Order), which can be found on page 132 of the full agenda. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

H. Professor J. Cioffi, Chair of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, presented and moved adoption of the Proposed Regulation 7 Expected Progress for Undergraduate Students, which can be found on page 133 of the full agenda. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

I. Professor J. Cioffi, Chair of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, presented and moved adoption of the Proposed Change to Riverside Division Bylaw 8.1 (Committees of the Division, Appointment and Tenure), which can be found on page 137 of the full agenda. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

J. Professor J. Cioffi, Chair of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, presented and moved adoption of the Proposed Division of Biomedical Sciences Bylaws, which can be found on page 139 of the full agenda. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

K. Professor J. Cioffi, Chair of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, presented and moved adoption of the Proposed Change to CHASS Bylaw 4.1.1.4, which can be found on page 146 of the full agenda. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

L. Professor J. Cioffi, Chair of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, presented and moved adoption of the
Proposed Change to GSOE Bylaw E4.1.1.2, which can be found on page 147 of the full agenda. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

M. Professor P. Keller, Vice Chair, Committee on Educational Policy, presented and moved adoption of the Framework for Establishing Combined Five-year Programs (CP) for Bachelor/Master Studies, which can be found on page 148 of the full agenda. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

N. Professor T. Przymusinski, Chair of the College of Engineering Executive Committee, presented and moved adoption of the proposed major in Materials Sciences and Engineering, which can be found on page 152 of the full agenda. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

O. Professor R. Lysloff, Chair of the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Executive Committee, presented and moved adoption of the revised proposal for a Department of Media & Cultural Studies found on page 166 of the full agenda. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

NEW BUSINESS: Professor D. Brinkerhoff, Emeritus Professor of the History of Art and President of UCR Emeriti Association, invited the faculty to join UCREA when they achieve emeritus status. UCREA welcomes all retired members of the campus community. UCREA also belongs to the Council of UC Retiree Association, CUCRA. Professor Brinkerhoff highlighted some of the benefits of belonging to this Association.

Chair Cogswell thanked Professor R. Russell, who is stepping down as Secretary-Parliamentarian after 2 years, for all his help.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

ATTEST:

R. L. Russell, Secretary-Parliamentarian
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

Sue Stracener
Recording Secretary
To be received and placed on file:

2007-2008 Election Report

1. COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

At the Faculty Meeting of the Bourns College of Engineering on June 4, 2007, Professor B. Anvari was approved to serve on the COE Executive Committee from the Department of Bioengineering for a 3 year term effective September 1, 2007.

2. COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

One Member of the CHASS Executive Committee to be chosen from among the Departments of Anthropology, Ethnic Studies, Psychology, and Sociology (1 year unexpired term)

One valid nomination received for:

Professor R. Richert

At the Faculty Meeting of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences on May 23, 2007, the Secretary was instructed to cast a single ballot for the following nominees who were approved for membership on the CHASS Executive Committee for a 2 year term effective September 1, 2007:

- Chair of the Faculty: Professor T. Patterson (Anthropology)
- English: Professor V. Nunley
- Religious Studies: Professor J. Walton
- Program of Latin-American Studies: Professor F. Schiwy
- Program of Asian Studies: Professor L. Chia

3. COLLEGE OF NATURAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

At the Faculty Meeting of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences on May 30, 2007, the Secretary was instructed to cast a single ballot for the following
nominees who were approved for membership on the CNAS Executive Committee for a 3 year term effective September 1, 2007:

- Earth Sciences: Professor M. McKibben
- Physics & Astronomy: Professor L. Pryadko
- Plant Pathology: Professor ALN Rao
- Statistics: Professor C. Mao

4. ANDERSON GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

Chair of the Faculty (2 year term)

Two valid nominations were received for:

- Professor J. Haleblian
- Professor S.J. Khoury

An election was held and the results of the balloting are as follows:

- Professor J. Haleblian: 13 votes*
- Professor S. J. Khoury: 6 votes

Professor J. Haleblian was elected as Chair of the Faculty of the Anderson Graduate School of Management.

5. DIVISION OF BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES

At the Faculty Meeting of the Division of Biomedical Sciences on July 9, 2007, the following were approved for membership on the Division of Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee effective September 1, 2007.

- Chair of the Faculty (3 year term): Professor A. Walker
- One Member (2 year term): Professor M. Carson
- One Member (2 year term): Professor C. Lytle
- One Member (2 year term): Professor I. Ethell
- One Member (2 year term): Professor D. Johnson

6. GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Chair of the Faculty (3 year unexpired term)

One valid nomination received for:

- Professor L. Swanson
To be received and placed on file:

The 2006-2007 Committee on Academic Personnel officially moved to the Academic Senate on June 15, 2007. While the kinks of the processes between the Academic Personnel Office and CAP continue to be worked out, the transition to University Office Building has been relatively smooth. CAP continued to meet regularly during the summer months and provided prompt, efficient feedback to the administration with minimal turn-around time. We are pleased to report that during the early transition period of June, July and August, CAP maintained its average turn-around time of two weeks for files received during that period! It is worthwhile to note that a few practices were changed once the move took effect. Namely, beginning in mid June, CAP no longer had oversight of the documents being sent to faculty who request “access to records”. In addition, the Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel no longer reviewed and approved the “statements of reasons” that were sent to faculty who were denied advancement, nor did the Committee see the announcements of final decisions until the end of the summer months. These and other processes are being discussed for finalization before the full swing of the personnel process begins for the 2007-2008 academic year.

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) met on 48 occasions during the 2006-2007 academic year. Meetings were approximately 3-4 hours in length. At the beginning of the academic year, the Committee additionally met with the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost, the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, and with all of the Deans. Most of the committee’s activity focused on personnel actions. CAP also was asked to provide opinions on a variety of Senate matters and administrative directives. These are listed below.

I. PERSONNEL ACTIONS

CAP reviewed 296 personnel actions this year and sustained an average turn-around time of 17 days from the time a file is received, to the time the CAP recommendation is forwarded to the administration. Included are 196 merit/promotion files, 10 advancements to above-scale or Step VI, 16 appraisals, 7 career reviews, and 61 appointments. In addition, the Committee reviewed files of tenured faculty who have been at step for five or more years (6 quinquennial reviews). This is in response to an August 12, 1991 directive from the Office of the President that all faculty members must be reviewed every five years.

A summary of the Committee’s actions is appended. A decision of the Chancellor's Office is defined as an “over-rule” if it disagrees with the majority vote of the Committee on Academic Personnel on rank, step, or off-scale. Effective with this report, in addition, the number of “differences” is being tallied also. A “difference” is defined as a final
outcome which is different than the CAP recommendation, but not one which is in contrast to a specific CAP vote:

- Of the 170 merit actions considered, the decisions of the Chancellor's Office differed from the recommendations of CAP in 16 instances, with one merit decision still pending. Of these, 9 were over-rules of the CAP recommendation (5%), the remaining 7 were differences of off-scale.
- Of the 10 advancements to Step VI or to Professor, Above Scale, the Chancellor's Office agreed with CAP in all instances relating to step, with one difference recorded relating to off-scale.
- CAP did not differ from the final decision of the Chancellor's Office on any of the 6 quinquennial reviews.
- Of the actions considered involving appointments, the Chancellor’s decision over-ruled the CAP recommendation on 1 of the 61 proposals (2%).
- Of the 16 appraisals, the final administrative decision over-ruled CAP’s recommendation in one instance (6%)
- And of the 7 career reviews, one two-step over-rule was recorded (14%) and one difference regarding off-scale.
- Finally, of the 26 proposed promotions, CAP and the administration agreed in all cases with one case still pending final decision.

CAP continues to depend on ad hoc committees for detailed analyses of many cases by the procedures prescribed in the Academic Personnel Manual. For 2006-2007, the Committee recommended ad hoc committees for promotions to Associate Professor and Advancements to Above-Scale, and in one instance, for a promotion to Full Professor. CAP served as its own ad hoc for all other actions. A total of 21 ad hoc committees were appointed in 2006-07, involving 81 Associate and Full Professors. Of the 21 ad hoc committees appointed, there was disagreement between the ad hoc committee and the Committee on Academic Personnel on 1 occasion. The Committee on Academic Personnel expresses its appreciation of the work of colleagues on these committees. Garnering participation on ad hoc committees was a much easier task during the 06-07 academic year.

II. DISCUSSIONS AND ADVICE
RECOMMENDATIONS PROPOSED AND IMPLEMENTED

- **Shadow CAP**
  In order to avoid any conflict of interest, Shadow CAP continued to review the personnel actions on current CAP members and their spouses or partners. This committee was historically appointed by the Executive Vice Chancellor. The 2001-2002 CAP, with the EVC’s concurrence, suggested Committee on Committees take over the function of Shadow CAP appointment. Committee on Committees agreed and beginning in 2002-2003 was responsible for appointing Shadow CAP members. Shadow CAP continues to consist of 6 members from former CAP committees of the past five years. This committee list is published and for 2006-07 had the following members:

  W. Frankenberger  A. Walker
  M. Kearney  R. Williams
  G. Waines  S. Ghosh, Chair
After twelve years of experience with the Shadow CAP process, the committee is quite satisfied that this system is a fair one.

• The CALL
  CAP participated in discussions and initiated changes in the CALL on the following issues:
  • Schedule of due dates
  • Diversity & Graduate Student Instruction
  • Ad hoc committees
  • Bibliography
  • Evaluation of teaching
  • Teaching Load Data Form

• E-File
  A number of CAP members participated in the early efile orientation sessions presented by C&C. C&C made several efile presentations to the full CAP membership. Several CAP members provided detailed comments on the on-line structure of the “screen shot”.

• CAP Advice to and Discussion with the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, the Executive Vice Chancellor and/or the Chancellor
  CAP provided advice to and initiated or participated in discussions with the administration on the following issues:
  • Eminent Scholar Nominees
  • Dean candidates
  • Campus Merit Equity Pool
  • Joint Senate/Administrative Task Force on Salary
  • Department Chair Appointments
  • HSRI Candidates
  • Endowed Chair Candidates
  • FTE Transfers
  • TOE hires

• CAP, the Executive Vice Chancellor and the Dean’s council again participated in a group meeting at the beginning of the Academic Year. CAP believes this forum to be an excellent opportunity to voice mutual concerns and assure concurrence regarding one another’s roles and expectations.

• CAP Advice to the Academic Senate
  CAP made suggestions or provided comment to the Academic Senate on the following issues:
  • Proposal for Dept of Media & Cultural Studies
  • Faculty Salaries
  • Campus Visa Policy
  • UCR Policy on Naming
  • UCAP salary study
  • School of Public Policy
• CAP move to the Senate
• Proposal on Grad Students
• Proposal on Relationship between pharmaceutical vendors & clinicians
• Pre-recall Teaching
• Plant Pathology name change
• Joint Appointment
• Health Sciences comp plan
• CAP 11th member
• Revisions to APM 220
• Bylaws for Biomed

UCAP PARTICIPATION
UC Riverside CAP continued its active participation in the system-wide UCAP.

MISCELLANEOUS
The Chair (AZ) wishes to thank Professor Richard Sutch for his strong leadership as CAP Acting Chair for 2 months during 2006-07.

Based on input received from the ad hoc Senate Advisory Committee, CAP has added a follow-up to the previous year’s CAP report. This and all future CAP reports will include final information for any action that was listed as pending in the preceding year’s report.

05-06 Pending Cases:

• Of the Promotion to Full Professor Cases, 1 was listed as pending. In agreement with CAP, this case was finalized as a negative decision.

• Of the Appointment cases, 1 was listed as pending. The appointment was finalized in agreement with CAP.

Edith Allen
David Bocian
Christopher Chase-Dunn
Harry Green
Ray Kea
Kathleen Montgomery
Richard Sutch
Natasha Raikhel
Maurya Simon (F)
Steven Axelrod (W, S)
Allen Zych, Chair
### TABLE I: SUMMARY OF PROMOTIONS AND ADVANCEMENTS

#### PROMOTIONS TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:
- Total Proposed: 16
- Total Approved: 15
- Approval %: 94% (one case pending)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Ad Hoc</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes No Other</td>
<td>Yes No Other</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No Split</td>
<td>AHS AOS NOS ALS LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 1 0</td>
<td>13 1 2</td>
<td>14 1 1</td>
<td>10 0 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 2 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROMOTIONS TO PROFESSOR:
- Total Proposed: 10
- Total Approved: 8
- Approval %: 80%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Ad Hoc</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes No Other</td>
<td>Yes No Other</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No Split</td>
<td>AHS AOS NOS ALS LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 1 1</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>7 1 2</td>
<td>3 2 0 2</td>
<td>3 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ADVANCEMENTS TO PROFESSOR VI & ABOVE-SCALE:
- Total Proposed: 10
- Total Approved: 10
- Approval %: 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Ad Hoc</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes No Other</td>
<td>Yes No Other</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No Split</td>
<td>AHS AOS NOS ALS LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 0 0</td>
<td>4 0 0</td>
<td>8 0 2</td>
<td>9 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Ad hoc committees used on advancements to AS only, not to step VI.

---

Key to Abbreviations:
- CAP = Committee on Academic Personnel
- CHAN = Chancellor or Executive Vice Chancellor
- SPLIT = CAP not clearly positive or negative
- AHS= Recommended/Approved Step Higher than initially recommended by Department
- AOS= Recommended/Approved OS salary in addition to merit advance recommended by Dept.
- NOS= Recommended/Approved merit advance but not additional OS salary recommended by Dept.
- ALS= Recommended/Approved Step Lower than initially recommended by Department
Table II: SUMMARY OF MERIT ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within AS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Merits: 163 6 1 131 11 28 104 19 0 1 15 14 10 7 101 19 1 19 13 3 12

Table III: SUMMARY OF APPOINTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>04-05 Actions</th>
<th>05-06 Actions</th>
<th>06-07 Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acting Assistant Professors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS - TOP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL APPOINTMENT ACTIONS</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Abbreviations:
- CAP = Committee on Academic Personnel
- CHAN = Chancellor or Executive Vice Chancellor
- SPLIT = CAP not clearly positive or negative
- AHS = Recommended/Approved Step Higher than initially recommended by Department
- AOS = Recommended/Approved OS salary in addition to merit advance recommended by Dept.
- NOS = Recommended/Approved merit advance but not additional OS salary recommended by Dept.
- ALS = Recommended/Approved Step Lower than initially recommended by Department
- LOS = Recommended/Approved Step Lower than initially recommended by Department and an off-scale
TABLE IV: MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS

Appraisals:
Total Proposed: 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Qualified Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Ad hocs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifth-year Appraisals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career Reviews:
Total Proposed: 7

Of the 7 proposed Career Reviews:
3 resulted in advancement of 2 or more steps. The department recommendation on two of these was for an advance of 3 steps or more.
2 resulted in promotions. The department supported the promotion in both cases.
2 resulted in a one step advancement to Professor, Step VI. The department supported the advancement in both cases.

Quinquennial Reviews
Total Proposed: 6
Total Satisfactory: 6
Ad hocs: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Merits &amp; Promotions</th>
<th>206</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Appointments</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Misc. Actions</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERSONNEL ACTIONS</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V: SUMMARY OF OFF-SCALE SALARIES APPROVED BY CHANCELLOR IN 2006-2007

New off-scale awards were distributed as below for each college or school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th>CAP merit based</th>
<th>Admin Merit Based</th>
<th>Equity Merit Pool</th>
<th>A/S or o/s Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4**</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGSM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSOE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 CNAS equity merit pool off-scale was administratively awarded
** 1 COE equity merit pool off-scale was administratively awarded
The committee on Planning and Budget met 26 times during FY 2006 – 2007 (term ended August 31, 2007). The P&B Committee met with the following individuals:

Vice Chancellor Gretchen Bolar, Vice Chancellor Academic Planning and Budget
Vice Chancellor William Boldt, University Advancement
Vice Chancellor Al Diaz, Administration
Vice Chancellor Charles Louis, Research
Vice Chancellor Jim Sandoval, Student Affairs
Assistant Vice Chancellor Charles Rowley, Computing and Communications
Dean Reza Abbaschian, BCOE
Dean Steven Bossert, GSOE
Dean Donald Cooksey, Interim Dean, CNAS
Dean Stephen Cullenberg, CHASS
Dean Anil Deolalikar, AGSM
Dean Dallas Rabenstein, Graduate Division
Interim Director Carolyn Stark, Palm Desert
Librarian Ruth Jackson
Director Stan Morrison, Director of Athletics

From mid October to late April P&B systematically met with the leaders (Deans, Vice Chancellors, etc) of the 19 UCR Units who participated in last academic year’s Visioning and Budget process (VBP) that was led by the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Budget. In May, the P&B Committee evaluated the plethora of views, priorities, and budget requests, as well as FTE requests that were provided to us by all these units.

The P&B Committee prepared a 51 page document titled **SHARED GOVERNANCE ADVICE** that provided a prioritized set of advice for the senior Administration that largely, but not exclusively, focused on budget allocations. P&B’s budget advice took into account the ground rule, defined by VC Bolar, that there was only $3,000,000 of Permanent funds available for allocation for the next academic year. P&B recommended a total allocation of $2,712,208 of Permanent funds and $1,511,614 of Temporary Funds to 14 units; in addition, an indication of each unit’s Priorities that P&B supports was also provided.

This attached Shared Governance Advice document (also posted on the UCR Senate Web site) represents the Academic Senate shared governance responsibilities for P&B that are defined in our Academic Senate By-Laws. It provides separate evaluative reports for 17

---

1 “The Planning & Budget Committee shall provide advice to the Chancellor and represent the Division on matters concerning the distribution of resources on campus. It shall also be the duty of the committee to consider, provide advice and report on such matters of academic planning and resource allocations which may
of the 19 Academic and Administrative/Service units that are integral to the general educational endeavor and responsibilities of the University of California Riverside for the fiscal year 2006 – 2007. These individual reports provide for each unit an evaluation of their budget request as well as for the academic unit’s I&R FTE requests.

The individual evaluative reports were preceded by a Summary Statement of P&B’s assessment of the budget requests that iterates, in three defined categories of priority (A, B, & C), the Unit priorities that P&B considered to be the highest from the senate/faculty perspective. These Summary Statements constitute the shared governance advice for consideration by the senior Administration of UC-Riverside.

Category A requests were projects or needs that if funded would have had a campus-wide impact, or would have affected a large number of individuals (students, faculty and/or staff) or would have favorably impacted UCR’s AAU status. Category B requests are projects or needs that did not meet the standard for a Category A request. P&B did, however, identify for each Unit some Priorities that individually or collectively had high merit and which competed favorably for the very limited funds available (divided equally, each unit would have received approximately $187,000 if there is $3,000,000 available). P&B did not attempt to rank-order or prioritize the 11 units placed in Category B; instead they are presented alphabetically. Category C Requests were Unit requests which, in the opinion of P&B, were of lowest priority. They should have been funded only if all other pressing needs of the units in Categories A and B were fulfilled.

The very last page of the Report has a table that compares the allocations approved by the Senior Administration with the recommendations of P&B.

As a consequence of these extensive deliberations P&B discussed the need for a more structured budget reporting system so that P&B would be able to see: a) where FTE allocations are being converted to other uses and b) what the budget request/allocation history has been so that we do not recommend funding items that were funded in the past. Perhaps P&B should initiate a protocol analogous to CAP’s “Call” which structures the information they receive in ways that make their decision process easier.

The P&B Committee welcomes advice or comments from our UCR faculty colleagues.

Planning & Budget Committee Members:

Wilfred Chen, Chemical Engineering
Subir Ghosh, Statistics
Joseph Childers, English
Douglas E. Mitchell, Education
Darleen DeMason, Botany and Plant Sciences
Mary Gauvain, Psychology
Conrad Rudolph, Art History
Tony Norman, Chair, Biochemistry & Biomedical Sciences

be referred to it by the UCPB, the Academic Council, the Chancellor, the vice Chancellors, the Deans, The Division or by any committee of the Division. [From UCR Senate By-Law 8.18.2]
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From
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June 7, 2007

Planning & Budget Committee Members:
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Darleen DeMason, Botany and Plant Sciences
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From the
Academic Senate Planning & Budget Committee
June 7, 2007

The UCR Senate Planning & Budget committee has held 25 meetings to date in the current academic year. From late September to late April we systematically met with the leaders (Deans, Vice Chancellors, etc) of the 19 UCR Units who have participated in this academic year’s Visioning and Budget process that was led by the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Budget. In May, the P&B Committee evaluated the plethora of views, priorities, and budget, as well as FTE requests that were provided to us by all these units.

This Report provides a prioritized set of advice for the senior Administration that largely, but not exclusively, focuses on budget allocations. P&B’s budget advice takes into account the ground rule, defined by AVC Bolar, that there is only $3,000,000 of Permanent funds available for allocation for the next academic year. Accordingly as summarized in Table 1 on page 5 of this Report, P&B recommends a total allocation of $3,031,495 of Permanent funds and $1,558,198 of Temporary Funds to 14 units; in addition, an indication of each unit’s Priorities that P&B supports is also provided.

This document represents the Academic Senate shared governance responsibilities for P&B that are defined in our Academic Senate By-Laws. It provides separate evaluative reports for 17 of the 19 Academic and Administrative/Service units that are integral to the general educational endeavor and responsibilities of the University of California Riverside for the fiscal year 2006 – 2007. These individual reports provide for each unit an evaluation of their budget request as well as for the academic unit’s I&R FTE requests; see Table 2, page 6.

The individual evaluative reports are preceded by a Summary Statement of P&B’s assessment of the budget requests that iterates, in three defined categories of priority (A, B, & C), the Unit priorities that P&B considers the highest from the senate/faculty perspective. These Summary Statements constitute the shared governance advice for consideration by the senior Administration of UC-Riverside.

Category A requests are projects or needs that if funded will have a campus-wide impact, or will affect a large number of individuals (students, faculty and/or staff) or will favorably impact UCR’s AAU status. Category B requests are projects or needs that that did not meet the standard for a Category A request. P&B has, however, identified for each Unit some Priorities that individually or collectively have high merit and which compete favorably for the very limited funds available (divided equally, each unit would receive approximately $187,000 if there is $3,000,000 available). P&B has not attempted to rank-order or prioritize these 11

1 "The Planning & Budget Committee shall provide advice to the Chancellor and represent the Division on matters concerning the distribution of resources on campus. It shall also be the duty of the committee to consider, provide advice and report on such matters of academic planning and resource allocations which may be referred to it by the UCPB, the Academic Council, the Chancellor, the vice Chancellors, the Deans, The Division or by any committee of the Division. [From UCR Senate By-Law 8.18.2]"
units placed in Category B; instead they are presented alphabetically. Category C Requests are Unit requests which, in the opinion of P&B, are of lowest priority. They should only be funded if all other pressing needs of the units in Categories A and B are fulfilled.

We expect that the advice and suggestions of our several budget related Summary Statements will be seriously considered by the Administration when arriving at final decisions. If there are not enough funds to cover all of P&B’s recommendations for Categories A and B, then we prefer to see that all of the A Category recommendations are funded, with appropriate reductions in the funding of Category B needs.

P&B has also reviewed the I&R FTE requests of CHASS\(^2\), CNAS, BCOE, GSE and AGSM. The Committee supports distribution of the requests for 78 FTE for all but AGSM; see Table 2 on page 6.

P&B will discuss this Report and our committee’s recommendations with the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost Ellen Wartella and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Budget Gretchen Bolar on Wednesday June 13, 2007. It is also the understanding of P&B that after final decisions have been made on the budget allocations for fiscal year 2006-2007, there will be a follow-up meeting scheduled with the EVC and VC for APB to explore the rationale for the details of the final budget decisions for FY2007-2008.

\(^2\) CHASS chose not to submit a budget request for either Permanent or Temporary funds.
### TABLE 1

**P&B PRIORITIES FOR BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR THE UCR VISIONING PROCESS FOR 2007-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>PRIORITIES</th>
<th>P&amp;B ADVICE</th>
<th>P&amp;B ADVICE</th>
<th>CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(From Units' Priority List)</td>
<td>PERMNT. $$</td>
<td>TEMP. $$</td>
<td>ALLOCATION DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRIORITIES</td>
<td>PRIORITIES</td>
<td>$ Awarded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRIORITY A (P&B Prioritized)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>P&amp;B Advice</th>
<th>TEMP. Advice</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Library 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1, 3, 4</td>
<td>$369,185</td>
<td>$505,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Division 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$328,545</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC-Administration 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>$316,124</td>
<td>$53,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;C 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>$260,287</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRIORITY B (Alphabetical)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>P&amp;B Advice</th>
<th>TEMP. Advice</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Planning &amp; Budget</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
<td>$24,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>$165,438</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGSM</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>$187,451</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourns College of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>$155,670</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor/EVC</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$163,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$163,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>$175,767</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5a, 6, 7</td>
<td>$241,161</td>
<td>$231,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC University Advancement</td>
<td>Space Rental</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$80,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC-Research</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>$219,239</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC-Student Affairs</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>$225,628</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRIORITY C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>P&amp;B Advice</th>
<th>TEMP. Advice</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palm Desert Graduate Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNITS WITH NO BUDGETS REQUESTED** (Alphabetical)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>P&amp;B Advice</th>
<th>TEMP. Advice</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>No budget request</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td>No budget request</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Extension</td>
<td>No budget request</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL >>> $3,031,495 $1,558,198**

With $3,000,000 to allocate amongst 16 units requesting an allocation, the average request would be $187,000
TABLE 2
P&B ADVICE CONCERNING I&R FTE REQUESTS
FOR THE
UCR VISIONING PROCESS FOR 2007-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS AS of 10/15/06</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Existing I&amp;R Commitments</th>
<th>I&amp;R FTE REQUESTS</th>
<th>TOTAL Requests</th>
<th>GRAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;B Approved (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>Promised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.10</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>87.85</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td></td>
<td>261.90</td>
<td>53.90</td>
<td>315.80</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>159.72</td>
<td>38.76</td>
<td>198.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSOE</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGSM</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>39.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOMED**</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Biomed – 2.00 additional FTE have been sequestered and the funding is allocated on an annual basis

- The basis for the decision to approve or not to approve the FTE requests are provided in the individual P&B evaluative Reports for each Unit.
UCR VISION AND GOALS

The 2006 – 2007 Planning & Budget Committee has been mindful of the extensive visioning process that the campus community has engaged in over the last several years that has resulted in the formulation of nine goals that are all designed to move UCR forward to a higher level of achievement as a premier university.

VISION

- UCR will have the profile of an AAU member university.
- UCR will be recognized for its distinction among all research universities in selected areas, which exhibit quality and momentum.
- UCR will become a campus of "first choice" for applicants, and students will have a successful experience at UCR.
- UCR will build on the diversity of its students and the distinction of its faculty, and connect the curriculum to the vision of UCR as an AAU institution.
- UCR will be a preeminent research university that has diversity as one of its measures of distinction.
- UCR will offer expanded graduate and professional education in areas that respond to the needs of the state and region and that help to stimulate a knowledge-based economy.
- UCR will organize and coordinate with others to achieve common goals for prosperity and sustainability of the Inland Empire through technology transfer, attraction and retention of highly skilled jobs and industries, and responsiveness to regional issues.
- To make the other seven goals possible.

Goals

- To enhance UCR's reputational rankings.
- To invest in areas of strength.
- To expand opportunities for all students.
- To reshape the curriculum.
- To diversify our faculty, staff and graduate population.
- To build professional schools and to increase opportunities for graduate and professional education.
- To forge closer ties with the community.
- To develop the resources and provide the infrastructure to develop the resources and provide the infrastructure

(a) Copied from the UCR WEB site, June 6, 2007
CATEGORY A UNIT REQUESTS

[In order of priority]

Criteria for Category A Requests: These are projects or needs that if funded will have a campus-wide impact, or will affect a large number of individuals (students, faculty and/or staff) or will favorably impact UCR’s AAU status.

[1st Priority]
P&B Advice Concerning the Library

P&B recommends allocation of $369,185 of Permanent funds and $505,785 of Temporary funds to the Library.

There is no such thing as a great university without a great library. The library system is absolutely fundamental to the research and teaching missions of UCR. It is also crucial to UCR's goal of achieving AAU status alongside UCB, UCD, UCI, UCLA, and UCSD. Statistics provided by the University Librarian make it only too apparent that UCR's library is desperately in need of a massive infusion of funding, not just in the area of collections, but especially in FTE, in order to even begin to bring it in line with the other libraries of the University of California.

Currently, UC Berkeley invests around $10 million or more a year in its collection expenditures than does UCR. FTE, however, is equally important to this central institution that is all but overwhelmed. Requests for instruction in research skills have nearly doubled in the last year alone, and it should be noted that Berkeley has a librarian to student ratio of 1:47, while UCR's is 1:101. Currently, UCR's library is ranked with those of Louisville (Kentucky) and Manitoba as peer institutions. Is this what UCR wants for its research base?

The fiscal state of the Library system is essentially that of a patient on a respirator, perpetually receiving just enough to stay alive but never being given what it needs to provide the foundation necessary to underpin the advancement of UCR as a whole. It is the recommendation of Planning and Budget that the endorsed priorities of the Library most definitely be fully funded, a recommendation it considers to be modest enough.

[2nd Priority]
P&B Advice Concerning the Graduate Division

P&B recommends allocation of $328,545 of Permanent funds and $200,000 of Temporary funds to the Graduate Division.

One of the most often cited characteristics of a top-flight research university is the percentage of graduate students in the total student population of a campus, with 15% typically held out as the threshold necessary for AAU status. UCR’s current ratio hovers around 11%, and as we move to raise our national research profile, it is clear that UCR must focus on recruiting more, top-quality, graduate students. Equally clear is the fact that as fees rise and competition for the best graduate students becomes more intense, the costs for these students will continue to increase. Not only must UCR meet fees, they must also offer
packages that include dissertation-year fellowships and stipends that are more attractive. Further, in a world that does more of its business electronically everyday, UCR is woefully retrograde in its lack of a complete online application for prospective graduate students. Although development of this service has been in the works for some time, it has yet to be realized and should be a top priority for the campus. In this same vein, as the campus moves forward to establish its new “brand” design, nearly every graduate program on campus should revise and update its website with an eye toward improving its recruitment.

All of these activities come at a cost, but in the view of the Committee on Planning and Budget, this is all money well spent. The graduate division is requesting $328,545 in increased permanent funding in order to keep pace with anticipated fee increases. It is also requesting $200,000 in temporary funds to use for stepped up recruiting efforts. Planning and Budget sees these requests as absolutely necessary if UCR is to maintain any forward momentum toward increased recruitment of graduate students. One of the difficulties of the current funding model for graduate support is the relative dearth of monies available for dissertation or “out year” funding. Although Dean Rabenstein’s recent efforts and the central administration’s largesse in this regard has been a move in the right direction, most graduate fellowship funding remains tied up in the cohort model. Operating under the assumption that after the first two years of support, graduate students should be able to rely on either TAships or GSRships (in labs, usually), this system does not leave enough fungible money available for departments to lure their very top recruits with extra fellowship years, dissertation funding, or the like. An infusion of the sort Graduate Division is requesting should help UCR to entice more of its first choice graduate recruits to enroll.

In terms of planning related recommendations, P&B has identified two areas which were not mentioned by the Graduate Division, but which we feel are highly meritorious. P&B feels that if investment is made in each of these areas that both will support our campus goal to increase graduate student enrollment.

(a) It is crucial that the graduate student application process be entirely electronic and be capable of being transacted entirely through the internet by graduate student applicants. UCR is the only UC campus that does not have an operative 100% on-line graduate application process.

(b) Funds are required to improve and update the web presence for many departmental-based graduate programs as well as interdepartmental graduate programs. The Administration has also vigorously encouraged all campus units with web sites, to convert to the new UCR logo and brand. Interdepartmental graduate Programs are never provided with web site funds on a regular basis; almost all of our graduate program web sites need modernization. There are a total of 37 UCR graduate programs; CHASS 13; CNAS 18; COE 5; and Education 1. P&B requests a special allocation of Temporary funds to the Graduate Division that is earmarked exclusively for web site modernization.3

Implementation of both of these projects is totally consonant with the stated objective of increasing graduate student enrollment on the campus.

3 P&B will obtain an estimate of the cost
P&B recommends allocation of $316,124 of Permanent funds and $53,584 of Temporary funds to the VC of Administration.

The VCA leads the largest overall unit on campus and most of the staff employees on campus are in one of the component precincts of the VCA. These include the Police, EH & S, Physical Plant, Fleet, Design and Construction, Transportation and Parking, as well as, Accounting, Purchasing, Finances, Student Business, Human Resources, Mail, Payroll, Bookstore, Printing, Child Development Center, Athletics and Housing and Dining units. These units are essential to the missions of the campus, which depend on them 24/7.

A significant problem facing our campus, as well as all other UC campuses, is the relatively low staff salaries compared to city, state, and private sectors. Overall turnover in staff last year was 11.9% and was 15.7% for under-represented employees. This fact leaves us vulnerable in terms of continuity and efficiency.

P&B recommends funding the Priorities #1, #2, #4 and #5 from Permanent funds and Priority #3 from Temporary funds. (See page 47) **Priority 1** addresses Human Resources administrative positions, which, at UCR, are the lowest classifications in the UC system. **Priority 2** addresses a number of senior positions currently filled and open. Retention of a group of employees avoids the losses in a well-trained team that result when reclassifying or hiring one individual at a time to higher salary levels occurs. **Priority 3** addresses reclassifying the new Sustainability Director, who has just been hired. This is a critical position for UCR, because our campus is far behind the other UC campuses in this area. UCR is also behind the City of Riverside. Sustainability is a national issue for all organizations, public and private. Environmental sustainability “is not only the appropriate and necessary action to take for environmental quality, but is vital to campus status, regarding student and employee recruitment, retention, and public relations.” People with qualifications in this area are in high demand by many organizations, including private industry, and command high salaries. **Priority 4** involves active, strategic recruitment of employees by expanding staff recruitment efforts to identify and hire the most talented pool of employees, reducing the time to hire, and marketing UCR as a desirable employer. **Priority 5** involves hiring an analyst to collect, manage and analyze data on UCR’s workforce, assess (by surveys) the state of the workforce, identify reasons employees leave UCR, institute policies to increase employee satisfaction, identify pay inequities, etc.

From P&B’s perspective, VC Diaz in addition to being a highly skilled and effective manager of a large and heterogeneous unit is also equally effective in one-on-one or small group situations. UCR is very fortunate to have him as our VCA.
[4th Priority]
P&B Advice Concerning Computing and Communications

P&B recommends allocation of $260,287 of Permanent funds.

The objective of Computing and Communications of providing, maintaining, and developing appropriate systems to more efficiently facilitate the goals of UCR faculty, staff, and students is indispensable to the University's mission. Given the ever-expanding demands for such systems and the staff who maintain them—as well as the current salary levels for certain systems administrators—Planning and Budget supports the top three priority requests of Computing and Communications as necessary to UCR's future computing demands and administrative restructuring.

Planning and Budget would especially like to draw attention to the need to maintain salary equity in this very critical area. If UCR does not remain competitive in this regard, the IT infrastructure of the university may be put in jeopardy. The same is true for the other areas that Planning and Budget recommends for support: general support for campus IT systems and Human Resources Application Development support. Because of the absolute centrality of Computing and Communications, Planning and Budget recommends full funding for this unit’s top three priorities.
Criteria for Category B Requests: These are projects or needs that did not meet the standard for a Category A request. P&B has, however, identified for each Unit some Priorities that individually or collectively have high merit and which compete favorably for the very limited funds available (approximately $187,000 for each unit if there is $3,000,000 available). P&B has not attempted to rank-order or prioritize these 11 units. Instead they are presented alphabetically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category B Units</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Planning &amp; Budget</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGSM</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourns College of Engineering</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor/EVC</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC University Advancement</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC-Research</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC-Student Affairs</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Units that did not submit a Budget request include Biomedical Sciences, CHASS and University Extension.
CATEGORY C UNIT REQUESTS

[Lowest Priority]

Criteria for Category C Requests: These are Unit requests which, in the opinion of P&B are of lowest priority. They should only be funded if all other pressing needs of the units in Categories A and B are fulfilled.

Category C Unit: Page #
Palm Desert Graduate Center 41

Units with no Budget Request:

- Biomedical Sciences
- CHASS
- University Extension
PLANNING TOPICS FOR NEXT YEAR’S VISION AND BUDGET PROCESS

In addition to evaluating and commenting on budget, staff and faculty allocation requests from all campus units, the Senate Planning and Budget Committee has identified four critical campus planning issues which we believe should be given high priority in next year's budget process. Our P&B advice is focused on the overall review of campus resource allocation policies and practices. These four issues are:

1. Documentation of how faculty FTE lines are being converted for other uses.
2. Balancing centralized and academic unit control over student support funds.
3. Addressing a persistent problem of classroom shortage.
4. Engaging Senate committees in the development of campus academic goals.

Our rationale for addressing each of these issues is outlined in the following paragraphs.

Issue #1: Documentation of FTE conversion for academic purposes

One issue which the Planning and Budget Committee believes can be addressed easily and which will greatly facilitate improved use of scarce campus resources is to have Schools’ and Colleges’ budget reports show explicitly what programs or services are being funded out of 19900 funds allocated for faculty lines. We recognize that there are good reasons for “cannibalizing or redirecting” some faculty lines to fund crucial activities. Some important examples include the conversion of faculty FTE funding that has been allocated to GSOE to support teacher education staff members who are not eligible for faculty senate membership. In CNAS, some faculty lines are unavoidably converted to cash to provide “start-up” packages for new faculty where market competition requires much larger complements than normal budget resources support. And in CHASS, faculty funding is understandably converted to provide the staffing for Subject A instruction. By not making explicit how and to what extent funded faculty positions are being converted to other uses, however, the campus is obscuring rather than illuminating the real costs of our educational programs and making it appear that we have a large number of unfilled faculty positions when we actually would not be able to sustain critical programs and services if we did fill all allocated faculty positions.

Making this conversion explicit and transparent would have several important budget and planning benefits. First, it would show just which critical programs and services are not being adequately funded from other sources. Second, it would create important opportunities for campus development officers to help identify specific sources of funding to “buy back” those faculty lines and free them up for their intended use. Third, it would allow the campus administration and the faculty senate to evaluate constructively whether the conversion of funded faculty lines for some purposes are really necessary or appropriate. Finally, it would encourage deans to be accountable for justifying this conversion of faculty support into other programs and services and to resist doing so whenever the alternative uses of funds are not truly more important than the purchase of additional faculty to support the campus’ instruction and research missions.
In summary, we urge the Chancellor to request budget documents from the Schools and Colleges that show exactly which activities are being paid for by converting funds from unfilled faculty positions, and request justification for those conversions.

**Issue #2: Balancing control over student support resources**

It has become obvious that student support funds, particularly for graduate students, support multiple campus goals. From a central planning perspective, student support needs to be used to recruit the most able students across the broad spectrum of campus programs and departments. Some resources are needed to facilitate the growth of new programs and to insure that the campus maintains the breadth of academic programs appropriate to an AAU research university. At the same time, it is clear in some instances that individual schools, programs and departments are in the best position to identify outstanding candidates worthy of support, and are most likely to know what competitive offers of support are being tendered to highly qualified students by other institutions.

Thus it is clear that the Graduate Division and College deans need to control and allocate resources on the basis of campus and program development, while departments and programs need to control sufficient resources to assure that competitive offers of support are awarded to highly qualified students. At present there is not a clear rationale for aligning resource control with these two competing campus needs. This issue needs to be studied and campus-wide policies developed to balance these competing interests.

**Issue #3: Addressing the campus’ ongoing classroom shortage**

The provision of classroom space has not kept pace with student growth over the last fifteen years with the result that class scheduling has become a serious problem, threatening the quality of instruction and of student life on campus. A clear plan for assuring adequate classroom space needs to be developed. Faculty Senate committees concerned with the quality of instruction need to be involved in the development of this plan, and adequate building resources need to be devoted to its realization.

Thus the administration should consult with the Senate committees of Educational Policy, Planning & Budget, and Physical Resources.

**Issue #4: Involving faculty in campus goals setting**

While the Chancellor needs to be identified with a clearly specified set of high priority goals for the campus, it is vitally important that the Faculty Senate also become engaged in the identification and development of these goals. Faculty involvement will certainly make it much more likely that adopted goals will be energetically pursued. More importantly, however, the goals themselves are likely to be more appropriate and effective because they will then draw upon the best insights of both faculty and administration regarding the feasibility and priority of addressing specific campus needs.
P&B UNIT REPORT
ACADEMIC PLANNING & BUDGET

P&B INTERVIEW:

VC Bolar made a presentation to the Chancellor and EVC as part of the Visioning process on Friday March 2, 2007.

UNIT VISION:
The Mission of the Office of Academic Planning & Budget (APB) is to support the planning efforts of the Campus and to provide leadership for resource management. APB consists of 6 departments. An “unofficial mission of APB is to recruit and train future accounting and planning professionals for the campus.

UNIT PRIORITIES:
The three new requests (see below) are considered by VC Bolar to “represent high risk areas for the UCR campus today”. Two years ago, one third of APB’s positions (39 FTE) were unfilled. Recruitment has been a high priority, and presently there are only 3 unfilled positions for which recruiting are ongoing.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007 = $ 5,515,545

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR '07 – '08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sr. Educational Facilities, Physical Planner</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$110,005</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Principal Administrative Analyst for Real Estate</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$94,647</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Auditor IV</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$94,647</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL $$ REQUEST &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$204,652</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$211,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:
The smooth operation of P&B is essential for the operation of an orderly and accurate campus-wide budget process, including planning for the future and maintenance of accurate and up-to-date records of income and expenditures.
P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:

- Priority #1 is the addition of an Assistant Campus Physical Planner. The campus currently has only one Physical Planner. Major tasks relevant to this position include development of an updated LRDP and development of UCR’s west campus. Comparable campuses investment in Physical Planning positions are UCSB = 4.0 FTE and UCSC 4.0 FTE.

- Priority #2 is the addition of a Principal Real Estate Officer. Currently UCR does not have any staff positions in this area. With the development of the School of Medicine, a real estate foundation, and independent housing authority and public/private ownerships, UCR lacks the requisite expertise in these areas. UC campuses with Health Science operations have large real estate operations with 6 – 9 professionals. In the long run VC Bolar hopes to fund a significant part of this position through an administrative cost recover mechanism.

- Priority #3 is the addition of an Auditor IV. The investigative workload for Audit and Advisory Services has grown steadily for the past 18 months, and is projected to continue to increase in the future. Currently there are 5.0 FTE in the Audit and Advisory Services Department of APB. With the development of the School of Medicine, audit expertise in Health Sciences would be extremely valuable.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:

Given the tight budget circumstance at the present time, P&B can only support Priorities#1 and #3. Priority #2 perhaps be funded in the next budget cycle, when the medical school will be closer to being a reality.
P&B UNIT REPORT
ACADEMIC SENATE

P&B INTERVIEW:

Senate Chair Tom Cogswell made a presentation of the Senate Office budget to the Chancellor, EVC and Provost and the VC for Planning and Budget during the budget hearings on March 8, 2007.

UNIT VISION:
To engage with the Administration in a productive and rich shared governance process for the good of UCR. To create an effective management process for the operation and management of the 14 Standing Senate Committees. To provide staff support mechanisms so that UCR faculty members can participate on Academic Senate Committees in an efficient and productive manner that will optimize the providing of advice and suggestions that result in an enhancement of the educational mission of the campus.

UNIT PRIORITIES:
The Senate has three budget goals. (a) For the Senate to assume full responsibility for operation and maintenance of the Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). (b) To provide funds to the Senate Educational Policy Committee (EPC) so as to facilitate the annual review of undergraduate majors on a regular schedule. (c) To administer funds so as to provide additional compensation for CAP Committee members.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007:
The total budget of the UCR Senate Office is $373,487 in general funds for Administrative functions.

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>PERM $</th>
<th>TEMP $</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Principal Admin Analyst I</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$81,244</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant III</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$53,750</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Start-up Funding for CAP responsibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Undergrad Program Reviews</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,444</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Additional Compensation for CAP committee members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL $ REQUEST &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$134,994</td>
<td>$30,444</td>
<td>$165,438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:
P&B fully supports all 3 priorities projects. Priorities #1 and #3 will allow our UCR Senate to fully manage the entire CAP process for merits and promotions on campus. UCR is the only campus where the Senate does not provide the organization and staff effort for the operation of CAP. The funding of Priority #2 will allow our EPC to meet its responsibility stated in its Charge, to carry out a regular schedule a review of the educational effectiveness of each of the undergraduate majors offered at UCR.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:
P&B feels that fully funding these 3 Priorities will enhance the shared governance process that is so essential for our quest for excellence as a University of California campus.
P&B ASSESSMENT OF THE I&R and BUDGET REQUEST OF THE ANDERSON GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

P&B INTERVIEW:
Dean Anil Deolalikar on April 4, 2007

ACADEMIC VISION:
P&B’s understanding is that AGSM is hiring aggressively so as to create a critical mass of faculty in each of their three departments, which at the same time will increase the academic stature of AGSM.

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES:
The prime goal of AGSM as articulated to P&B is: “For continued success, we need to hire significantly more faculty.” According to the Interim Dean, “we are short of faculty in many core areas, which in turn jeopardizes our accreditation with the AACSB”. Also, AGSM hopes to hire a new Dean in the current fiscal year (2006/07).

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007 = $7,135,498 and does not include any gifts/endowments

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF FTE</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR '07 – '08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reclassification of SAOs to PAAIs</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Professional Academic Advisor I</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>64,696</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Administrative Specialists</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>118,525</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sr. Writer</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>34,848</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>TOTAL REQUEST &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$187,451</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I&R FTE CURRENT STATUS AND REQUESTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS of 10/15/06</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Existing I&amp;R Commitments</th>
<th>I&amp;R FTE REQUESTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>GRAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filled</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>Promised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>39.58</td>
<td>39.58</td>
<td>44.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGSM currently has 15.7 Teaching Assistant FTE; they have requested only 1.53 new FTE for 2007/08.
CURRENT FTE STATUS (Academic Units) (2006-2007):

AGSM has currently approved a total of 39.58 I&R FTE approved; of this total 18.58 are ‘open’. It is already known as of May 1, 2007 that several of the searches have failed. These failed searches would presumably be re-started in 2007/08.

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:
Interim Dean Deolalikar is to be commended for his efforts to right the AGSM ship. He has the faculty working together to plan a Vision for the future, and has successfully made several ‘senior’ hires. A critical area of focus is to make the MBA move closer to a ‘self supporting status’. This will be critical so that AGSM can provide summer salary support as well as provide appropriate initial research complements to current and newly-recruited faculty. Also this will relieve the Central Administration of the burden of providing these funds. Also a Ph.D. is planned to start in 2008/09.

P&B ADVICE ON FTE REQUESTS (Academic Units) for 2007-2008 and 2008 – 2009
AGSM requests 5.00 I&R FTE for 2007/08; these are all to be at the ‘senior’ level; see their Table 1. P&B recommends that the 5.0 FTE requested for 2007/08 not be made available until it is clear that they will be utilized; there is likely to be unfilled FTE from 2006/07 that should be utilized first.

P&B endorses the suggestion of the Chancellor and VC Bolar that AGSM need to use their returned income from their professional school tuition surcharge to support their faculty summer salary needs.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:
P&B approves Priorities #1, #2 and #3. Priorities #1 and #2 will improve the professional status of their Academic Advisors. Priority #3 will permanently fund 2 Administrative Specialists who would each be assigned as staff support for the three growing departments resident in AGSM. It is crucial that these departments thrive and are able to stand on their own; collectively this will ensure the future stability of AGSM and move it further away from some of its troubling history.
P&B UNIT REPORT
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

P&B INTERVIEW:
On April 25, 2007 Athletics Director Stan Morrison, Executive Associate Athletics Director and SWA Janet Lucas, Asst. Athletics, Cheryl Sautter, Administrative Budget Officer and Vice Chancellor for Administration Al Diaz met with P&B for about 75 minutes. Professor Joe Childers chaired the meeting.

UNIT VISION:
To move toward increased competitiveness in the Big West Conference and to attract top quality athletes and coaches to UCR. Also, to contribute an increasing portion to its overall budget through ticket sales, television and advertising revenue, etc.

UNIT PRIORITIES:
For 2007-08 there are several priorities; however, top priorities are to increase grants in aid (scholarships) to athletes, thus making UCR more competitive in recruiting, to bring Men’s and Women’s basketball support more in line with other Big West schools, and to hire an assistant for Associate A.D. Michael Scarano to aid with overseeing the increasing demands of NCAA rules compliance.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007 = $ 7.3 million. This total is derived from the following sources: Student Registration fees, $1.1 million; Student Referendum fees, $1.7 million; UCR General fund, $1.6 million; Other Institutional funds, $1.6 million; Sales & Service + NCAA + Athletics Fund Raiser + Guarantees+ Gifts, $1.3 million.

The UCR Athletics budget is next to the bottom of the 9 other Big West Conference members (the highest budget is 2X that of UCR) and the lowest of the 4 UC members.

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR '07 – '08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Athletic Grant in Aid (GIA); Competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Women's Basketball; Competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Men's Basketball; Competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Compliance: Assistant</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$59,263</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Men's Soccer: Staff retention</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$16,941</td>
<td>$16,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Men's Soccer: Staff ;assistant coach</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Women's Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Custodial/Grounds; baseball field and surrounding maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Media Relations</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$54,215</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>TOTAL $$ REQUEST &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$241,161</td>
<td>$231,134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:
UCR’s athletic teams have, in large part, proven they can compete strongly at the Division 1 level, especially in baseball, women’s basketball, and, increasingly, in track and field. However, the marquee sport for UCR is men’s basketball, which has yet to emerge as a contender in the Big West conference. The new hire of a men’s basketball coach, together with the successes in the other sports should make UCR an important regional, and potentially national, player in division 1 sports.

P&B anticipates that this enhanced regional prominence will augment UCR’s public stature, which will in turn improve the UCR Development’s Office fund raising efforts.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:
The priorities seem well placed, especially given that so much of the request that P&B advises granting is for student support. The compliance assistance seems vital to ensuring that UCR is able to keep with the highly complex NCAA policies and regulations.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:
Fund the top 4 priorities to Athletics from permanent funds. Fund Priorities #5a and #6 an additional $231,134, from Temporary funds; UCR can not expect the AVC Facilities M. Miller to personally cut the grass.
**P&B ASSESSMENT OF THE I&R and BUDGET REQUEST OF THE BOURNS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**

**P&B INTERVIEW:**

Dean Abbaschian on February 20, 2007

**ACADEMIC VISION:**
The vision of BCOE as articulated to P&B is: “To Become a Nationally Recognized Leader in Engineering Research and Education”.

**ACADEMIC PRIORITIES:**
The key priority is to create the profile of a top 25 Engineering School by increasing faculty and diversity, by increasing visibility, and by enhancing student success and enrollment.

**CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007 = $ 46,294,437**

**TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR '07 – '08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>PERM $</td>
<td>TEMP $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Graduate Student Affairs Manager</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>74,426</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Director of Communications</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>81,244</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL REQUEST &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</strong></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td><strong>$155,670</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P&B strongly support funding for the director of communications since this is the top priority in enhancing the external visibility of the college and the departments. This is particularly important for this young college, which requires the development of extra promotional materials and website to attract attention.

Funding for the Graduate manager is recommended if there is available funding. Since each department has their own graduate assistant, the true benefit of this new position may be to enhance the recruiting activities.
I&R FTE CURRENT STATUS AND REQUESTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS of 10/15/06</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Existing I&amp;R Commitments</th>
<th>I&amp;R FTE REQUESTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>GRAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filled</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>07/08 08/09</td>
<td>Promised 07/08 08/09 09/10 10/11 Rqsts</td>
<td>22.00 113.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.10</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>87.85</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>91.85</td>
<td>6.00 6.00 5.00 5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BCOE currently has 29.7 Teaching Assistant FTE; they have requested only 6 new FTE for 2007/08 with 3 new FTE going specifically to the new Bioengineering Department.

CURRENT FTE STATUS (Academic Units)(2006-2007):
BCOE has currently approved a total of 87.85 I&R FTE approved; of this total 14.75 are ‘open’. Four additional FTE have been committed prior to this year.

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:
We highly recommend that Dean Abbasschian to develop a long-term FTE hiring vision, particularly on the key research areas that are critical for the College’s and University’s mission.

P&B ADVICE ON FTE REQUESTS (Academic Units) for 2007-2008 and 2008 – 2009:
They are current conducting searches to fill up to 10 FTEs this year. It is known that negotiation with up to 10 candidates is currently underway and a few more may begin within the few two weeks. If all these searches are successful, BCOE will be down to 8.75 unfilled FTE, which is lower than the 10% reserve required. With that in mind, P&B would support the additional 6 FTEs request for 2007-2008.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:
P&B approves Priorities #2 and recommends funding for Priorities #1 if possible. Priorities #2 will significant benefit the College’s visibility and improve our ranking and fundraising outlook. Even though Priority #1 will be a good add-on to the overall graduate education structure, the actual coordination and job-sharing responsibility with other graduate assistants should be more clearly defined.

P&B supports the current request of 6 additional faculty FTEs for 2007-2008 considering the proposed hiring of 10 FTEs this year.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:
The most important issue is to invest strategically into the right research areas. The College has a good core group of faculty and a few more correct investments will likely result in a substantial enhancement in the overall research productivity.
P&B UNIT REPORT
CHANCELLOR/EVC

P&B INTERVIEW:
The committee met with Executive Vice Chancellor Ellen Wartella on February 28, 2007 to discuss the budget request from this unit.

UNIT VISION:
To continue efforts in the Office of the Chancellor to bring UCR into preeminence among U.S. research universities.

UNIT PRIORITIES:
1. To establish a VP position to consolidate into a single program the various international study and research programs on the campus.
2. To provide staff support for the Chancellor regarding meetings and meeting follow-up.
3. To add a technical support person for several offices in the unit to assist in document management and carrying out duties relevant to personnel and compliance issues.
4. To add an administrative support person to help with the workload of the offices of Executive Searches and Campus Counsel.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007 = $ 9,536,290

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR ’07 – ’08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VP-International Programs</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Admin specialist (Office of the Chancellor)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$59,623 $3,500</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Programmer/Analyst</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$59,623 $7,500 $62,763</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Admin. Specialist</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$62,763</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>TOTAL $$ REQUEST &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$59,623 $163,763 $223,386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:
The office of the Chancellor and EVC carry out many of the core functions of the campus ranging from campus academic programs to systemwide and state concerns. The vision of the Chancellor and EVC to improve the national ranking of the institution is supported campus wide.
P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:

- Item 1 requests funds for a .5 FTE position, course release, summer salary, stipend and S & E for a faculty member to assume leadership of the various international programs on the campus. This effort is especially important at this time in that international activities involving students and faculty are on the rise. A centralized organization will be efficient as well as create more opportunities for coordinating these efforts than currently exist.

- Item 4 is for an administrative specialist to assist in the offices of Executive Searches and Campus Counsel. Each of these two new offices has 1 support staff; the new staff person would be shared by the two offices. The workloads in each of these offices are very heavy and they are expected to increase, therefore, an additional staff support is warranted.

- Item 2 is for a support staff to assist the Chancellor in activities related to meetings including records, preparation, and follow-up. Given the current turnover in this office, the committee decided not to recommend funding of this request.

- Item 3 is for a technical support person to help establish and organize records in several offices in the unit, such as the VP-UAP, VP-Academic Personnel. The staff position described in this request seems to cover similar areas of responsibility as the staff position described in the request from Computing and Communications. Therefore, it was unclear whether both positions should be funded.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:
These two requests are important for streamlining campus efforts regarding international education and for supporting several of the critical activities of the unit.
P&B ASSESSMENT OF THE I&R and BUDGET REQUEST OF THE COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES (CHASS)

P&B INTERVIEW:
Dean S. Cullenberg on February 20, 2007

ACADEMIC VISION:
4-fold:
1. Help move campus to AAU status.
2. Build foundations for new professional schools in public policy and law
3. Begin a set of innovative programs with the potential to provide interdisciplinary connections across the campus and raise visibility of the university as a whole.
4. provide support to the Eminent Scholar program.

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES:
For 2007-08 to increase the visibility and growth of its graduate programs

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007 = $54,522,445

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007-2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR '07 – '08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>PERM $</td>
<td>TEMP $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>TOTAL $$$ REQUEST &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) CHASS did not submit a Budget request

I&R FTE CURRENT STATUS AND REQUESTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS of 10/15/06</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Existing I&amp;R Commitments</th>
<th>I&amp;R FTE REQUESTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>GRAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filled Open</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>07/08 08/09 Promised</td>
<td>07/08 08/09 09/10 10/11 Rqsts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261.90</td>
<td>53.90</td>
<td>315.80 13 2 330.80 15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>345.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CURRENT FTE STATUS (Academic Units)(2006-2007):
CHASS proposes holding approximately 15% of FTE open to support necessary college operations, including the support of lecturers, TAs and Visiting Assistant Professors. It is requesting authorization to recruit 22 searches from its own resources in 2007-08. In 2006-07, more than 30 searches were successfully completed. Current student/faculty ratios among undergraduates are quite high (especially in the social sciences) and CHASS enrollment continues to grow at both the graduate and undergraduate level, with several key departments having experienced negative or flat-line growth over the last several years.
P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:
CHASS’s vision is laudable and quite achievable. There is no disputing the importance of the Eaton collection or the desire to establish the foundations for a future law school by enhancing/inaugurating the Law and Science in Society center, and the CHASS plan offers results for both the near and long term.

P&B ADVICE ON FTE REQUESTS (Academic Units) for 2007-2008 and 2008 – 2009:

CHASS is requesting 15 new FTE in 2007-08 in the following areas:

1. 3 Enhancement FTE to foster research excellence, build graduate education and increase research support (external). These are targeted to departments with good to excellent track records in attracting external funding.
2. 6 FTE to build the potential for professional schools, including inaugurating the Center for Law and Science in Society.
3. 3 FTE to inaugurate science fiction studies on campus, building on the world-renowned Eaton Collection.
4. 3 FTE for one quarter Visiting Scholars to improve chances for recruiting eminent scholars.
5. 6 TA-Ships for increasing graduate support and reducing sections sizes.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:
FTE, especially with a view to enhancing graduate education must remain a priority for CHASS. The priorities are well thought out, and many of the College’s goals are attainable through its own resources.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:
This is a thoughtful, creative, and ambitious vision for CHASS and deserves close attention. Our recommendation is to award all the requested FTE to CHASS.
P&B ASSESSMENT OF THE I&R and BUDGET REQUEST OF THE COLLEGE OF NATURAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES (CNAS)

P&B INTERVIEW:

March 15, 2007 presentation by Interim Dean Donald Cooksey

ACADEMIC VISION:

Special UCR Initiative: Impact of Climate Change on Agricultural Sustainability

Multidisciplinary Initiatives:

1. Genomics and Bioinformatics
2. Evolution and Ecology
3. Agricultural Sciences
4. Environment-Related Research
5. Material Science and Nanotechnology
6. Health Science-Related Research
7. Computational Sciences, Modeling and Simulation

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES:

1. Infectious Diseases, Vector Biology, and Food Safety: Entomology, Plant Pathology, Biology
2. Ecosystems Science: Biology, Botany, Earth Sciences, Environmental Sciences
3. Agricultural Genomics: IIGB, Botany and Department(s) to be Determined
4. Health Science-Related Research: Biochemistry, Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Chemistry, IIGB, Physics
6. IGPP: Institute for Geophysics and Planetary, Astrophysics, Space Physics, and Astronomy

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007:

CNAS Combined Permanent Budgets FY 2006-07: Total Budget $58.1 Million

By Function (Non-AES, AES, & CE): AES (36%), CE (4%), Non-AES (60%)

By Expenditure Category (Non-AES, AES, & CE): Academic Salaries (53%), Staff Salaries (17%), Apprentice Salaries (7%), Benefits (14%), S&E (9%)
### TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>PERM $</th>
<th>TEMP $</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (a)</td>
<td>Finalize Centralized Undergrad Advising Plan and Address Secondary Effects</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>$341,351</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$141,351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strengthen Analytical Support Services and Enhance Contract &amp; Grant Development and Administration</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>$273,508</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sustain Instructional Support at an Appropriate Level</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>$173,178</td>
<td>$12,250</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Enhance Administrative Support Infrastructure</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>$118,138</td>
<td>$8,750</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expansion of CNAS Freshman Scholars Program/Support of CAMP Program</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$68,014</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Support Undergraduate Research Across the Campus (Institutional Priority):</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$62,308</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total FY 2007/08 Requests</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$164,101</td>
<td>$364,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) The PERMANENT amount requested of $341,351 was reduced to $200,000 and the remaining amount of $141,351 has been moved to TEMPORARY $$. Thus the total $$ of support for priority #1 is $364,101 as requested by the Dean.

### I&R FTE CURRENT STATUS AND REQUESTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filled</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>2006/2007</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>Promised</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11 Requests</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>GRAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>159.72</td>
<td>38.76</td>
<td>198.48</td>
<td>198.48</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>237.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CURRENT FTE STATUS (Academic Units)(2006-2007):
One-Sixth of approved FTEs remain unfilled at the beginning of May 1, 2007.
P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:
The overall plan/vision is excellent for organized research component of CNAS. However, only a few remarks were made concerning undergraduate and graduate education. No structured vision has been presented for either of these key educational efforts of CNAS. P&B expresses its serious concerns over the high failure rates of students in basic science and math courses as well as existing high dropout rates in the college. Restructuring advising will only begin to address the problematic issues.

P&B ADVICE ON FTE REQUESTS (Academic Units) for 2007-2008 and 2008 – 2009:
24 FTEs are requested for 07/08 and 15 FTEs are requested for 08/09. With the proposed vision plan, these requests are legitimate. Given the use of vacant FTEs for the initial complement financing plan for new hires, it is not clear how this fact has been incorporated into Priority Positions in the plan. The organized research has been over-emphasized to the extent the individual units would be not be supported for maintaining their research and their undergraduate as well as graduate education mission.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:
P&B can only support Priority #1, given the overall magnitude of the CNAS unrealistic request of $1,012,247; this amount significantly exceeds the average allocation of $187,000 if there is only $3.0 million on the table. P&B concurs that improving the CNAS ability to provide improved Advising to our undergraduate is an overdue appropriate ‘first priority’. The proposed 2nd priority has two unrelated components. P&B can not support duplicating the proposed Contract and Grant request; this function is more appropriately carried out by the Research Office. Also P&B does not support using ‘allocated $’ to support the Analytical Support Services; this should be supported by user fees.

The 3rd priority may well be deserving, but is not justified in the information provided to P&B, nor was it addressed in the ‘presentation’ to P&B. Also the term “appropriate level” has not been defined.

The statements below are made with regard to the CNAS Proposed Faculty Recruitments FY 2007/2008 Budget Call. P&B has some serious concerns.

1. The ability of the College to accumulate the required resources through philanthropy or other extramural sources is questionable, given the magnitude of the resource shortfall e.g., we need the equivalent of a $130 million endowment, spinning off 4% in annual income. (Top of Page 3.)

2. It should be duly noted that the financial position of the College would deteriorate further if we are required to fill all vacant FTE, as the resources generated by those FTE are a key component of the initial complement financial plan for new hires. (Middle of Page 3.)

3. Without a significant allocation of new FTE in FY 2007/08 (16.5 to 24 I&R FTE), we will be in a deficit position as early as FY 2007/08; for all intents and purposes CNAS will have fully committed the resources associated with new faculty FTE projected to be received in FY 2007/08, before we even begin the recruitments for the related faculty positions. ( Middle of Page 3.)
4. Given that the campus is now holding the resources for staff augmentations that would have previously been allocated to the College as part of the resource base associated with each new faculty FTE, we believe it is fair to expect the campus to fund a minimum of one new staff position for every four faculty positions allocated.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:
P&B supports with enthusiasm the allocation of the proposed significant resources to support the overhaul of the undergraduate student Advising System in CNAS.
**P&B UNIT REPORT**
**COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS**

**P&B INTERVIEW:**


**CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007 =** $8,461,497 (general funds) and $7,133,020 (in recharges fees for service).

**TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR '07 – '08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Equity Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>$70,993</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Programmer Analyst III @ midpoint</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$94,647</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>Programmer Analyst III @ midpoint</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$189,294 (a)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL $$ REQUEST &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</strong></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td><strong>$260,287</strong></td>
<td><strong>$260,287</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) C&C’s Priority #3 bundled 2.0 FTE. P&B supports only 1.0 FTE for $94,647.

**P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:**
The objective of Computing and Communications of providing, maintaining, and developing appropriate systems to more efficiently facilitate the goals of UCR faculty, staff, and students is indispensable to the University's mission. Given the ever-expanding demands for such systems and the staff who maintain them--as well as the current salary levels for certain systems administrators--Planning and Budget supports the top three priority requests as necessary to future computing demands and administrative restructuring.

**P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:**
Priority 1 is an unavoidable addressing of the salary equity issue. Priority 2 is necessary to the continued smooth function of campus IT systems in a reliable and secure manner. P&B supports only 1.0 FTE of Priority 3; these funds will help UCR better manage its workforce in these times of limited staff funding.

**P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:**
Because of the absolute centrality of Computing and Communications Planning and Budget recommends full funding of this unit's top two priorities and half of their Priority #3.
P&B UNIT REPORT
GRADUATE DIVISION

P&B INTERVIEW:
Dean Dallas Rabenstein on January 16, 2007

ACADEMIC VISION:
Increase the number and quality of graduate students at UCR, putting the campus within the AAU standard of at least 15% graduate students in the total student population.

UNIT PRIORITIES:
To increase graduate student support for 2007-08 and thereby increase graduate student enrollment.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007 = $14,259,391 ($12,452,866 in financial aid)

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR ’07 – ’08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Additional Graduate Student Support Funding for 2007-08</td>
<td></td>
<td>$328,545</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Graduate Student Recruitment Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>TOTAL $$ REQUEST &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>$328,545 $200,000</td>
<td>528,545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:
The plan/vision is admirable, but it is important to fund at levels that make us competitive in recruiting.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:
Priority one is absolutely necessary to maintain competitiveness with other institutions. As it now stands, an increase in support per student between 2006-07 and 07-08 is only nominal and covers only an increase in costs. This will be absolutely wiped out if the Regents do indeed agree to the 8% increase for graduate students. Thus, it must be covered. Graduate student recruitment has worked well in several departments across campus, and making those funds (temporarily) available to departments will increase the likelihood of even more successes in graduate recruiting—both in terms of numbers and quality.
P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:
In terms of planning related recommendations, P&B has identified two areas which were not 
mentioned by the Graduate Division, but which we feel are meritorious. P&B feels that if 
investment is made in each of these areas that both will support our campus goal to increase 
graduate student enrollment.

(c) It is crucial that the graduate student application process be entirely electronic and be 
capable of being transacted entirely through the internet by graduate student 
applicants. UCR is the only UC campus that does not have an operative 100% on-line 
graduate application process.

(d) Funds are required to improve and update the web presence for many departmental- 
based graduate programs as well as interdepartmental graduate programs. The 
Administration has also vigorously encouraged all campus units with web sites, to 
convert to the new UCR logo and brand. Interdepartmental graduate Programs are 
ever provided with web site funds on a regular basis; almost all of our graduate 
program web sites need modernization. There are a total of 37 UCR graduate 
programs; CHASS 13; CNAS 18; COE 5; and Education 1. P&B requests a special 
allocation of $50,000 of Temporary funds to the Graduate Division that is earmarked 
exclusively for web site modernization.
P&B ASSESSMENT OF THE I&R and BUDGET REQUEST OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION (GSOE)

P&B INTERVIEW:

Dean Steve Bossert on February 15, 2007.

ACADEMIC VISION:
GSOE identifies three priorities in its vision statement: Enhancing academic quality, creating new professional programs, and fostering new professional partnerships in the community. These include new MEd programs, building a community college collaborative and working with a science and math charter school.

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES:
Academic priorities include one new faculty member (in Special Education supported by the Eady bequest), enhancing faculty support services.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007 = $ 8,701,043
$4,952,500 Academic
1,571,052 Staff
2,178,222 Non Salary Support
Contract & Grant Awards: 17 awards totaling $5,505,751

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>PERM $</th>
<th>TEMP $</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 FTE Admin Specialist; 0.75 FTE for AAIII to increase staff to 2.0 FTE Accounting &amp; 1.0 FTE Purchasing</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>$101,341</td>
<td>$3500</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0 FTE Sr. Admin. Analyst for Academic &amp; Staff Personnel</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$74,426</td>
<td>$3500</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>TOTAL $$ REQUEST &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>$175,767</td>
<td>$7000</td>
<td>$182,767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I&R FTE CURRENT STATUS AND REQUESTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS of 10/15/06</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Existing I&amp;R Commitments</th>
<th>I&amp;R FTE REQUESTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>GRAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filled</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>Promised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRENT FTE STATUS (Academic Units) (2006-2007):
Pending and unsuccessful searches this year will mean one or two additional searches for 07/08

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:

The GSOE Plan emphasizes expanding self-sustaining MED program enrollments to free up faculty FTE lines currently committed to teacher and administrator credential programs.

P&B ADVICE ON FTE REQUESTS (Academic Units) for 2007-2008 and 2008 – 2009
The proposed assistant professor appointment is essential to maintain APA approval for the School Psychology program – a source of significant portion of the GSOE doctoral degree enrollment.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:
The case for staff support seems reasonable, though an equally high campus priority should be providing funds to support GSOE professional credential programs.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:
Several of the “open” FTE faculty positions are currently being converted to lecturers and supervising teachers to sustain these programs, making it appear as if the unit has more faculty lines than are actually available. The School could expand programs significantly if professional credential programs were more fully supported.
P&B UNIT REPORT
OFFICE OF RESEARCH

P&B INTERVIEW:

Vice Chancellor Charles Louis met with Planning and Budget on December 7, 2006.

UNIT PRIORITIES:

The Office of Research supports the UCR academic community by building and supporting its research programs. The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research oversees: Sponsored Programs Administration, Research Integrity, Intellectual Property Services, Research Development and the Campus Veterinarian. The Office is responsible for the review and regulatory oversight of campus research Centers and Organized Research Units, which include: Center for Sustainable Suburban Development, UC Mexus, Environmental Research Institute, and the Institute for Geophysics and Planetary Physics. The VCR is responsible for investigation of allegations of research misconduct and oversees various research and laboratory safety committees, including Animal Care and Use, Biosafety, Radiation Safety, Stem Cell Research, and Misconduct.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007:

The 2006 budget was $4,072,851, which was up from $2,113,224 two years ago. The budget consisted of staff salaries and benefits (66.1%), academic salaries and benefits (6.6%) and non-salary support (27.1%). This latter category showed the greatest increase over a two year period.

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR '07 – '08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$95,280</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Animal Technician Supervisor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$59,263</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Senior Writer</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$64,696</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administrative Analyst - IGPP</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$64,696</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

xx TOTAL $$$ REQUEST >>>> 2.5 $222,212 $7,000 $229,212

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:

The requests from the VCR are mainly reactive and centered on maintenance rather than being forays into new and creative realms.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:

The first priority request is to continue the appointment of Dr. Richard Luben as a 0.5 appointment as an Associate VCR. This request is necessary due to the complexity of activities under the prevue of the Office of Research. The priority 2 request is necessary because the problematic budget of IGPP was recently transferred to the Office and the
workload cannot be subsumed without additional financial assistance. **Priority 3** is to hire an employee to oversee the daily operation of all vivaria on that have recently been centralized. This request results from recommendations from a site visit that occurred recently. **Priority 4** entails hiring a senior writer/editor to assist faculty in writing grants for complex, interdisciplinary research programs. Such grants are becoming more common and are more lucrative. We reprioritized the requests as shown above.

We support the first 3 priorities, from our list, and the fourth as well, if funding is possible. But this is complicated by the $181,598 separately requested for the Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development.

**P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:**
P&B is puzzled as to how to respond to the budget needs of the VCR relative to the Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development (BCSSD); it is one of the four centers that report to the Office of Research. Vice Chancellor Louis requested separately for BCSSD $181,598 of buy-out funds for release time for the Director and Asst. Director plus staff support for the operation of the Center. P&B has difficulty supporting this request if there is only $3 million on the table.
UNIT REPORT
UCR Palm Desert Graduate Center (PDGC)

P&B INTERVIEW:
Presentation by Carolyn Stark

ACADEMIC VISION:
PDGC will be a catalyst for the economic diversification of the region by forging close ties to
the community, providing relevant regional research, offering innovative graduate and
professional programs that attract and retain world class talent to the region, and extend the
resources of the university through research, education, and service.

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES:
1. Attract more research by UCR faculty to be done at the UCR PDGC
2. Increase the number of graduate degree programs offered at UCR PDGC
3. Partner with the deans and faculty to develop high level education programs
4. Support the UCR Medical School initiative by offering related courses and
   programs in Palm Desert
5. Continue to form meaningful partnerships and collaborations with local government,
   businesses, individuals and organizations that further the goals of UCR and
   respond to the needs of the region.
6. Establish a community forum (“Lyceum”) that grows into a “Winter Institute” of a
   series of related conferences addressing a regional issue identified through the
   forum and attracting intellectual contributions from around the world.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007:
Existing Budget 06/07
Perm $1,640,273
Temp $384,226
Total $2,024,499

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>PERM</th>
<th>TEMP</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>TOTAL $$ REQUEST &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$222,212</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$229,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>Sal/benefits, Communications charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>Video surveillance system, furniture and honoraria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$109,551
$90,000
Y for Temp
N for Perm

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:
Overall plan/vision for UCR PDGC is excellent. The center currently runs MBA and MFA
programs.

**P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:**
In case of budget difficulties, the best strategy is to partner with AGSM

**P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:**
PDGC will expand opportunities for learning and personal growth for both undergraduate and graduate students.
P&B INTERVIEW:

Presentation by Bill Boldt on March 6, 2007.

ACADEMIC VISION:
University Advancement has a broad array of activities and envisioned future priorities. The unit has been recently expanded and upgraded and has had substantial success in bringing new gifts to the campus. The resources generated by this unit are several times the cost of its operation.

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES:
The most important priorities include:

1. Full implementation of a Strategic Communications office,

2. Preparation for, and initial implementation of, UCR's first major fund campaign,

3. Expanding annual giving,

4. Helping to launch the Medical School initiative, and

5. Development of a philanthropy orientation and communication capability throughout the community.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007:

Existing Budget 06/07
Perm $1,640,273
Temp $384,226
Total 2,024,499

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR '07 – '08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>Rental and maintenance of office space for Strategic Communications</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>$80,580</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR '07 – '08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>Rental and maintenance of office space for Strategic Communications</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>$80,580</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:
University Development has been bringing much appreciated energy and direction to this vital function for the campus. Investment in this area appears to be paying off very handsomely.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:
Budget is reasonable, and will probably be offset from new income sources.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:
The current focus of this campus unit is much needed and much appreciated.
P&B INTERVIEW:

Ruth M. Jackson presentation to P&B on February 1, 2007

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007 = $13,692,747

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR '07 – '08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Base budget increase request for collections: monographic shortfall, CDL, new serial titles</td>
<td></td>
<td>$255,785</td>
<td>$255,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>Head, Science Library</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$113,400</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4**</td>
<td>Thai Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** P&amp;B supports only a portion of the unit's Priority number 2; the request of the Library bundled 8 positions into one Priority #2 request. ** P&amp;B has full support for the unit's priority number 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $$ REQUEST >>>>> 1.0 $369,185 $505,785 $874,970

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:
There is no such thing as a great university without a great library. The library system is absolutely fundamental to the research and teaching missions of UCR. It is also crucial to UCR's goal of achieving AAU status alongside UCB, UCD, UCI, UCLA, and UCSD. Statistics provided by the University Librarian make it only too apparent that UCR's libraries are desperately in need of an infusion of funding, especially in the area of FTE, in order to begin to bring them in line with the other libraries of the University of California.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:
Priority 1 addresses the pressing need of maintaining the monograph and journal collection--as well as maintaining ARL status. Currently, Berkeley invests around $10 million more a year in its collection expenditures than does UCR. FTE, however, is equally important to this central institution that is all but overwhelmed. Requests for instruction in research skills have nearly doubled in the last year alone, and it should be noted that Berkeley has a librarian to student ratio of 1:47, while UCR's is 1:101. Planning and Budget recommends as our 2nd priority (the Library's 4th priority) the hiring of a Head of the Science Library, believing that any significant developments in this crucial unit will be set aside until permanent leadership is in place. Priority 3, support for the Thai collection, is made in light of the broad investments already made in this area in instruction and research, including at least five relatively recent faculty hires in the South-east Asian area.
P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:
The fiscal state of the Library system is essentially that of a patient on a respirator, perpetually receiving just enough to stay alive but never being given what it needs to provide the foundation necessary to underpin the advancement of UCR as a whole. It is the opinion of Planning and Budget that these three priorities of the Library most definitely be fully funded.
P&B INTERVIEW:

Vice-Chancellor Al Diaz addressed Planning and Budget on April 5, 2007.

UNIT VISION:

The VCA endeavors to provide cost effective and high quality business support and administrative services that are vital to ensure excellence in UCR’s teaching, research and public service. The goals are safety, quality, meeting commitments and people.

UNIT PRIORITIES:

A large number of units are supervised by the VCA. These are Police, EH & S, Physical Plant, Fleet, Design and Construction, Transportation and Parking, as well as, Accounting, Purchasing, Finances, Student Business, Human Resources, Mail, Payroll, Bookstore, Printing, Child Development Center, Athletics and Housing and Dining.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FOR FY 2006-2007:

There are two separate budgets under VCA. The first budget for 2006 was $42,677,914 and was down over a two year period from $73,936,872. The expenditures included salaries (47.9%), non-salary support (48.6%) and equipment (3.5%). Expenditures came from Sales and Service (69.4%), state funds (25.7%), contracts and grants (1.6%) and other (2.1%). No student fees were used for expenditures in these units.

The other budget (OMP) for 2006 totaled $3,499,746, which was up over the past two years from $28,019,045. The expenditures were for staff salaries and benefits (34.3%), non salary support (65.2%). Expenditures came from state funds (64.8%) and sales and service (34.9%).

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR '07 – '08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HR-Reclassifications for HR Staff</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>PERM $</td>
<td>TEMP $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total 6 retentions &amp; recruitment, including Ross Grayson retention.</td>
<td>66,759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reclassification of EHS Specialist II (7135) to Principal EHS Specialist (0725)</td>
<td>46,854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HR-Senior Personnel Analyst – Recruiter and recruitment expenses</td>
<td>86,583</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Principle Analyst – Workforce planning and analysis</td>
<td>94,647</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>TOTAL $$ REQUEST &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>316,124</td>
<td>53,854</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:
The VCA leads the largest overall unit on campus and most of the staff employees on campus are in one of the components precincts of the VCA. These units are essential to the missions of the campus, which depend on them 24/7. A significant problem facing our campus, as well as all other UC campuses, is the relatively low staff salaries compared to city, state and private sectors. Overall turnover in staff last year was 11.9% and was 15.7% for under-represented employees. This fact leaves us vulnerable in terms of continuity and efficiency.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:
The first five (listed above) priorities speak directly to salary and staffing issues. Priority 1 addresses Human Resources administrative positions, which, at UCR, are the lowest classifications in the UC system. Priority 2 addresses a number of senior positions currently filled and open. Retention of a group of employees avoids the losses in a well trained team that result when reclassifying or hiring of one individual at a time to higher salary levels occurs. Priority 3 addresses reclassifying the new Sustainability Director, who has just been hired. This is a critical position for UCR, because our campus is far behind the other UC campuses in this area. UCR is also behind the City of Riverside. Sustainability is a national issue for all organizations, public and private. Environmental sustainability “is not only the appropriate and necessary action to take for environmental quality, but is vital to campus status, regarding student and employee recruitment, retention, and public relations.” People with qualifications in this area are in high demand by many organizations, including private industry, and command high salaries. Priority 4 involves active, strategic recruitment of employees by expanding staff recruitment efforts to identify and hire the most talented pool of employees, reduce the time to hire and market UCR as a desirable employer. Priority 5 involves hiring an analyst to collect, manage and analyze data on UCR’s workforce, assess (by surveys) the state of the workforce, identify reasons employees leave UCR, institute policies to increase employee satisfaction, identify pay inequities, etc.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:
P&B recommends funding of the Priorities #1, #2, #4, and #5 as outlined by VC Diaz from Permanent funds. His Administrative unit provides core services and infrastructure that support almost all other units on campus. P&B also supports Priority #3 being funded from Temporary funds.

Vice-Chancellor Diaz’s handling of the recent staff survey and resulting communications and dialogs with staff are to be commended. From P&B’s perspective, VC Diaz in addition to being a highly skilled and effective manager of a large and heterogeneous unit is also equally effective in one-on-one or small group situations. UCR is very fortunate to have him as our VCA.
UNIT VISION:
VCSC strives to create a capable and diverse student body by supporting the academic, social, physical, recreational, psychological, and ethical experiences of the students on the campus. It is also concerned with student preparation for further training and careers in the complex social and economic realities of the state.

UNIT PRIORITIES:
The office of VCSC oversees a large number of staff and units devoted to student support and development including the Offices of Enrollment Management, Dean of Students, and Student Administration. Offices within these units pertain to critical functions of the campus and include the Registrar, Financial Aid, Undergraduate Recruitment, Campus Health, Career Services, Student Commons, Counseling Center, Student Judicial Affairs, and a range of student organizations.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2006-2007 = $104,988,466
VCSC has had substantial changes to its budget over the last year. In 2004-05 the budget was $66,021,639 and in 2005-06 it was $68,884,668. The 2006-07 budget included academic salaries ($290,569), staff salaries and benefits ($31,427,653), non-salary support ($25,889,155), equipment ($472,919), and financial aid ($46,908,170). In 2006-07, 20.87% of the permanent budget was state funded.

TOP BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR 2007 - 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT PRIORITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BUDGET REQUEST</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR '07 – '08</th>
<th>Approved by P&amp;B (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AVC/EM MSO II: Enrollment Mgmt Units</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$65,533</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UR/Tours SAO II: Campus Tour Manager</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$61,925</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AVC / EM AAIII: AVCEM Assistant</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$49,475</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FAO AAII: Operations</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$48,695</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UA Admin Analyst: Comp. Review/App processing</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$54,944</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FAO Student Affairs Officer II</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$64,695</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FAO AAII: Fiscal</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$46,880</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EMS Programmer Analyst II</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$79,088</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
<td>TOTAL $$ REQUEST &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$225,628</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION:

This unit has many needs, a number of which have been deferred for several budget cycles. The priorities in the current request are all crucial to supporting the activities of the staff in the VCSA. The committee supports funding of the first four requests ($225,628 in permanent funds and $14,000 in temporary funds). These positions are necessary to support the current staff, which is overextended, and to carry out important program functions.

- Item 1 is for an MSO to oversee the budget of the 8 different offices responsible for enrollment management. This staff person will be responsible for overseeing the budget and other issues pertaining to personnel in this large office.
- Item 2 is for a staff position for a Campus Tour Manager, which is directly related to student recruitment. Over 25,000 prospective students and their families visit UCR each year and their experiences during this visit play a huge role in their decision to come to UCR or not. This position has been covered by temporary funds that are no longer available; therefore support for this position is critical to student recruitment next year.
- Item 3 is for an additional staff assistant to work in the enrollment management office.
- Item 4 is for an assistant in the Office of Financial Aid. All of these positions are necessary to support the current staff, which is overextended, and to carry out important program functions.

The remaining 4 items in the budget are worthwhile and should be considered for funding if possible.

- Item 5 requests funds to support a staff person to assist in preparing and generating admissions reports to the campus and UCOP as well as other support activities in the Office of Undergraduate Admissions.
- Item 6 requests funds to continue a Financial Aid Counselor position that is currently vacant but needed to handle the large number of requests from students and compliance offices.
- Item 7 requests funds for a staff person to work with student aid expenditures and compliance issues.
- Item 8 requests funds for a staff person to work with enrollment management as an information technology specialist.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES:

VCSA carries out a complex and diverse range of functions that are core to the health and viability of the campus as a whole. Without effective recruitment of undergraduates and support for students when they come to campus, UCR cannot survive. The operations of this unit have met the expectations of increasing enrollment on the campus. Continued and appropriate levels of support for this unit are integral to meeting the long-term enrollment plans of the campus. The four support positions requested in this budget are part of the overall plan for the unit and are expected to be incorporated in the permanent budget in the 2008-09 budget cycle.
P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC AND PROVOST:
The VCSA has done an outstanding job in helping the campus reach its enrollment targets. Continued support of the unit in the ways outlined in this budget request will help in sustaining this effort.
# TABLE 2 WITH PROPOSED SENIOR MANAGEMENT DECISIONS INCLUDED (PLAN C AUGUST 28th)

P&B PRIORITIES FOR BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR THE UCR VISIONING PROCESS FOR 2007-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITS WITH NO BUDGETS REQUESTED</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITY A</strong></td>
<td>(P&amp;B Prioritized)</td>
<td>Perm $</td>
<td>Temp $</td>
<td>TOTAL $</td>
<td>Perm $</td>
<td>Temp $</td>
<td>TOTAL $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$255,785</td>
<td>$505,785</td>
<td>$761,570</td>
<td>$85,570</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$435,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Division</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$328,545</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$528,545</td>
<td>$328,545</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$528,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC-Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$181,230</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$188,230</td>
<td>$366,038</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$380,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;C 4th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$260,287</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$260,287</td>
<td>$670,173</td>
<td>$365,397</td>
<td>$1,035,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITY B</strong></td>
<td>(Alphabetical)</td>
<td>Perm $</td>
<td>Temp $</td>
<td>TOTAL $</td>
<td>Perm $</td>
<td>Temp $</td>
<td>TOTAL $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Planning &amp; Budget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$204,652</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$211,652</td>
<td>$112,630</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$116,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$134,994</td>
<td>$30,444</td>
<td>$165,438</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$71,660</td>
<td>$71,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGSM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$187,451</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$197,951</td>
<td>$70,359</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$73,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourns College of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$155,670</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$162,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor/EVC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$163,763</td>
<td>$163,763</td>
<td>$58,760</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$134,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$164,101</td>
<td>$364,101</td>
<td>$132,258</td>
<td>$101,500</td>
<td>$233,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSOE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$175,767</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$182,767</td>
<td>$117,423</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$120,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$241,161</td>
<td>$231,134</td>
<td>$472,295</td>
<td>$741,970</td>
<td>$453,584</td>
<td>$1,195,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC University Advancement</td>
<td>Space Rental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$80,580</td>
<td>$80,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC-Research</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$219,239</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$226,239</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$402,858</td>
<td>$402,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC-Student Affairs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$225,628</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$239,628</td>
<td>$377,512</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$384,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITY C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNITS WITH NO BUDGETS REQUESTED (Alphabetical)**

| Biomedical Sciences | No budget request | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| CHASS | No budget request | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $500,000 | $500,000 |
| University Ext. | No budget request | $0 | $0 | $0 |

**TOTAL**

|$2,712,208 | $1,511,614 | $4,295,716 | $3,395,525 | $2,615,999 | $6,011,523 |
To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on Committees reports the following appointments made since the last report of May 22, 2007:

Appointed Professor T. Przymusinski of the Computer Science and Engineering Department to serve on the Privilege and Tenure Committee.

Appointed Professor P. M. Sadler of the Earth Sciences Department to serve as Chair of the Undergraduate Council.

Appointed Professor L. Fernandez of the Environmental Sciences Department to serve on the Diversity and Equal Opportunity Committee.

Appointed Professor G. W. Scott of the Chemistry Department to serve on the Distinguished Service Committee.

Appointed Professor R. Schultz of the Mathematics Department to serve on the Committee on Educational Policy.

Appointed Professor R. Redak of the Entomology Department to serve as Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Appointed Professor n. L. Schiller of Biomedical Sciences to serve as Chair of the Distinguished Teaching Committee.

Appointed Professor R. R. Russell of the Economics Department to serve as Chair of the Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer.

Appointed Professors K. Harris of the English Department and J. Hughes of the Religious Studies Department to serve on the Library and Scholarly Communication Committee.

Appointed Professors J. T. Rotenberry of the Sociology Department and A. Zaki of the Art Department to serve on the Physical Resources Planning Committee.

Appointed Professors D. R. Cocker of the Chemical/Environmental Engineering Department and J. Tobias of the English Department to serve on the Preparatory Education Committee.

Appointed Professor M. Chauvet of the Economics Department and H. L. Swanson of the Graduate School of Education to serve on the University Extension Committee.
Appointed Professor T. H. Morton of the Chemistry Department to serve as the Universitywide Committee on Faculty Welfare representative.

Appointed Professor W. F. Frankenberger of the Environmental Sciences Department to serve on the Committee on Academic Personnel for the Fall and Winter Quarters.

Appointed Professor N. C. Ellstrand of the Botany and Plant Sciences Department to serve on the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Staff Climate.

Recommended numerous faculty to serve on the various planning workgroups of the Medical School Initiative.

Appointed Professor J. W. Gary of the Department of Physics and Astronomy, as Chair of the In Memoriam Committee for Professor Emeritus B. C. Shen. Professors Emeritus S-Y. Fung and D.E. MacLaughlin of the Department of Physics and Astronomy were appointed as members of the committee.

Nominated six faculty members to serve on the Chancellor’s Search Committee.

Appointed Professor J. K. L. Roberts of the Biochemistry Department, D. N. Reznick of the Biology Department, P. Hickmott of the Psychology Department and Professor Emeritus R. A. Luben of the Division of Biomedical Sciences to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee on a Vet School.

Appointed Professors R. T. A. Lysloff of the Music Department, M. A. Chappell of the Biology Department, and H. Maier of the Comparative Literatures and Foreign Languages Department to serve on the Non Senate Instruction Excellence Review Committee.

Nominated a faculty member to serve on the Proposed Revision to the Health Science Code of Conduct Committee.

Appointed Professor G. Marcoulides of the Graduate School of Education to serve on the Institutional Research Coordinating Group (IRCG).

Appointed Professor D. S. Willis of the English Department to serve as Chair of the Committee on Preparatory Education for Fall Quarter.

Appointed Professor N. Becker of the Graduate School of Education to serve on the Student Success Steering Committee.

Appointed Professor L. Barrett of the English Department to serve on the Diversity & Equal Opportunity Committee.

Appointed Professor D. N. Reznick of the Biology Department to serve on the Educational Policy Committee.

Appointed Professor M. Maduro of the Biology Department to serve on the Graduate Council.
Appointed Professor F. Sauer of Biochemistry to serve on the Physical Resources Planning Committee.

Appointed Professor B. Echeverria from the Graduate School of Education to serve on the Diversity and Equal Opportunity Committee.

Appointed Professor A. Deolalikar from the Economics Department to serve as Chair of the Research Committee

Appointed Professor G. J. Palardy from the Graduate School of Education to serve on the Scholarships and Honors Committee.

Appointed Professor J. Wu from the Chemical/Environmental Engineering Department to serve as Chair of the Scholarships and Honors Committee.

Nominated a faculty member to serve on the Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRGs) associated with the Course Identification (C-ID) Project.

Re-appointed Professor C. A. Macnamara to the Student Health Advisory Committee.

B. C. ARNOLD  
R. A. CARDULLO  
R. J. DEBUS  
A. MULCHANDANI  
K. PYKE  
F. M. SLADEK  
M. SPERLING  
A. ULLAH  
G. WATSON  
J. M. GANIM, CHAIR
To be received and placed on file:
The Committee on Courses has approved the following courses.

**Undergraduate Course**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Units/Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESTORE ENGL 141 N</td>
<td>Literature and Related Fields (4) Holocaust Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 002 A</td>
<td>General Physics (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW BMSC 093</td>
<td>Seminar for Medical Scholars Program Students (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPSC 097</td>
<td>Lower-Division Research (1-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE 197</td>
<td>Research for Undergraduates (1-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 030</td>
<td>Introduction to Computational Science and Engineering (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 138</td>
<td>Electrical Properties of Materials (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 197</td>
<td>Research for Undergraduates (1-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 011</td>
<td>Global Climate Change (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 102 B</td>
<td>Summer Field Geology (1-14)</td>
<td>GEO 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 102 C</td>
<td>Summer Field Geology (1-14)</td>
<td>GEO 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNPG 043 E</td>
<td>Honors Seminar in Social Sciences (4) Survey of Social Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 147</td>
<td>Introduction to Fourier Analysis and Its Applications (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUS 003</td>
<td>Introduction to Opera (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUS 073 A</td>
<td>Dance of Mexico (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUS 073 B</td>
<td>Dance of Mexico (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 142</td>
<td>Advanced Topics in the Philosophy of Language (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSC 108</td>
<td>Politics of Race, Immigration, and Ethnicity in the United States (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSC 133</td>
<td>Politics of Central Asia in Comparative Perspective (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSC 148 H</td>
<td>Honors Politics of Congressional Elections (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSC 148 S</td>
<td>Politics of Congressional Elections (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSC 156</td>
<td>Political Systems across Muslim Societies (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSC 173 S</td>
<td>Government and Politics of California (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSC 180 S</td>
<td>The Politics of Public Health (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 117</td>
<td>Cognitive Neuroscience of Memory and Consciousness (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 111</td>
<td>Computational Modeling and Simulation (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPN 187</td>
<td>Latin American Science Fiction (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELETE ENGL 141 H</td>
<td>Literature and Related Fields (4) Modern Drama in Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 141 M</td>
<td>Literature and Related Fields (4) Literature and Myth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 141 V</td>
<td>Literature and Related Fields (4) Literature and the Illustrated Book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE BIEN 155</td>
<td>Bioengineering Laboratory (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 158</td>
<td>Medical Molecular Parasitology (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPSC 135</td>
<td>Plant Cell Biology (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 010</td>
<td>Introduction to Computer Science for Science, Mathematics, and Engineering I (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 120 A</td>
<td>Logic Design (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 120 B</td>
<td>Introduction to Embedded Systems (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNCE 007</td>
<td>Dance: Cultures and Contexts (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNCE 073 A</td>
<td>Dance of Mexico (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNCE 073 B</td>
<td>Dance of Mexico (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 104</td>
<td>Mathematics Education (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 120 A</td>
<td>Logic Design (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 120 B</td>
<td>Introduction to Embedded Systems (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 140</td>
<td>Computer Visualization (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 020 C</td>
<td>Introduction to Alternative Critical Perspectives on Literature and Culture (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 141 (E-Z)</td>
<td>Literature and Related Fields (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTM 106</td>
<td>Insect Evolution (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTM 107</td>
<td>Insect Biodiversity (3)</td>
<td>ENTM 107L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 102 A</td>
<td>Summer Field Geology (1-14)</td>
<td>GEO 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNST 073 A</td>
<td>Dance of Mexico (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNST 073 B</td>
<td>Dance of Mexico (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 010 B</td>
<td>Calculus of Several Variables (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 015</td>
<td>Contemporary Mathematics for the Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 046</td>
<td>Introduction to Ordinary Differential Equations (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 09H A</td>
<td>First-Year Honors Calculus (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 09H B</td>
<td>First-Year Honors Calculus (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 09H C</td>
<td>First-Year Honors Calculus (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 104</td>
<td>Mathematics Education (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 146 A</td>
<td>Ordinary and Partial Differential Equations (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 146 B</td>
<td>Ordinary and Partial Differential Equations (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 146 C</td>
<td>Ordinary and Partial Differential Equations (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUS 117</td>
<td>Music and Ritual (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 122 (E-Z)</td>
<td>Topics in History of Philosophy (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSE 148</td>
<td>Politics of Congressional Elections (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSE 173</td>
<td>Government and Politics of California (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSE 180</td>
<td>The Politics of Public Health (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 153</td>
<td>Introduction to Clinical Psychology (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 040</td>
<td>Elements of Statistics (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 048</td>
<td>Statistics for Business (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 100 A</td>
<td>Introduction to Statistics (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 140</td>
<td>Nonparametric Techniques (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 146</td>
<td>Statistical Forecasting Techniques (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 155</td>
<td>Probability and Statistics for Science and Engineering (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEA 191 (E-Z)</td>
<td>Seminar in Theatre (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Course**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE MGT 404</td>
<td>Communications, Leadership, Teams, and Ethics (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduate Course**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW BIEN 227</td>
<td>Biophotonics: Laser-Tissue Interactions and Therapeutic Applications (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW BIEN 228</td>
<td>Biophotonics: Optical Diagnosis and Measurements (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW BIOL 220</td>
<td>Evolutionary Physiology (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC 229</td>
<td>Foundations in Translational Research (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC 231 M</td>
<td>Foundations of Medicine I: Clinical Aspects (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC 232 M</td>
<td>Cardiovascular, Renal, and Respiratory Sciences I: Clinical Aspects (5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC 233 M</td>
<td>Gastrointestinal, Endocrine, and Reproductive Health I: Clinical Aspects (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC 234 M</td>
<td>Musculoskeletal Medicine: Clinical Aspects (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC 235 M</td>
<td>Clinical Neurosciences I: Clinical Aspects (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC 236 M</td>
<td>Foundations of Medicine II: Clinical Aspects (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC 238</td>
<td>Clinical Neurosciences II (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC 260 A</td>
<td>Topics in Translational Biomedical Research (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC 260 B</td>
<td>Topics in Translational Biomedical Research (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC 260 C</td>
<td>Topics in Translational Biomedical Research (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC 261</td>
<td>Methods in Biomedical Research (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPSC 230</td>
<td>Molecular Plant-Microbial Interactions (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMDB 230</td>
<td>Molecular Plant-Microbial Interactions (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPLT 272</td>
<td>The Origins and Promise of Science Fiction (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPLT 273</td>
<td>Genre and Method in Science Fiction Studies (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPLT 275</td>
<td>Science Fiction Authors (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPLT 276</td>
<td>Science Meets the Fiction (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWT 283</td>
<td>Multigenre Workshop (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWT 288</td>
<td>Thesis Workshop (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 210 (E-Z)</td>
<td>Topics in Environmental Economics (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN 230</td>
<td>Molecular Plant-Microbial Interactions (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT 285 E</td>
<td>Special Topics in Management (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 242</td>
<td>Advanced Topics in the Philosophy of Language (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSE 208</td>
<td>Seminar in Representation (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLST 229</td>
<td>Material Culture of Religion (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLST 246</td>
<td>Religious Reading Cultures (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 243 E</td>
<td>Special Topics in Sociology (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>SPN 278 Studies in Latin American Literature and Culture (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPN 279 Studies in Spanish Literature and Culture (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELETE</td>
<td>CHEM 260 Analysis of Single Cells and Subcellular Organelles (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEM 263 Synthesis of Novel Molecules (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEM 266 Chemical Microsensors for In Situ Measurements (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEM 268 Organometallics in Organic Synthesis (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEM 276 Enantioselective Homogeneous Catalysis (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STAT 232 Statistics for Management (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>BCH 240 Special Topics in Biochemistry (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 214 A Nervous and Musculoskeletal Systems (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 214 B Nervous and Musculoskeletal Systems (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 223 E Themes in Human Biology and Disease (3) Inflammation, Autoimmunity, and Pathogen Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 223 F Themes in Human Biology and Disease (4) Cardiovascular Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 223 G Themes in Human Biology and Disease (3) Renal Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 223 I Themes in Human Biology and Disease (3) Respiratory Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 223 J Themes in Human Biology and Disease (3) Gastrointestinal Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 231 Foundations of Medicine I (7.5) BMSC 211A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 232 Cardiovascular, Renal, and Respiratory Sciences I (12) BMSC 212A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 233 Gastrointestinal, Endocrine, and Reproductive Health I (10) BMSC 213A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 234 Musculoskeletal Medicine (4) BMSC 214A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 235 Clinical Neurosciences I (5) BMSC 214B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 236 Foundations of Medicine II (10) BMSC 215B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 237 Gastrointestinal, Endocrine, and Reproductive Health II (13) BMSC 213B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 239 Cardiovascular, Renal, and Respiratory Sciences II (12) BMSC 212B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMSC 240 Integrative Human Biology and Disease (3) BMSC 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEM 242 Combinatorial Chemistry and Chemical Genomics (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DNCE 260 (E-Z) Seminar in Dance History (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECON 282 (E-Z) Advanced Macroeconomic Theory (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECON 283 (E-Z) Advanced Microeconomic Theory (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGL 277 Seminar in Sexualities and Genders (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 201 Quantitative Analysis (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 202 Financial Management (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 205 Information Systems (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 207 Operations Management for Competitive Advantage (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 224 Managing for Quality Improvement (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 227 Financial Institutions and Markets (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 233 Marketing Research (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 239 Simulation for Business (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 252 B Speculative Markets (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 267 Applied Business Forecasting (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHIL 222 (E-Z) Topics in History of Philosophy (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLPA 230 Molecular Plant-Microbial Interactions (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLPA 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPN 220 Criticism and Critical Documentation (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXTENSION COURSES:

Course and Instructor approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDU X80</td>
<td>AN INTRODUCTION TO EARLY CHILDHOOD STUDIES - CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (4.5)</td>
<td>C. CHAVEZ, M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU X80</td>
<td>AN INTRODUCTION TO EARLY CHILDHOOD STUDIES - CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (4.5)</td>
<td>A. VERVIVE, M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU X81</td>
<td>THE ROLE OF HOME, SCHOOL, AND COMMUNITY IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (4.5)</td>
<td>C. CHAVEZ, M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU X82</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENTALLY APPROPRIATE CURRICULUM IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (4.5)</td>
<td>C. CHAVEZ, M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU X83</td>
<td>OBSERVING CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR (3)</td>
<td>C. CHAVEZ, M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU X84</td>
<td>STRATEGIES FOR REPORTING CHILD ABUSE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (1)</td>
<td>C. CHAVEZ, M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU X85</td>
<td>SUPERVISING ADULTS WITHIN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS (3)</td>
<td>C. CHAVEZ, M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU X86</td>
<td>PARENT (FAMILY) INVOLVEMENT IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (3)</td>
<td>C. CHAVEZ, M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU X87</td>
<td>HEALTH, NUTRITION, AND SAFETY IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (2)</td>
<td>C. CHAVEZ, M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU X88A</td>
<td>SEMINAR IN ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION CENTERS, PART A (4.5)</td>
<td>C. CHAVEZ, M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU X88A</td>
<td>SEMINAR IN ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION CENTERS, PART B (4.5)</td>
<td>C. CHAVEZ, M.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on Courses has approved requests to allow the following instructors to teach upper division courses indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>LIMITS OF AUTHORIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. PAL</td>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td>STAT 100B SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. VEGA</td>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td>STAT 100B SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. MIN</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 109 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. ZHENG</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 110 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. LEDGER-RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 116 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. DEUS</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 174 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. OSBORN</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 177A SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. SHAPIRO</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 139 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. EVANSON</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 172 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. BARRERA</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 255A SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. GERAGHTY</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 219 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. CRONIN</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 280L SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. GILLAN</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 280L SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. GUGGINO</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 280P SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. NAJERA</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 280P SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 280R SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. PANISH</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 280R SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. MACHADO</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 280S SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. DROUGAS</td>
<td>COMPUTER SCIENCE</td>
<td>CS 153 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. A. CORTES</td>
<td>COMPUTER SCIENCE</td>
<td>CS 152 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. KOUFOGIANNAKIS</td>
<td>COMPUTER SCIENCE</td>
<td>CS 141 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-S. LEE</td>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>CS 183 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. LEPAGE</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>SOC 150 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. SCHMITT</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>SOC 151 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. GUIJERREZ</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>SOC 142 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. DIAZ</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>SOC 133 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. ABRUTYN</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>SOC 168 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. JOHNSON</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>SOC 160 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. LAWRENCE</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>SOC 184 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. NIEMEYER</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>SOC 169 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. AFFOLTER</td>
<td>PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>PHIL 116 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. CHANG</td>
<td>PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>PHIL 116 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. HUANG</td>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td>STAT 100B W 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. BHATTACHARYYA</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>ECON 160 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. FARHAT</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>ECON 178 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. KOOGLUGIL</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>ECON 103A SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. QIAN</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>ECON 107 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. SENYUZ</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>ECON 130 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. MUTSALKLISANA</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>ECON 101 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. ISLER</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>ECON 102B SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. SON</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>ECON 153 SS 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. HARRIS</td>
<td>COMPUTER SCIENCE &amp;</td>
<td>CS 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. COBURN</td>
<td>CELL BIOLOGY &amp;</td>
<td>CBNS 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. DEY</td>
<td>NEUROSCIENCE</td>
<td>STAT 100B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. BI</td>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td>STAT 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. WEN</td>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td>STAT 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. BANERJEE</td>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td>STAT 100B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. MONTES DE OCA</td>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td>STAT 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. EVANSON</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>EDUC 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. KING</td>
<td>ANTHROPOLOGY</td>
<td>ANTH 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. DILORENZO</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>PSYC 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. SCHMITT</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>SOC 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. LEPAGE</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>SOC 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. LIO</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>SOC 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. MOORE</td>
<td>STUDIES</td>
<td>FVC 143E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. BROWN</td>
<td>POLITICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>POSC 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. TSUHA</td>
<td>ETHNIC STUDIES</td>
<td>ETST 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. HOOVER</td>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>SOC 183H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. LINDER</td>
<td>ANTHROPOLOGY</td>
<td>ANTH 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. WATSON</td>
<td>HISTORY</td>
<td>HISE 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. S. CHEUNG</td>
<td>COMPUTER SCIENCE &amp;</td>
<td>CS 161L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. CORREIA</td>
<td>LANGUAGES</td>
<td>FRE 109A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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To be received and placed on file:

According to statistics available to the Entry-Level Writing Program, a total of 1715 entering students (out of 3594 new freshmen) had not passed the Entry-Level Writing Requirement upon entering as full-time students in the Fall of 2006. The approximate percentage of New Freshmen held upon entrance for ELWR in the Fall of 2006 was 47.7% (1715/3594), a slight improvement over Fall 2005 (51%; 1520/2988).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2005 Entering Students Held for ELWR</th>
<th>Students placed into English 4 or 5 who did not pass by Spring 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the students held, fifty students who originally placed into English 4 or 5 had not satisfied the ELWR after three quarters. Twenty-six of those students enrolled in UCR summer school, and 13 passed (though three of these were dismissed by their colleges for reasons other than ELWR status). One student, who had put off taking the diagnostic exam for three quarters, finally took and passed the exam and thereby passed the requirement. Therefore, thirty-six students who started in English 4 or 5 did not succeed in satisfying the requirement prior to Fall 2007. Of these thirty-six, twenty-two students were lapsed solely on the basis of ELWR. Ten of the thirty-six were dismissed by their colleges for other reasons. Four students were allowed by their Dean to continue for a fourth quarter because their efforts to enroll in an ELWR course in their first quarter had been unsuccessful. (In the fall, we accommodate over 99% of demand. Last-minute limitations on classroom space and the availability of instructors occasionally prevent very late registrants from finding a place.)

Of the 130 students who started in Basic Writing 3 (and who were therefore at first off the clock), thirty-nine had not yet passed an ELWR course by the end of Spring Quarter. Two of those students enrolled in UCR summer classes. Eight passed the ELWR requirement in a summer course. This left thirty-one students still working to pass the requirement within the time-limit of three quarters after passing BW 3. We expect half or more of these students to pass the requirement this fall or winter.

Despite our persistent recruitment efforts and warnings, a few ELWR students did not enroll in one or more of our courses all year, even though they did not pass the diagnostic exam. Twenty-two students took the diagnostic late (in the Fall and Winter of 2006-2007 or in Summer 2007).

---

1 See the next paragraph. Of these fifty, thirty-six had not satisfied the requirement by the end of summer 2007.
2 This group consisted of 3 COE students, 15 CNAS students, and 21 CHASS students. We are counting only persisting non-passing students: those who continued as full-time students at UCR and who still needed to pass the requirement.
3 Thirty-nine students took Basic Writing 3 in winter quarter, and thirteen took Basic Writing 3 in spring quarter. Students who passed Basic Writing 3 in winter 2007 or in spring 2007 will have until the end of Winter Quarter 2007 or Spring Quarter 2007 respectively to satisfy the requirement.
of 2007) and therefore lost a quarter or more of eligibility. But the majority of these students eventually passed the requirement.

The overall success rate for UCR freshmen last year continued to be very high: 98% for students starting in English 4 and English 5. Over 76% of the students who started in Basic Writing 3 for ESL instruction have passed the ELWR requirement. We expect many more ESL students in that entering cohort to pass this fall or winter, before their three quarters of residence after BW 3 are used up.
The Committee on University Extension has approved the following courses and/or teacher approvals:

**To be received and placed on file:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>COURSE TITLE/UNITS</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR(S)</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>CERT. APPL.</th>
<th>COURSE SERVICE</th>
<th>DATE APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X80</td>
<td>AN INTRODUCTION TO EARLY CHILDHOOD STUDIES-CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (4.5)</td>
<td>D. KIRTLAND, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X81</td>
<td>THE ROLE OF HOME, SCHOOL, AND COMMUNITY IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (4.5)</td>
<td>D. KIRTLAND, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X81.9</td>
<td>TEACHING SOCIAL SKILLS IN PRESCHOOLERS (3)</td>
<td>M. WILD, PH.D.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X81.9</td>
<td>TEACHING SOCIAL SKILLS IN PRESCHOOLERS (3)</td>
<td>D. KIRTLAND, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X82</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENTALLY APPROPRIATE CURRICULUM IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (4.5)</td>
<td>D. KIRTLAND, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X82.31</td>
<td>ADVANCED CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (3)</td>
<td>M. WILD, PH.D.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X82.31</td>
<td>ADVANCED CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (3)</td>
<td>C. CHAVEZ, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X82.31</td>
<td>ADVANCED CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (3)</td>
<td>G. HERNANDEZ, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X82.31</td>
<td>ADVANCED CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (3)</td>
<td>G. HERNANDEZ, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X82.31</td>
<td>ADVANCED CHILD GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (3)</td>
<td>G. HERNANDEZ, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X82.66</td>
<td>OVERVIEWS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS: DIFFERENT APPROACHES IN DIFFERENT ENVIRONMENTS (5)</td>
<td>G. HERNANDEZ, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X83</td>
<td>OBSERVING CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR (3)</td>
<td>A. VERIVE, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X84</td>
<td>STRATEGIES FOR REPORTING CHILD ABUSE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (1)</td>
<td>A. RUBIO, M.S.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X85</td>
<td>SUPERVISING ADULTS WITHIN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS</td>
<td>S. GREENBURG, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X87</td>
<td>HEALTH, NUTRITION, AND SAFETY IN EARLY CHILDHOOD (2)</td>
<td>G. NYSTROM, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.A</td>
<td>SEMINAR IN ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF EARLY CHILDHOOD CENTERS, PART A (4.5)</td>
<td>G. HERNANDEZ, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.A</td>
<td>SEMINAR IN ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF EARLY CHILDHOOD CENTERS, PART A (4.5)</td>
<td>S. GREENBURG, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.B</td>
<td>SEMINAR IN ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF EARLY CHILDHOOD CENTERS, PART B (4.5)</td>
<td>G. HERNANDEZ, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.B</td>
<td>SEMINAR IN ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF EARLY CHILDHOOD CENTERS, PART B (4.5)</td>
<td>S. GREENBURG, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.62</td>
<td>UNDERSTANDING CHILDREN OF CRISIS, VIOLENCE, AND LOSS IN HOME AND THE EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS (3)</td>
<td>G. HERNANDEZ, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.63</td>
<td>EDUCATION AND CARE OF THE INFANT (5)</td>
<td>G. HERNANDEZ, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.63</td>
<td>EDUCATION AND CARE OF THE INFANT (5)</td>
<td>M. WILD, PH.D.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>COURSE TITLE/UNITS</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR(S)</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>CERT. COURSE</td>
<td>IN SERVICE</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.63</td>
<td>EDUCATION AND CARE OF THE INFANT (5)</td>
<td>C. CHAVEZ, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.63</td>
<td>EDUCATION AND CARE OF THE INFANT (5)</td>
<td>A. VERIVE, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.64</td>
<td>CREATIVE MUSIC AND MOVEMENT (3)</td>
<td>G. HERNANDEZ, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.65</td>
<td>SUPERVISED FIELD EXPERIENCE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD STUDIES (5)</td>
<td>D. KIRTLAND, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.65</td>
<td>SUPERVISED FIELD EXPERIENCE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD STUDIES (5)</td>
<td>M. WILD, PH.D.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.65</td>
<td>SUPERVISED FIELD EXPERIENCE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD STUDIES (5)</td>
<td>R. CARREON-BAILEY, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X88.65</td>
<td>SUPERVISED FIELD EXPERIENCE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD STUDIES (5)</td>
<td>G. HERNANDEZ, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X308.62</td>
<td>THE EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS (1)</td>
<td>A. RUBIO, M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X311.6</td>
<td>NATIVE AMERICAN CHILDREN'S LITERATURE (2)</td>
<td>S. KEWANHAPTEWA-DIXON, M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X311.9</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INDIAN MATERIAL CULTURE (2)</td>
<td>B. DRAKE, AA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X311.9</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INDIAN MATERIAL CULTURE (2)</td>
<td>L. SISQUOC</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X313.38</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL AND ETHICAL ISSUES IN THE COLLEGE APPLICATION PROCESS (3)</td>
<td>S. DENEKLAU, M.S.</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X314.36A</td>
<td>SCHOOLS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: MATCHING DESIGN TO THE CURRICULUM (1.5)</td>
<td>G. CHRISTOPHER, B.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X317.2</td>
<td>SAFETY &amp; RISK FACTORS IN DRIVER EDUCATION &amp; TRAINING (4)</td>
<td>H. C. CHEN, M.S.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X316.4</td>
<td>FAMILY DYNAMICS (3)</td>
<td>D. MALHOTRA, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X319.91</td>
<td>READING DISABILITIES AND THE ORTON-GILLINGHAM REMEDIATION, INITIAL LEVEL (4)</td>
<td>M. SANBORN, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X323.45</td>
<td>EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES FOR WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM, K-6 (1)</td>
<td>J. L. MORRIS, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X323.45</td>
<td>EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES FOR WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM, K-6 (1)</td>
<td>J. MENDEZ, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X325.32</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO ONLINE TEACHING (3)</td>
<td>B. REILLY, PH.D.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X326.34</td>
<td>METHODS AND TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING ESL: STUDENT TEACHING (4)</td>
<td>M. KUTTER, M.ED.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X326.34</td>
<td>METHODS AND TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING ESL: STUDENT TEACHING (4)</td>
<td>E. MICKELSON, B.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X328</td>
<td>TEACHING THE GIFTED AND TALENTED: APPROACHES TO CURRICULUM AND DESIGN (3)</td>
<td>J. A. BEHRENS, M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X328.10A-D</td>
<td>EXPLORING NEW PATHWAYS: INSPIRING IMAGINATION AND INNOVATION (2)</td>
<td>D. REUPERT, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8/17/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X329.01</td>
<td>DIFFERENTIATING INSTRUCTION USING ICONS TO INCREASE HIGHER-LEVEL THINKING SKILLS (1)</td>
<td>M. ROSATI, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X330.34</td>
<td>TECHNIQUES OF EDUCATIONAL THERAPY, PART II (3)</td>
<td>M. SANBORN, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6/1/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X330.57</td>
<td>WRITING AND ASSESSING IN THE LANGUAGE ARTS CLASSROOM (3)</td>
<td>L. PARKER, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X372.1</td>
<td>OVERVIEW OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL BUSINESS SERVICES (1)</td>
<td>M. H. FINE, B.A.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X372.4</td>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT FOR THE CHIEF BUSINESS OFFICIAL (4)</td>
<td>W. H. FREEMAN, J.D.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X372.5</td>
<td>COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION (1)</td>
<td>M. H. FINE, B.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X372.5</td>
<td>COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION (1)</td>
<td>W. H. FREEMAN, J.D.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X386.L</td>
<td>FUNDAMENTALS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION TRAINING: WAYS TO FOSTER EARLY READING/LITERACY SKILLS (2)</td>
<td>N. MUNDO-ROMO, B.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.2</td>
<td>TECHNOLOGY FOR PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES (1)</td>
<td>G. F. WHITAKER, M. ED.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>COURSE TITLE/UNITS</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR(S)</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>CERT.</td>
<td>IN SERVICE</td>
<td>DATE APPRVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.3</td>
<td>HUMAN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT, THEORIES OF LEARNING, PART A</td>
<td>C. SUTTON, M.S.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/1/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.4</td>
<td>HUMAN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT, INTERVENTION STRATEGIES, PART B (3)</td>
<td>C. SUTTON, M.S.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/1/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.6</td>
<td>METHODS OF ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION (3)</td>
<td>K. M. R. SCHANZ, ED.D.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.7</td>
<td>LEGAL MANDATES AND PROFESSIONAL ETHICS IN PERSONNEL SERVICES (2)</td>
<td>T. MEDINA, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/1/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.8</td>
<td>DEVELOPING STUDENT SUPPORT AND INTERVENTION THROUGH FAMILY, SCHOOL, AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION (4)</td>
<td>M. LEWIS-HAMILTON, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.13</td>
<td>GUIDANCE INSTRUCTION AND ADVOCACY (2)</td>
<td>G. BEAR, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.14</td>
<td>ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT (3)</td>
<td>T. MEDINA, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/1/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.15</td>
<td>CAREER DEVELOPMENT (3)</td>
<td>M. K. R. SCHANZ, ED.D.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.16</td>
<td>PERSONAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (3)</td>
<td>T. MEDINA, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/1/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.19</td>
<td>AND GUIDANCE PROGRAMS (3)</td>
<td>G. BEAR, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/1/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.21</td>
<td>COUNSELING (1)</td>
<td>T. MEDINA, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/1/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.23</td>
<td>SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY (3)</td>
<td>G. BEAR, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.28</td>
<td>CHILD WELFARE AND ATTENDANCE PROGRAM LEADERSHIP, MANAGEMENT COLLABORATION AND PARTNERSHIPS (3)</td>
<td>C. BERRY, M.S.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X388.29</td>
<td>SCHOOL CULTURE AND BARRIERS FOR UNDERACHIEVING LEARNERS (3)</td>
<td>C. BERRY, M.S.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>X400</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO MUSEUM STUDIES (2)</td>
<td>J. S. BAUGH</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X401</td>
<td>FACILITIES MANAGEMENT (3)</td>
<td>A. CAMPBELL, M.A.</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X401</td>
<td>IYENGAR YOGA, PART I (2)</td>
<td>D. H. PARISH, M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X401</td>
<td>IYENGAR YOGA, PART I (2)</td>
<td>A. DELURY, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X401.01A</td>
<td>CASE STUDIES IN FACILITIES MANAGEMENT (3)</td>
<td>K. STEIN</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X401.5</td>
<td>IYENGAR YOGA, PART II (2)</td>
<td>D. MORGAN, M.B.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/3/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X401.5</td>
<td>IYENGAR YOGA, PART II (2)</td>
<td>A. DELURY, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X401.7</td>
<td>IYENGAR YOGA, PART III</td>
<td>A. DELURY, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X402.1</td>
<td>YOGA FOR BACK PAIN (.5)</td>
<td>A. DELURY, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X402.2</td>
<td>YOGA FOR SENIORS (.5)</td>
<td>A. DELURY, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X402.3</td>
<td>YOGA FOR STRESS (.5)</td>
<td>A. DELURY, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X404.A</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO THEORY AND PRACTICE OF PRANAYAMA, PART A (1)</td>
<td>A. DELURY, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X404.B</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO THEORY AND PRACTICE OF PRANAYAMA, PART B (1)</td>
<td>A. DELURY, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X404.C</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO THEORY AND PRACTICE OF PRANAYAMA, PART C (1)</td>
<td>A. DELURY, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X404.D</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO THEORY AND PRACTICE OF PRANAYAMA, PART D (1)</td>
<td>A. DELURY, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPN</td>
<td>X404.9</td>
<td>MEDICAL TERMINOLOGY AND CONVERSATION - SPANISH (3)</td>
<td>J. DE LA CRUZ, B.A.</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X405</td>
<td>PRANAYAMA: THEORY AND PRACTICE (1)</td>
<td>A. DELURY, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPN</td>
<td>X406</td>
<td>HEALTH CARE INTERPRETATION I (3)</td>
<td>J. DE LA CRUZ, B.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X407</td>
<td>LEAN MANUFACTURING (5)</td>
<td>D. C. ASHLEY, PH.D.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>X409</td>
<td>COLLEGE ALGEBRA (4)</td>
<td>E. WOOLSEY, M.S.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9/10/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHY</td>
<td>X412.A</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO THE CONCEPT OF PHYSICS (4)</td>
<td>O. LONG, PH.D.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGR</td>
<td>X415</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODES (3)</td>
<td>B. H. LEE, B.S.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8/27/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT NUMBER</td>
<td>COURSE TITLE/UNITS</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR(S)</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>CERT.</td>
<td>IN SERVICE</td>
<td>DATE APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URB X415</td>
<td>ENDANGERED SPECIES AND HABITAT CONSERVATION PLANNING (3)</td>
<td>J. ACKERMANN, J.D.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/22/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC X415.3</td>
<td>RESEARCH METHODS AND STATISTICS IN CRIME ANALYSIS (4)</td>
<td>T. MAHKANI, B.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC X415.9</td>
<td>FIELD METHODS OF FORENSIC ANTHROPOLOGY: SEARCH, RECOVERY AND ANALYSIS OF HUMAN REMAINS (2)</td>
<td>J. M. SUCHEY, PH.D.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT X417.6</td>
<td>GRANT WRITING FOR ARTISTS AND ARTS MANAGERS (1)</td>
<td>C. MARSHALL, B.A.</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC X418.82</td>
<td>SQL SERVER 2005 DESIGNING AND OPTIMIZING DATA ACCESS (3)</td>
<td>X. WANG, M.S.</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV X420</td>
<td>PRINCIPLES OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT (3)</td>
<td>S. PENCE, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS X420</td>
<td>PUBLIC ART AND URBAN DESIGN (1)</td>
<td>C. MARSHALL, B.A.</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URB X420.1</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO LAND USE PLANNING PRACTICES (4)</td>
<td>K. GUTIERREZ, B.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS X421.5</td>
<td>TURFGRASS PESTS (3)</td>
<td>M. MONDO-OCAMPO, PH.D.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWT X421.5</td>
<td>FLASH FICTION FOR PUBLICATION (2)</td>
<td>N. BELARDES</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART X423.37</td>
<td>FINDING YOUR CREATIVE STROKE (2.5)</td>
<td>G. R. ADAMSON</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT X424.3</td>
<td>DOCUMENTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES (3)</td>
<td>J. V. HEDTKE</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC X424.8</td>
<td>MS ACCESS: DESIGNING DATABASE SOLUTIONS (3)</td>
<td>P. T. MEINKE, B.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/22/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU X427.9</td>
<td>SAFETY HAZARDS IN THE OCCUPATIONAL ENVIRONMENT: RECOGNITION AND PREVENTION (3)</td>
<td>T. MARQUEZ-LOPEZ, ED.D.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6/1/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV X428.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. E. FOURNIER, M.B.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT X428.16</td>
<td>COST ACCOUNTING (4)</td>
<td>D. M. URSENBACH, B.S., C.P.A.</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW X431</td>
<td>LEGAL RESEARCH AND WRITING I (4)</td>
<td>C. J. LEMMON, J.D.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH X434.04</td>
<td>NATIVE AMERICAN ROCK ART IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA (2)</td>
<td>S. M. FREERS, M.S.</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT X435</td>
<td>SURVEY OF PERSONAL FINANCIAL PLANNING (3)</td>
<td>R. E. RIDGEWAY, M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT X435.2</td>
<td>ESTATE PLANNING (4)</td>
<td>A. D. KASSOY, J.D.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC X435.7</td>
<td>UNIX/LINUX SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION (3)</td>
<td>R. L. HOFFMASTER, B.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC X438.2</td>
<td>ASP.NET 2.0 WEB-BASED CLIENT DEVELOPMENT (4)</td>
<td>R. L. CASOLARO, M.H.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URB X440</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT: THE SUBDIVISION MAP ACT AND LOCAL ZONING LAWS (4)</td>
<td>C. SCHILLER, J.D.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC X442.10</td>
<td>MICROSOFT WINDOWS VISTA ADMINISTRATION (4)</td>
<td>K. SHEPHERD</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC X443.8</td>
<td>DESIGNING SECURITY FOR MS NETWORKS (3)</td>
<td>K. SHEPHERD</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERT X450</td>
<td>PRACTICAL APPROACHES FOR IMPLEMENTING GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS (3)</td>
<td>W. ROBERTS, M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9/18/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT X452.1</td>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (3)</td>
<td>L. A. FENSTERMAKER, M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/15/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT X452.3</td>
<td>LABOR AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS (3E)</td>
<td>R. T. DIAZ, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5/3/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS X460</td>
<td>NATIVE PLANTS OF CALIFORNIA: MEDICINAL USES (1)</td>
<td>L. SISQUOC</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS X460</td>
<td>NATIVE PLANTS OF CALIFORNIA: MEDICINAL USES (1)</td>
<td>B. DRAKE, A.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART X461.21</td>
<td>DESIGNING WITH LIGHT (3)</td>
<td>P. SULLIVAN, M.B.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART X461.32</td>
<td>COLOR RENDERING AND PORTFOLIO PRESENTATION (3)</td>
<td>J. M. BERNSTEIN</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART X461.35</td>
<td>CAD FOR INTERIOR DESIGN (4)</td>
<td>M. A. RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/1/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART X461.52</td>
<td>TEXTILE DESIGN: HISTORY, DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF FIBERS AND FABRICS (3)</td>
<td>B. BALL, A.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>COURSE TITLE/UNITS</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR(S)</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>CERT.</td>
<td>IN SERVICE</td>
<td>DATE APPRVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>X461.52</td>
<td>FABRICS (3)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/27/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>X463.5</td>
<td>GREEN: THE COLOR OF OUR FUTURE (1)</td>
<td>M. MARTIN-O'SHEA, A.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X465</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO FORENSIC SCIENCE IN HEALTH CARE SETTINGS (3)</td>
<td>C. HOYT, M.S.N.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X465.5</td>
<td>FORENSIC APPROACHES TO MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT (1)</td>
<td>P. DROWN, M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X468.5</td>
<td>MANAGERIAL ACCOUNTING (4)</td>
<td>C.P.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X469</td>
<td>SUPERVISION, LEADERSHIP AND TEAMBUILDING (50)</td>
<td>J. F. MIGNONE, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/3/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X470.33</td>
<td>PROJECT LEADERSHIP, COMMUNICATION AND TEAM BUILDING (3)</td>
<td>W. A. FREIRE, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X470.41</td>
<td>PROJECT MANAGEMENT ESSENTIALS (3)</td>
<td>R. D. STONE, B.S.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X470.45</td>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP (2)</td>
<td>J. F. MIGNONE, B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X471.3</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION BUDGET, ACCOUNTING AND CONTROL MANAGEMENT (3)</td>
<td>M. N. SCURO, M.ED.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X471.6</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION PROJECT PLANNING, SCHEDULING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (3)</td>
<td>G. J. BOWERS, M.P.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X471.7</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (4)</td>
<td>R. D. STONE, B.S.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X471.10</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES (4)</td>
<td>M. C. JOSHI, M.B.A.</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X475.5</td>
<td>CONSUMER BEHAVIOR (3)</td>
<td>J. ZIMMERMAN, M.B.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X476.6</td>
<td>MARKETING, ADVERTISING AND SALES PROMOTION (3)</td>
<td>L. Y. VIAN, E.M.B.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X477.3</td>
<td>PRINCIPLES OF ACCOUNTING (4)</td>
<td>D. L. O'CONNELL, M.B.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X477.6B</td>
<td>BUSINESS PLAN DEVELOPMENT (3)</td>
<td>L. Y. VIAN, E.M.B.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>X480</td>
<td>PRINCIPLES OF GEOLOGY FOR EDUCATORS (4)</td>
<td>M. MCKIBBEN, PH.D.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X480.5</td>
<td>CUSTOMER SERVICE MANAGEMENT (2)</td>
<td>C. K. ORTMAN, M.B.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X483</td>
<td>PAYROLL ADMINISTRATION FUNDAMENTALS (3)</td>
<td>K. L. DE RENARD</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/27/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>X484.34</td>
<td>DOCUMENTARY PHOTOGRAPHY (2)</td>
<td>J. M. MENA GARZA, B.A.</td>
<td>C/I*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>X486.2</td>
<td>DIGITAL PHOTOGRAPHY: THE BASICS (2)</td>
<td>M. BAMBERG, M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>X486.6</td>
<td>DIGITAL WEDDING PHOTOGRAPHY (2)</td>
<td>M. K. ALLEN, B.A.</td>
<td>C/I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X490</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO HUMAN ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY FOR MEDICAL VOCATIONS (4)</td>
<td>A. M. ALLEN, BSN</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/18/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>X499</td>
<td>PARALEGAL INTERNSHIP (3)</td>
<td>D. F. CASH, J.D.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>X842</td>
<td>CBEST (CALIFORNIA BASIC EDUCATION SKILLS TEST) TEST PREP (0)</td>
<td>C. L. BROWN, M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/12/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes first time approval for Instructor
**Denotes Instructor has previously been approved but has not yet taught; therefore, there are no evaluations
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To be received and placed on file:

Reports of degrees awarded*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE/DIVISION</th>
<th>MASTER OF FINE ARTS</th>
<th>MASTER OF ARTS</th>
<th>MASTER OF SCIENCE</th>
<th>MASTER OF BUS. ADMIN</th>
<th>MASTER OF EDU.</th>
<th>DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Natural &amp; Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>BACHELOR OF ARTS</td>
<td>BACHELOR OF SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Humanities, Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.S. Jacobs, Secretary-Parliamentarian

Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

*The names of the candidates are filed in the official records of the Office of the Registrar
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
BOURNS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
NOVEMBER 20, 2007

PROPOSED CHANGE TO BIOENGINEERING MAJOR REQUIREMENTS

To be adopted:

PRESENT:
Major Requirements
1. Lower-division requirements (75 units)
   a) BIOL 005A, BIOL 05LA, BIOL 005B, BIOL 005C
   b) CHEM 001A, CHEM 001B, CHEM 001C, CHEM 01LA, CHEM 01LB, CHEM 01LC
   c) CEE 011
   d) MATH 008B or MATH 009A, MATH 009B, MATH 009C, MATH 010A, MATH 010B, MATH 046
   e) ME 001C, ME 010, ME 018
   f) PHYS 040A, PHYS 040B, PHYS 040C

2. Upper-division requirements (86 units)
   a) BCH 100, BCH 102
   b) BIEN 110, BIEN 120, BIEN 125, BIEN 130, BIEN 130L, BIEN 135, BIEN 140A/CEE 140A, BIEN 140B/CEE 140B, BIEN 155, BIEN 175A, BIEN 175B
   c) CHEM 112A, CHEM 112B, CHEM 112C
   d) ME 118, ME 138
   e) STAT 105
   f) Technical electives (16 units): upper-division courses in engineering, biology and/or substantive courses in a field(s) related to bioengineering

PROPOSED:
Major Requirements
1. Lower-division requirements (75 units)
   a) BIOL 005A, BIOL 05LA, BIOL 005B, BIOL 005C
   b) CHEM 001A, CHEM 001B, CHEM 001C, CHEM 01LA, CHEM 01LB, CHEM 01LC
   c) CEE 011
   d) MATH 008B or MATH 009A, MATH 009B, MATH 009C, MATH 010A, MATH 010B, MATH 046
   e) ME 001C, ME 010, ME 018
   f) PHYS 040A, PHYS 040B, PHYS 040C

2. Upper-division requirements (88 units)
   a) BCH 100, BCH 102
   b) BIEN 110, BIEN 120, BIEN 125, BIEN 130, BIEN 130L, BIEN 135, BIEN 140A/CEE 140A, BIEN 140B/CEE 140B, BIEN 155, BIEN 175A, BIEN 175B
   c) CHEM 112A, CHEM 112B, CHEM 112C
   d) ME 118, ME 138
   e) STAT 155
   f) Technical electives (16 units): upper-division courses in engineering, biology, and/or substantive courses in a field(s) related to bioengineering

Visit the Student Affairs Office in the College of Engineering or www.engr.ucr.edu/studentaffairs for a sample program.
**Justification:**
STAT 105 is being deleted. The Bioengineering department would like to use STAT 155 (Probability and Statistics for Science and Engineering) instead of STAT 105. STAT 155 is a course that has been deemed acceptable by several of our degree programs.

Approved by the Faculty of the Bioengineering Department: July 31, 2007
Approved by the College of Engineering Executive Committee: August 3, 2007
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: August 3, 2007
Approved by Advisory on behalf of the Division: August 3, 2007
PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE CHEMICAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

To be adopted:

PRESENT:
The objective of the chemical engineering program is to produce graduates who:

- Demonstrate the ability to apply mathematics, engineering principles, computer skills, and natural sciences the chemical engineering practice.
- Are prepared for entry into careers in chemical engineering in the diverse areas including petrochemical and petroleum refining, bioengineering, semiconductor manufacturing, and food processing.
- Are prepared to pursue graduate education and research in chemical engineering at major research universities.
- Are capable of synthesizing principles and techniques from engineering, mathematics, engineering planning and project management and the natural and social sciences to develop and evaluate alternative design solutions to engineering problems with specific constraints.
- Exercise professional responsibility and sensitivity to a broad range of societal concerns, such as ethical, environmental, economic, regulatory, and global issues.
- Work effectively in a team environment, communicate well, and are aware of the necessity for personal and professional growth.

PROPOSED:
The program educational objectives are to produce graduates who demonstrate in their careers and professional pursuits the following:

- An ability to apply mathematics, engineering principles, computer skills, and natural sciences to chemical engineering practice.
- Application of fundamental chemical engineering principles at an advanced level, and competence in synthesizing knowledge from multiple disciplines to develop and evaluate design solutions.
- Engagement in chemical engineering careers in diverse areas including bioengineering, nanotechnology, petrochemicals, alternative energy, and semiconductor manufacturing.
- Pursuit of graduate education and research in chemical engineering at major research universities.
- Exercise professional responsibility and sensitivity to a broad range of societal concerns, such as ethical, environmental, economic, regulatory, and global issues.
- Effective performance in a team environment, outstanding communication, and involvement in personal and professional growth activities.
**Justification:**
Changes made per suggestion of ABET. The ABET reviewer requested very subtle changes in the language. Also, areas of future employment were updated to stay current with today's trends.

Approved by:

- Faculty of the Chemical and Environmental Engineering Department: 1/26/07
- BCOE Executive Committee: 4/30/07
- Committee on Educational Policy approved on content, not grammar or syntax: 6/1/07
- Endorsed by Advisory: 6/11/07
PROPOSED CHANGE TO COMPUTER ENGINEERING MAJOR REQUIREMENTS

To be adopted:

PRESENT:
Computer Engineering
Major Requirements
1. Lower-division requirements (67 units)
   a) CS 010, CS 012, CS 014, CS 061
   b) CS 011/MATH 011
   c) EE 001A, EE 001A, EE 001B
   d) MATH 008B or MATH 009A,
      MATH 009B, MATH 009C,
      MATH 010A, MATH 046
   e) PHYS 040A, PHYS 040B,
   f) One course of 4 or more units in
      Chemistry to be selected in consultation
      with a faculty advisor.

2. Upper-division requirements (80 units minimum)
   a) CS 141, CS 161, CS 161L; one
      course from CS 153 or CS 160
   b) CS 120A/EE 120A, CS 120B/EE 120B;
      one course from CS 122A or EE 128
   c) CS 111/MATH 111
   d) EE 100A, EE 100B, EE 110A,
      EE 110B
   e) ENGR 180
   f) MATH 113
   g) STAT 155
   h) Five courses (at least 20 units) as
      technical electives from the following
      set of Computer Science and
      Engineering, Electrical Engineering
      upper-division courses
      CS 100, CS 122A, CS 122B, CS 130,
      CS 133, CS 150, CS 152, CS 153,
      CS 160, CS 162, CS 164, CS 165,
      CS 166, CS 168, CS 170, CS 177,
      CS 179 (E-Z), CS 180, CS 181,

PROPOSED:
Computer Engineering
Major Requirements
1. Lower-division requirements (68 units)
   a) ENGR 001G
   b) CS 010, CS 012, CS 014, CS 061
   c) CS 011/MATH 011
   d) EE 001A, EE 001A, EE 001B
   e) MATH 008B or MATH 009A,
      MATH 009B, MATH 009C,
      MATH 010A, MATH 046
   f) PHYS 040A, PHYS 040B,
   g) One course of 4 or more units in
      Chemistry to be selected in consultation
      with a faculty advisor.

2. Upper-division requirements (80 units minimum)
   a) CS 141, CS 161, CS 161L; one
      course from CS 153 or CS 160
   b) CS 120A/EE 120A, CS 120B/EE 120B;
      one course from CS 122A or EE 128
   c) CS 111/MATH 111
   d) EE 100A, EE 100B, EE 110A,
      EE 110B
   e) ENGR 180
   f) MATH 113
   g) STAT 155
   h) Five courses (at least 20 units) as
      technical electives from the following
      set of Computer Science and
      Engineering, Electrical Engineering
      upper-division courses
      CS 100, CS 122A, CS 122B, CS 130,
      CS 133, CS 150, CS 152, CS 153,
      CS 160, CS 162, CS 164, CS 165,
      CS 166, CS 168, CS 170, CS 177,
CS 183, CS 193  
EE 105, EE 115, EE 128, EE 132, 
EE 140, EE 141, EE 144, EE 146, 
EE 150, EE 151, EE 152, EE 175A, 
EE 175B 
The technical electives selected from h) must include either CS 179 (E-Z) or both EE 175A and EE 175B. The selection of the remaining technical electives must be planned, in consultation with a faculty advisor, to include at least one coherent sequence of two classes from either Computer Science and Engineering or Electrical Engineering. The technical electives must be distinct from those used to satisfy the upper-division requirements specified in items a) and b) above.

Students may petition for exceptions to the above degree requirements. Exceptions to Computer Science course requirements must be approved by the Computer Science and Engineering undergraduate advisor or the Chair, and exceptions to Electrical Engineering course requirements must be approved by the Electrical Engineering undergraduate advisor or chair. Exceptions to other requirements require the approval of the undergraduate advisors or chairs of both departments.

Visit the Student Affairs Office in the College of Engineering or www.engr.ucr.edu/studentaffairs for a sample program.

---

**Justification:**

**EE Department**

Motivation.
This course serves several purposes:  
-- Introduction to Engineering  
-- Introduction to Computer Engineering
-- Development of cliques of engineering students
-- ABET issues (life long learning and ethics)
-- Mentoring
-- Intro to clubs and student life at UCR
-- Study habits
-- Retention improvement

History.
To achieve the same issues listed above, all engineering majors at UCR now include some freshmen year course similar to the above. For example, EE students take EE10. CS students take Engr001 Section I. CmpE students have no such requirement. In alternate years, CmpE students have been asked to take either EE 10 or Engr001 Section I. They cannot be forced to do either, as it is not a requirement. This approach has not worked well for two reasons. First, since it is not required, not many participate. Second, since the suggested course (EE10 or Engr001 Section I) changes every year, student advising is haphazard. Third, CmpE students have no separate identity.

CSE Department
ENGR 001 (E-Z) is for incoming freshmen, to orient them and get them connected to the department. The CS dept has offered (and strongly encouraged incoming students to take) informal versions of ENGR 001 (E-Z) over the last three years, run as informal mentoring sessions. We want to make ENGR 001 (E-Z) a required because of our experience offering informal versions of ENGR 001 (E-Z). In these informal versions, students have been encouraged to take the course essentially by trickery. No grades are given, so inducing students to participate, and recognizing their participation positively, is difficult. For example, we have used registration pin delays, but this is essentially punitive and sends the wrong message to the students. We expect that requiring the courses officially and offering actual grades based on participation will improve the course.

Note that the ENGR 001 (E-Z) and ENGR 101 (E-Z) series have been introduced by the college for just the kinds of goals that motivated our informal variants of the course in the past. Thus, bringing the CS dept offerings in line with the college structure seems appropriate.

Each proposed course will require the instructors to adapt the course to varying enrollments and available activities. Typical current numbers are 75 incoming CompEng majors.

Approved by the Faculty of the Computer Engineering Program: May 21, 2007
Approved by the College of Engineering Executive Committee: May 29, 2007
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: June 8, 2007
Endorsed by Advisory: June 11, 2007
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
BOURNS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
NOVEMBER 20, 2007

PROPOSED CHANGE TO COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING MAJOR REQUIREMENTS

To be adopted:

PRESENT:

MAJOR REQUIREMENTS
Computer Science Major
1. Lower-division requirements (59 units)
   a) CS 010, CS 012, CS 014, CS 061
   b) CS 011/MATH 011
   c) MATH 008B or MATH 009A,
      MATH 009B, MATH 009C,
      MATH 010A
   d) PHYS 040A, PHYS 040B,
      PHYS 040C
   e) One course of 4 or more units in
      an engineering discipline outside the
      field of computer science to be selected
      in consultation with a faculty advisor.
      (Either a lower-division or an upper-
      division course may be used to satisfy
      this requirement.)
   f) ENGL 01SC

2. Upper-division requirements (84 units minimum)
   a) CS 141, CS 150, CS 152, CS 153,
      CS 161, CS 161L, CS 179 (E-Z)
   b) CS 120A/EE 120A, CS 120B/EE 120B
   c) CS 111/MATH 111
   d) ENGR 180
   e) MATH 113
   f) STAT 155
   g) Two courses from MATH 046,
      MATH 120B, MATH 126, PHIL 124
   h) At least 24 units of technical electives
      to be chosen from an approved list of
      courses which currently includes CS 100,
      CS 122A, CS 122B, CS 130, CS 133,
      CS 134, CS 145, CS 151, CS 160,
      CS 162, CS 164, CS 165, CS 166,
      CS 168, CS 170, CS 177, CS 170 (E-Z)

PROPOSED:

MAJOR REQUIREMENTS
Computer Science Major
1. Lower-division requirements (60 units)
   a) ENGR 001I
   b) CS 010, CS 012, CS 014, CS 061
   c) CS 011/MATH 011
   d) MATH 008B or MATH 009A,
      MATH 009B, MATH 009C
      MATH 010A
   e) PHYS 040A, PHYS 040B, PHYS 040C
   f) One course of 4 or more units in
      an engineering discipline outside the
      field of computer science to be selected
      in consultation with a faculty advisor.
      (Either a lower-division or an upper-
      division course may be used to satisfy
      this requirement.)
   g) ENGL 01SC

2. Upper-division requirements (85 units minimum)
   a) ENGR 101I
   b) CS 141, CS 150, CS 152, CS 153,
      CS 161, CS 161L, CS 179 (E-Z)
   c) CS 120A/EE 120A, CS 120B/EE 120B
   d) CS 111/MATH 111
   e) ENGR 180
   f) MATH 113
   g) STAT 155
   h) Two courses from MATH 046,
      MATH 120B, MATH 126, PHIL 124
   i) At least 24 units of technical electives
      to be chosen from an approved list of
      courses which currently includes CS 100,
      CS 122A, CS 122B, CS 130, CS 133,
      CS 134, CS 145, CS 151, CS 160,
      CS 162, CS 164, CS 165, CS 166,
Information Systems Major

1. Lower-division requirements (52 units)
   a) BSAD 020A, BSAD 020B
   b) CS 010, CS 012, CS 014, CS 061
   c) CS 011/MATH 011
   d) ECON 002, ECON 003
   e) MATH 008B or MATH 009A, MATH 009B, MATH 09C, MATH 010A

2. Upper-division requirements (92 units)
   a) BUS 101, BUS 103, BUS 104/STAT 104
   b) CS 100, CS 141, CS 153, CS 164, CS 165, CS 166, CS 180
   c) CS 111/MATH 111
   d) ENGR 180
   e) MATH 113
   f) SOC 150
   g) STAT 155
   h) Twelve (12) units of upper-division Computer Science technical electives, which must be distinct from the above major requirements. These 12 units may be chosen from those courses listed as upper-division requirements or technical electives for the Computer Science major. At least two courses must be in the Department of Computer Science and Engineering.
   i) Sixteen (16) units of Business Administration technical electives, including at least 8 units of management information system courses. These 16 units must be distinct from the above major requirements and may be chosen from any of the available Business Administration courses.

Students may petition for exceptions to the above degree requirements. Exceptions to
Justification:

The change is to make ENGR 001 (E-Z) and ENGR 101 (E-Z) official major requirements:

These are each 1-credit courses to be offered in the fall. ENGR 001 (E-Z) is for incoming freshmen, to orient them and get them connected to the department. The CS dept has offered (and strongly encouraged incoming students to take) informal versions of ENGR 001 (E-Z) over the last three years, run as informal mentoring sessions.

ENGR 101 (E-Z) is for juniors, to get them thinking about the post-graduation career process. This has not been offered yet formally or informally by the CS dept per se, although the office of student affairs and other campus organizations do some of this. Our ENGR 101 (E-Z) is likely to start off as an introduction and tie-in to those resources.

These courses are designed to be flexible so we can improve them and respond to changing departmental conditions. (E.g. changing faculty and undergrad enrollments.)

We want to make these courses are required because of our experience offering informal versions of ENGR 001 (E-Z). In these informal versions, students have been encouraged to take the course essentially by trickery. No grades are given, so inducing students to participate, and recognizing their participation positively, is difficult. For example, we have used registration pin delays, but this is essentially punitive and sends the wrong message to the students. We expect that requiring the courses officially and offering actual grades based on participation will improve the course.

Note that the ENGR 001 (E-Z) and ENGR 101 (E-Z) series have been introduced by the college for just the kinds of goals that motivated our informal variants of the course in the past. Thus, bringing the CS dept offerings in line with the college structure seems appropriate.

Each proposed course will require the instructors to adapt the course to varying enrollments and available activities. Typical current numbers are: 100 incoming CS and IS majors.
Approved by the Faculty of the Computer Science and Engineering Department: March 20, 2007
Approved by the College of Engineering Executive Committee: May 29, 2007
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: June 8, 2007
Endorsed by Advisory: June 11, 2007
To be adopted:

PRESENT:
College Requirements
See The Marlan and Rosemary Bourns College
of Engineering, Colleges and Programs section.

The Electrical Engineering major uses the
following major requirements to satisfy the
college’s Natural Sciences and Mathematics
breadth requirement.
1. One course in the biological sciences chosen
   from an approved list
2. CHEM 001A, CHEM 01LA
3. MATH 008B or MATH 009A
4. PHYS 040A, PHYS 040B

Major Requirements
1. Lower-division requirements (70 units)
   a) One course in the biological sciences
      chosen from an approved list
   b) CHEM 001A, CHEM 01LA
   c) CS 010, CS 061
   d) EE 001A, EE 01LA, EE 001B, EE 010
   e) MATH 008B or MATH 009A, MATH
      009B, MATH 009C, MATH 010A,
      MATH 010B, MATH 046
   f) ME 010
   g) PHYS 040A, PHYS 040B, PHYS 040C

2. Upper-division requirements (81 units)
   a) EE 100A, EE 100B, EE 105, EE 110A,
      EE 110B, EE 115, EE 116, EE 132, EE
      141, EE 175A, EE 175B
   b) CS 120A/EE 120A, CS 120B/EE 120B
   c) ENGR 180
   d) STAT 155 or STAT 164
   e) Twenty (20) units of technical electives
      (chosen with the approval of a faculty advisor)
      from CS 122A, CS 130, CS 143/EE 143, CS
      161, CS 168; EE 117, EE 128, EE 133, EE 134,
      EE 135, EE 136, EE 137, EE 140, EE 144, EE
      146, EE 150, EE 151, EE 152, EE 160.

PROPOSED:
College Requirements
See The Marlan and Rosemary Bourns College
of Engineering, Colleges and Programs section.

The Electrical Engineering major uses the
following major requirements to satisfy the
college’s Natural Sciences and Mathematics
breadth requirement.
1. One course in the biological sciences chosen
   from an approved list
2. CHEM 001A, CHEM 01LA
3. MATH 008B or MATH 009A
4. PHYS 040A, PHYS 040B

Major Requirements
1. Lower-division requirements (70 units)
   a) One course in the biological sciences
      chosen from an approved list
   b) CHEM 001A, CHEM 01LA
   c) CS 010, CS 061
   d) EE 001A, EE 01LA, EE 001B, EE 010
   e) MATH 008B or MATH 009A, MATH
      009B, MATH 009C, MATH 010A,
      MATH 010B, MATH 046
   f) ME 010
   g) PHYS 040A, PHYS 040B, PHYS 040C

2. Upper-division requirements (81 units)
   a) EE 100A, EE 100B, EE 105, EE 110A,
      EE 110B, EE 114, EE 115, EE 116, EE
      132, EE 141, EE 175A, EE 175B
   b) CS 120A/EE 120A, CS 120B/EE 120B
   c) ENGR 180
   d) Twenty (20) units of technical electives
      (chosen with the approval of a faculty advisor)
      from CS 122A, CS 130, CS 143/EE 143, CS
      161, CS 168; EE 117, EE 128, EE 133, EE 134,
      EE 135, EE 136, EE 137, EE 140, EE 144, EE
      146, EE 150, EE 151, EE 152, EE 160.
The choice of technical electives must ensure that the upper division requirements include at least one coherent sequence of at least three (3) electrical engineering courses to ensure depth in one area of electrical engineering. Example course sequences are available through the Student Affairs Office in the College of Engineering or http://www.engr.ucr.edu/studentaffairs/

**Justification:**
The ABET EE program criteria requires that each "program must demonstrate that graduates have knowledge of probability and statistics, including applications appropriate to EE and its program objectives."

Previously, the EE program tried to address this requirement through STAT155. In a recent site visit, ABET officials stated the lack of probability and statistics appropriate to EE as a "program weakness" which needs to be addressed as soon as possible, and pointed out that the best way to address this "program weakness" was to introduce a new course highlighting EE applications taught by EE faculty. Similar courses or sequences of courses are currently being offered, with the same motivations, at other UC schools (e.g., ECE139A/B and ECE140 at UCSB, ECE 109 and 153 at UCSD, EE131A/B at UCLA). The EE response to ABET describing how we a have addressed this issue states that EE114 has been approved and that we are now in the process of adding the course to the program in place of "Stat 155 or 161."

Approved:
Faculty of the Electrical Engineering Department: 4/06/07
BCOE Executive Committee: 05/01/07
Committee on Educational Policy: 05/11/07
Endorsed by Advisory 6/11/07
PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

To be adopted:

PRESENT:
The objective of the environmental engineering program is to produce graduates who:

- Demonstrate the ability to apply mathematics, engineering principles, computer skills, and natural sciences to the environmental engineering practice.
- Are capable of synthesizing principles and techniques from engineering, mathematics, engineering planning and project management, and the natural and social sciences to develop and evaluate alternative design solutions to engineering problems with specific constraints.
- Are prepared for entry into careers in environmental engineering that involve air quality systems evaluation and engineering, air pollution control technology, water quality systems evaluation and engineering, water and wastewater treatment, or site remediation.
- Are prepared to pursue graduate education and research in environmental engineering at major research universities.
- Exercise of professional responsibility and sensitivity to a broad range of societal concerns, such as ethical, environmental, economic, regulatory, and global issues.
- Work effectively in a team environment, communicate well, and are aware of the necessity for personal and professional growth.

PROPOSED:
The program educational objectives are to produce graduates who demonstrate in their careers and professional pursuits the following:

- An ability to apply mathematics, engineering principles, computer skills, and natural sciences to the environmental engineering practice.
- Application of fundamental environmental engineering principles at an advanced level, and competence in synthesizing knowledge from multiple disciplines to develop and evaluate design solutions.
- Engagement in environmental engineering careers in diverse areas including sustainability, air quality and pollution control, water quality engineering, bioremediation, and green engineering.
- Pursuit of graduate education and research in environmental engineering at major research universities.
- Exercise of professional responsibility and sensitivity to a broad range of societal concerns, such as ethical, environmental, economic, regulatory, and global issues.
- Effective performance in a team environment, outstanding communication, and involvement in personal and professional growth activities.
**Justification:**
Changes made per suggestion of ABET. The ABET reviewer requested very subtle changes in the language. Also, areas of future employment were updated to stay current with today's trends.

Approved by:

Faculty of the Chemical and Environmental Engineering Department: 1/26/07  
BCOE Executive Committee: 4/3/07  
Committee on Educational Policy: Approved on content, not on grammar or syntax: 6/1/07  
Endorsed by Advisory: 6/11/07
To be adopted:

Proposed Change in the B.A. Degree in Creative Writing Major

Present

The major requirements for the B.A. degree in Creative Writing are as follows:

Prerequisite courses:
CRWT 056 or equivalent, and ENGL 001A or equivalent.

1. Lower-division requirements (12 units; three courses)

    One Creative Writing survey course from CRWT046A, CRWT046B or CRWT46C

    and

    Two literature survey courses from CRWT012/CPLT012, CRWT040/FVC039, CRWT041, CRWT042, CRWT043, CRWT044, CRWT045, ENGL 014, ENGL 015, ENGL 017

2. Upper-division requirements (60 units)

    a) Three Workshop courses in primary genre:

        Creative Nonfiction
        CRWT 130, CRWT 132, CRWT 134

        or

        Poetry
        CRWT 150, CRWT 160, CRWT 170

    or

Proposed

No Change

1. Lower-division requirements (20 units; five courses)

    Two Creative Writing survey courses from CRWT046A, CRWT046B or CRWT046C

    and

    Two Creative Writing introductory courses from CRWT057A, CRWT057B, or CRWT057C

    and

    One literature survey courses from CRWT012/CPLT012, CRWT040/FVC039, CRWT041, CRWT042, CRWT043, CRWT044, CRWT045, ENGL 014, ENGL 015, ENGL 017

2. No Change
Fiction
CRWT 152, CRWT 162, CRWT 172

b) Repeat one advanced workshop in primary genre of interest (CRWT 134, 170, 172) or other course approved by the department.

c) One workshop in second genre: (No Change)

CRWT 130, CRWT 132, CRWT 134
CRWT 150, CRWT 152, CRWT 160,
CRWT 162*, CRWT 164A/THEA 164A,
CRWT 164B/THEA 164B, the CRWT
166A/
FVC 166A/THEA 166A, CRWT 166B/
FVC 166B/THEA 166B, CRWT 166C/
FVC 166C/THEA 166C series, CRWT
170*, CRWT 172*

*These workshops may be repeated; however, only 4 units total can be applied to the major.

d) One workshop in third genre: (No Change)

CRWT 130, CRWT 132, CRWT 134
CRWT 150, CRWT 152, CRWT 160,
CRWT 162*, CRWT 164A/THEA 164A,
CRWT 164B/THEA 164B, the CRWT
166A/
FVC 166A/THEA 166A, CRWT 166B/
FVC 166B/THEA 166B, CRWT 166C/
FVC 166C/THEA 166C series, CRWT
170*, CRWT 172*

*These workshops may be repeated; however, only 4 units total can be applied to the major.

e) Three upper-division courses in Creative Writing: (No Change)

CRWT143, CRWT 146 (E-Z), CRWT155, CRWT 165, CRWT 171, CRWT 173, CRWT 174, CRWT 175, CRWT 176 (E-Z), CRWT185 (E-Z),
CRWT187/ CPLT187, CRWT 191 (may be taken twice but used only once for major credit), CRWT 198I (may be taken only once, for 4 Units)

f) One upper-division course in Art, Art History, Music, Dance, or Theatre (must be a 4 unit course) (No Change)
g) Four (4) units of CRWT195 or CRWT195H (Senior Honors Thesis) or approved course from list available in department

h) Four upper-division courses of concentration in another discipline or set of disciplines approved by advisor

Justification: We have added a new series of courses (CRWT 57A, B, C) to the Creative Writing major requirements because we as a department found that the students were not well prepared to enter their primary genre in their major. With these new courses we are able to introduce the concept of creative writing. They will also have ability to read quality work in their genre and the ability to explore their craft of writing before entering their Upper-Division coursework. These new courses and requirements will better prepare the students for their Upper Division courses in their primary genre.

Approved by Creative Writing Department: 11/28/06
Approved by Executive Committee, CHA&SS: 4/26/07
Approved by Committee on Educational Policy: 5/11/07
Endorsed by Advisory: 6/11/07
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
NOVEMBER 20, 2007

To be adopted:

Proposed Change for the English major

Present: Proposed:

The major requirements for the B.A. in English are as follows:

1. ENGL 20A, ENGL 20B, and ENGL 20C (15 units). These courses are normally required of all English majors as a prerequisite to upper division courses.

2. ENGL 102 (4 units). This course should normally be taken prior to or concurrently with the student’s first upper-division English course.

3. Four courses (16 units); one course from each of the following areas:

   a) English Literature to 1660: ENGL 117A, ENGL 117B, ENGL 117C, ENGL 128E, ENGL 128F, ENGL 128G, ENGL 129A, ENGL 148Q, ENGL 149, ENGL 151A, ENGL 151B, ENGL 151T, ENGL 152, ENGL 153, ENGL 154


   c) American Literature to 1900: ENGL 126A, ENGL 127A, ENGL 128O, ENGL 128Q, ENGL 130, ENGL 131, ENGL 132, ENGL 148G, ENGL 148W

The major requirements for the B.A. in English are as follows:

1. ENGL 20A, ENGL 20B, and ENGL 20C (15 units). These courses are normally required of all English majors as a prerequisite to upper division courses.

2. ENGL 102 (4 units). This course should normally be taken prior to or concurrently with the student’s first upper-division English course.

3. Four courses (16 units); one course from each of the following areas:

   a) English Literature to 1660: ENGL 117A, ENGL 117B, ENGL 117C, ENGL 128E, ENGL 128F, ENGL 128G, ENGL 129A, ENGL 148Q, ENGL 149, ENGL 151A, ENGL 151B, ENGL 151T, ENGL 152, ENGL 153, ENGL 154


   c) American Literature to 1900: ENGL 126A, ENGL 127A, ENGL 128O, ENGL 128Q, ENGL 130, ENGL 131, ENGL 132, ENGL 148G, ENGL 148W

4. One 4-unit course on literature and ethnicity, literature and gender, or literature and sexuality chosen from ENGL 121 (E-Z), ENGL 122 (E-Z)/LGBS 122 (E-Z), ENGL 123A, ENGL 123B, ENGL 124A, ENGL 124B, ENGL 136, ENGL 136T, ENGL 137T, ENGL 138A, ENGL 138B, ENGL 138T, ENGL 139, ENGL 139T, ENGL 143 (E-Z)/FVC 143 (E-Z), ENGL 144 (E-Z)/FVC 144 (E-Z)

5. One 4-unit course on literature and related fields, including theory, or a literary theme or genre chosen from ENGL 033/FVC 033, ENGL 100 (E-Z), ENGL 101, ENGL 104/FVC 104, ENGL 140 (E-Z), ENGL 141 (E-Z), ENGL 142 (E-Z), ENGL 143E/FVC 143E, ENGL 145 (E-Z)/FVC 145 (E-Z), ENGL 146 (E-Z)/FVC 146 (E-Z)

6. Five additional upper-division English courses (20 units). Only 4 units from ENGL 103 or any upper-division Creative Writing course will be accepted toward the fulfillment of this requirement. Four units of ENGL 190 may be counted toward this requirement. Proposals for English 190 must be approved by a sponsoring faculty member and the department chair. If the student wishes to offer units from English 190 as part of the 20 units, a copy of an approved petition will be placed in the student’s file.
Total units in major: 63 units, of which at least 15 units and no more than 20 units must be at the lower-division level.

Students are encouraged to take at least one of the following as a college breadth requirement or as an elective: CLA 027A, CLA 027B, CLA 040; CPLT 017A, CPLT 017B, CPLT 017C; ETST 114, ETST 120, ETST 124, ETST 138, ETST 170/WRLT 170, ETST 183; or any literature course in a language other than English. Students are also encouraged to take a course in British or American history, such as HIST 017A, HIST 017B, HISE 150, HISE 151, HISE 152.

Each student is assigned a faculty advisor for help in shaping a program and following it through to graduation. Students must see their advisors on a regular basis, normally once per quarter prior to registration. Information about advisors is available in the department office from the undergraduate student affairs officer.

**Departmental Honors**

The English Department awards departmental honors to those who complete the following requirements:

1. Maintain a GPA of 3.5 or higher in the English major.

2. Complete 14 additional units of upper division courses in English.

3. Complete English 193A “Senior Seminar” (the units of which may be used toward the additional upper division unit requirement)

4. Complete English 193B “Senior Research,” by submitting a Senior Paper as the result of research begun in 193A “Senior Seminar.”

5. Successfully present their Senior Paper in an undergraduate Honors Research colloquium or conference sponsored by the English Department.

Students may request to participate in the honors track or they may be invited. Students must declare their intention to participate by the end of the fourth quarter prior to graduation.

Total units in major: 63 units, of which at least 15 units and no more than 20 units must be at the lower-division level.

Students are encouraged to take at least one of the following as a college breadth requirement or as an elective: CLA 027A, CLA 027B, CLA 040; CPLT 017A, CPLT 017B, CPLT 017C; ETST 114, ETST 120, ETST 124, ETST 138, ETST 170/WRLT 170, ETST 183; or any literature course in a language other than English. Students are also encouraged to take a course in British or American history, such as HIST 017A, HIST 017B, HISE 150, HISE 151, HISE 152.

Each student is assigned a faculty advisor for
help in shaping a program and following it through to graduation. Students must see their advisors on a regular basis, normally once per quarter prior to registration. Information about advisors is available in the department office from the undergraduate student affairs officer.

**JUSTIFICATION:** To provide research opportunities and recognition to top undergraduates in the major.

**APPROVALS:**

Approved by the Department: 12/04/06
Approved by Executive Committee, CHA&SS: 05/16/07
Approved by Committee on Educational Policy: 06/01/07

Endorsed by Advisory: 6/11/07
The Executive Committee of the A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management met five times during the 2006-07 academic year.

1. Scholarship Decisions
   A. Degrees Awarded
      Master of Business Administration
      Summer Session 2006    2
      Fall Quarter 2006     3
      Winter Quarter 2007  19
      Spring Quarter 2007  29
      Total   53
   B. Students on Probation, 2006-07
      Subject to dismissal    8
      Dismissed             0

2. Courses and Curriculum
   A. Courses
      i. New courses    2
      ii. Course revisions    9
      iii. Course deletions    1
   B. Program change approvals
      i. New MBA program requirements (4/16/07)
      ii. BSAD program changes (12/6/06)

2006-07 Executive Committee
   Elected Members (voting): Waymond Rodgers, Chair (to 8/31/07)
                            John Halebian    (to 8/31/07)
                            Bajis Dodin      (to 8/31/08)
                            Paul Pavlou      (to 8/31/08)
   Ex Officio Member (voting): Anil Deolalikar, Dean (to 6/30/07)
2007-08 Executive Committee
Elected Members (voting):
  John Haleblian, Chair  (to 8/31/09)
  Paul Pavlou  (to 8/31/08)
  Bajis Dodin  (to 8/31/08)
  Jorge Silva-Risso  (to 8/31/09)

Ex Officio Member: (voting)
  David Stewart, Dean

John Haleblian for the Executive Committee
To be received and placed on file:

The Executive Committee of the College of Engineering met 9 times during the 2006-07 academic year.

1. Course proposals

New Courses 17
Course Changes 19
Cross-listings 3
Deletions 0

2. Programs

A proposal to establish a new program in Materials Science and Engineering was submitted to the Executive Committee during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Proposals to change the Degree Requirements for Bioengineering, Chemical Engineering, Computer Engineering, Computer Science and Engineering, Environmental Engineering, and Information Systems majors were submitted to the Executive Committee during the 2006-07 academic year.

3. Regulations and Bylaws

There were 4 proposed changes to the College Bylaws, 3 proposed changes to the Campus Regulations, and 1 new Campus Regulation submitted for consideration during the 2006-07 academic year.

4. Student Petitions

There were no student petitions presented to the Executive Committee in the 2006-07 academic year.

5. Scholarship Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees awarded</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.S. end of Fall</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. end of Winter</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. end of Spring</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honors at Graduation</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>High Honors</th>
<th>Highest Honors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Students on Probation and Subject to Dismissal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Winter 2007</th>
<th>Spring 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Probation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to Dismissal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Subject to Dismissal</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2006-07 Executive Committee:

- Teodor Przymusinski, Chair
- David Cocker
- Yingbo Hua
- Stefano Lonardi
- Thomas Stahovich
- Ertem Tuncel
- Charles Wyman
- Christopher Salam, Student Representative
- Reza Abbaschian, Dean, *Ex officio*
- Mark Matsumoto, Associate Dean, *Ex officio*
- Chinya Ravishankar, Associate Dean, *Ex officio*
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
November 20, 2007

To be received and placed on file:

The Executive Committee of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences met 10 times during the 2006-07 academic year.

1. **Course Proposals**
   - New courses: 68
   - Courses changed: 65
   - New E-Z segments: 37
   - Courses deleted: 5
   - Professional courses: 0
   - Courses restored: 3

2. **Majors**
   - The Faculty approved the following new majors: None
   - The Executive Committee approved changes in the following majors: Business Administration; Creative Writing; English; Liberal Studies

3. **Minors**
   - The Faculty approved the following new minors: NONE
   - The Executive Committee approved changes in the following minors: NONE

4. **Program Reviews**
   - The Faculty approved the following new programs: NONE
   - The Faculty approved the following new department: Revised proposal for Department of Media and Cultural Studies

5. **Regulations and Bylaws**
   - **College**
     - The committee approved the following new College regulation: NONE
     - The committee approved the following new College bylaw: HS2.1.4 and HS4.1.1.4
   - The committee approved the following College regulation changes: NONE
   - The committee approved the following College bylaw changes: NONE
   - **Campus**
     - The committee approved the following Senate regulation change: R2.1.2, R2.1.3, R2.1.4, and Regulation 7
     - The committee approved the following Senate bylaw change: NONE

6. **Student Petitions**
   - 1

7. **Scholarship Decisions**
   - **Degrees Awarded**
     - B.A. end of Summer Session 2006: 363
     - B.S. end of Summer Session 2006: 105
     - B.A. end of Fall Quarter 2006: 235
     - B.S. end of Fall Quarter 2006: 103
     - B.A. end of Winter Quarter 2007: 200
     - B.S. end of Winter Quarter 2007: 87
     - B.A. end of Spring Quarter 2007: 1073
     - B.S. end of Spring Quarter 2007: 390
8. Students/Academic Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Winter 2007</th>
<th>Spring 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restored to good standing</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to dismissal</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstated/readmitted</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Honors at Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cum Laude</th>
<th>Magna Cum Laude</th>
<th>Summa Cum Laude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session 2006</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Quarter 2006</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter 2007</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter 2007</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rene T.A. Lysloff, Chair (2006-07)

2006-07 Executive Committee:
- René T.A. Lysloff, Chair
- Susan Antebi, Hispanic Studies
- Dale Barr, Psychology
- Paulo Chagas, Music
- Christine Gailey, Women’s Studies
- Justin McDaniel, Religious Studies
- Mindy Marks, Economics
- Toby Miller, English
- Anne Sutherland, Global Studies/Interdisciplinary Studies
- Antoine Yoshinaka, Political Science

Ex Officio:
- Scott Coltrane, Assoc. Dean ex-officio
- David Fairris, Assoc. Dean ex-officio
- Georgia Warnke, Assoc. Dean ex-officio
- Stephen Cullenberg, Dean ex-officio
To be received and placed on file:

The Executive Committee of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences met 15 times during the 2006-2007 academic year.

1. **Courses and Curriculum:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Courses</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in major requirements</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Revisions</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion of program</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Deletions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbanded Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Restored</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Minors (revision)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Listing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Interdepartmental Major</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Minor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Petition</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Scholarship Decisions:**

   A. **Degrees Awarded:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A. degrees end of Summer 2006</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. degrees end of Summer 2006</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. degrees end of Fall 2006</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. degrees end of Fall 2006</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. degrees end of Winter 2007</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. degrees end of Winter 2007</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. degrees end of Spring 2007</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. degrees end of Spring 2007</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honor</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Honors</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Honors</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   B. **Students on probation and subject to dismissal:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Winter 2007</th>
<th>Spring 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to Dismissal</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont’d Subject to Dismissal</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Revision in the By-Laws and Regulations:

Seven

2006-2007 Executive Committee Members

Leonard Nunney, Chair
Anthony Norman, Biochemistry
Daphne Fairnairn, Biology
David Johnson, Biomedical Sciences
Adam Lukaszewski, Botany/Plant Sciences
Michael Marsella, Chemistry
David Oglesby, Earth Science
Joseph Morse, Entomology
Frederick Wilhelm, Mathematics
Isgoushi Kaloshian, Nematology
Paphael Zidovetzki, Cell Biology & Neuroscience
Richard Seto, Physics
James Borneman, Plant Pathology
Jiri Simunek, Environmental Sciences
Changxuan Mao, Statistics
To be received and placed on file:

The Executive Committee for Biomedical Sciences has only recently been formed and so has conducted no business during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Executive committee members
Monica Carson
Christian Lytle
Iryna Ethell
David Johnson
Ameae Walker (Chair)
To be received and placed on file:

The Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Education met formally eight times.

Degrees and credentials awarded:

Teacher Education Credentials:
- Multiple and Single Subject Credential: 132
- Education Specialist Credential: 10
- Administrative Services Credential (ASC): 2
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential:
  - School Psychology: 1

M.Ed.: 63

MA Summer 2006 - Spring 2007: 21

Ph.D. Summer 2006 - Spring 2007: 12

Major topics:

GSOE Issues

- EVC Wartella approved three open lines in Education.
- Two-faculty searches open: Higher Education (C4) and School Psychology
- Dr. V.P. Franklin hired in College of Humanities to work quarter time for GSOE
- Recruited Director of Teacher Education: Dr. Anne Jones
- Held Accreditation/External Review of Graduate Programs in May 2007
- Successful recruitment for positions in quantitative methods: Professor George Marcoulides and Assistant Professor Gregory Palardy
- Two higher education candidates did not accept positions: Kimberly Rogers (due to knee surgery in the summer) and Frances Contreras (due to personal and professional reasons)
- Faculty voted unanimously to establish a Taskforce on Diversity that was recommended by EVC Wartella to include faculty, students and staff
• New GSOE marketing logo Peterson, Skolnick, & Dodge funded by Development
• Dr. Paul Green transferred to Ethnic Studies in Fall 2007
• Adopted Workload Policy guidelines
• Nominations for two new EC members-and one new Faculty chair to be elected now or terms beginning September 1, 2007

Curricular Issues:

M.Ed. emphasis in Leadership approved
Decision to evaluate first year Ph.D. core

Executive Committee Members:
  Jan Blacher, Chair
  Richard Newman
  Natalie Becker
  John Wills
  Lee Swanson
  Athena Waite, Director of Teacher Education, ex officio
  Associate Dean Sharon Duffy, ex-officio
  Dean Steven Bossert, ex-officio
PROPOSAL FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

Approvals:

Committee on Educational Policy: May 1, 2007
Committee on Planning and Budget: May 2, 2007
Graduate Council: May 23, 2007
Committee on Academic Personnel: November 20, 2006
Committee on Faculty Welfare: November 30, 2006
Committee on Research: April 30, 2007
Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication: November 20, 2006
Endorsed by Advisory Committee: June 11, 2007
May 1, 2007

TO:    THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:    EUGENE NOTHNAGEL, CHAIR
       COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE:    SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY PROPOSAL

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has reviewed the revised Proposal for a School of Public Policy at UCR. The questions we had this past fall were well addressed, and the additional support letters greatly strengthened the proposal. For these reasons, the CEP voted unanimously to support the proposal to form a School of Public Policy.
May 2, 2007

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

RE: PROPOSAL FOR A SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

Planning and Budget has reviewed the response of the School of Public Policy Task Force regarding our concern about the possibility of fundraising affecting the course of establishment of the school. The Task Force seems confident that resources do not represent a serious challenge to the plan, that their needs are not great, and that the establishment of the school will be incremental. Although the Task Force provided no further information regarding funding, Planning and Budget feels that the School is in the interest of the campus and supports the proposal to establish the School.
May 23, 2007

TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair
    Academic Senate

RE: School of Public Policy

At its meeting today, the Graduate Council voted to approve sending the SPP proposal forward.

While the Council’s general concern about priorities being given to the allocation of new FTE around the campus remains, its concerns about process in this particular case have been resolved. In particular, the Council appreciates the recent efforts of Anil Deolalikar and others to engage faculties of salient departments in discussions about integrated curricula and joint appointments. The Council looks forward to similar consultation as the planning process moves forward.

The Council believes that the proposal might fare better at the system-wide level if the curriculum were a little more fully developed (with, say, some sample syllabi) but certainly does not want to hold up the process for such development.

On behalf of the Graduate Council,

R. Robert Russell, Chair

Cc: Anil Deolalikar
April 30, 2007

TO:  Thomas Cogswell, Chair  
     Riverside Division

FM:   Kiril Tomoff, Chair  
       Committee on Research

RE:  Proposal to Create a School of Public Policy

Dear Tom,

The Committee on Research endorses the proposal to create a School of Public Policy at UCR. The majority of COR members considered that the response to earlier queries not only addressed the concerns raised but substantially improved the proposal.

Sincerely,

Kiril
April 23, 2007

TO:  E.A. NOTHNAGEL, CHAIR, EDUCATIONAL POLICY
     ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR, PLANNING AND BUDGET
     ROBERT RUSSELL, CHAIR GRADUATE COUNCIL
     KIRIL TOMOFF, CHAIR, RESEARCH

FM:  THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
      RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE:  PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY AT UCR –
     RESPONSES TO SENATE COMMITTEE

Attached for your review is an appendix to the above responses including letters from external
sources. Please review the material with your committee and submit your comments to me by
April 30, 2007. I am also including the memo that was sent to EVC and Provost Wartella for
your information.

Thanks.
Response to the Academic Senate Committees on the Proposal to establish a School of Public Policy at UCR

UCR Task Force on Public Policy

April 23, 2007

Committee on Educational Policy (CEP)

1. Lack of supporting letters from faculty and administrators in similar programs at other UC campuses or other peer institutions.

Attached are letters of support from the following public policy programs: UCLA’s School of Public Affairs, University of Washington’s Evans School of Public Affairs, and Georgetown University’s Public Policy Institute. All of these are renowned schools and among the top public policy programs in the country. They all provide a strong endorsement of not only the curriculum proposed but also the distinctiveness and competitiveness of the proposed UCR School of Public Policy.

2. Why are there no supporting letter of support from the top-level UCR administration?

Attached is a letter of strong support from the EVC/Provost that commits the University administration to providing 12 faculty FTEs to the proposed School of Public Policy (SPP).

3. What will be the relationship of the proposed School with the Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development?

As noted already in the proposal, the SPP will distinguish itself from the many research centers at UCR, including the Blakely Center, in two ways. First and most importantly, the Blakely Center is a research center, and as such has no teaching mission. On the other hand, the SPP’s raison d’être will be teaching and training. Second, while the Blakely Center is focused almost exclusively on issues of suburban sprawl and development, the SPP’s research and training agenda will go far beyond these topics; it will include higher education, health, environmental, and social policy.

Cooperation with the SPP will allow Blakely Center researchers to sharpen the policy focus of their research. Likewise, cooperation with the Blakely Center will provide an easy entrée for SPP students interested in urban and regional policy to work closely with Blakely Center faculty and their research projects. Indeed, we believe that, in the long run, it would be natural for the Blakely Center to be housed as a research center within the SPP, although, of course, such an arrangement would need to be discussed first with all concerned parties.
4. **How and where will the proposed School be housed?**

Page 15 of the proposal already indicates the space requirements and plans for the new school. As noted there, the master plan for the West Campus includes dedicated space (of about 51,000 asf) for the School of Public Policy (in a building to be shared with the Graduate School of Education). We realize, however, that the West Campus complex will not be ready for occupancy until 2013-14. In the short run, the campus administration has committed itself to providing space that would become available from the two CHASS buildings under construction. Since the full build-out of the SPP will likely not occur until 2013-14, these space allocation plans are adequate for the time being.

5. **Why is the Ph.D. oral qualifying examination committee referred to as a dissertation committee on page 11?**

The task force apologizes for the typographical error that resulted in an erroneous reference to the oral qualifying exam committee and the dissertation committee being one and the same. We recognize that these two committees are different, and that the dissertation committee is not appointed until after the oral qualifying examination is passed. This error will be corrected in the proposal.
Committee on Planning and Budget

1. What will be the consequences to the School if the ambitious development plans of fund-raising efforts are not achieved?

The full build-out of the proposed School will occur in a phased manner. The SPP will not move to the next stage of the build-out until specific development goals have been realized. At the same time, we should note that the development goals set for the SPP are not overly ambitious; only about $3 million will need to be raised to cover the cumulative shortfall during the start-up phase. We are very confident that this relatively modest goal can be realized.
Graduate Council

1. **Will the 12 faculty FTE lines be sufficient to deliver the rather heavy curriculum of the proposed program?**

We are confident that a faculty of 12 will be able to deliver the proposed curriculum. **First**, many other policy programs in the country are able to accomplish their teaching and supervision objectives with comparable faculty strength (e.g., the programs at UCLA and Georgetown). **Second**, the faculty resources of the proposed School will be leveraged by having MPP students take several of their elective courses in other departments (e.g., Economics, Political Science, Environmental Sciences, and Anthropology), at least initially. Likewise, the Ph.D. program will rely significantly, at least in the first few years, on elective courses offered in other departments. The MPP core curriculum will consist of 13 courses, all of which could easily be taught by 12 SPP faculty having a normal course-load.

2. **Concern about campus emphasis on top-down initiatives to build interdisciplinary programs at the possible expense of our core graduate programs.**

This is a very important concern that we feel needs to be addressed fully. There are several points that we wish to make. **First**, the proposal to establish a School of Public Policy is by no means a top-down initiative from the central UCR administration. The Public Policy Initiative (PPI) originated as a bottom-up initiative – organized by several faculty across campus who wanted a forum to exchange, discuss, and disseminate the policy implications of their research. The PPI has been around for two years, and has sponsored an active seminar series and lively faculty symposia. At a town-hall meeting organized by the PPI in April 2005, more than 75 faculty from around the campus expressed their strong support for formalizing the Initiative into something more tangible. It was on the basis of this grass-roots faculty support that the Chancellor and EVC/P appointed a task-force of 17 faculty members to explore the possibility of establishing a School of Public Policy at UCR.

**Second**, it is important to note that the field of public administration and policy differs from new inter-disciplinary fields like ethnic studies, film and visual culture, or digital arts. Public policy is a well-established professional degree program that has been around for half a century in many American universities. While it is multi-disciplinary in nature, it has emerged as a core academic discipline in recent years with its own set of theory and empirical methods. For instance, there is a large, flourishing literature in public policy decision-making theory and in policy analysis. Many other core disciplines, such as economics and political science, make use of empirical methods developed in public policy, such as program evaluation and project monitoring. It is no wonder that more than 50 universities in the country offer programs in public policy.

The professional nature of the public policy field is important because growing the number of professional schools at UCR is one of the key Chancellorial goals for the
campus. In addition, the proposed School of Public Policy will contribute greatly to another Chancellorial goal — viz., increasing the number of graduate students at UCR. At full build-out, the SPP is expected to have an enrollment of 120 MPP students. It will be very difficult — and expensive — to increase graduate enrollments by 120 students in the core disciplinary programs at UCR.

Third, we do not agree with the Graduate Council's belief that UCR should first strengthen its core disciplinary programs and then launch into inter-disciplinary initiatives. In our opinion, both priorities need to be pursued simultaneously. This is what most other universities around the country are doing. New inter-disciplinary programs that bring together knowledge in the core disciplines in innovative ways to further our understanding of society and technology are in great demand these days — from both students as well as employers. They are the fastest growing segment of academic programs at universities across the country.

Fourth and finally, the sharp distinction drawn between the core disciplines and inter-disciplinary fields ignores the fact that there is a dynamic element to the evolution of disciplines. A niche, inter-disciplinary field today may well become a core academic discipline tomorrow. Academic programs like business administration, environmental sciences, and bio-engineering all started as inter-disciplinary initiatives, but are well-established fields in their own rights today.

3. To what extent have the relevant departments been consulted on the joint programs and joint appointments discussed in the proposal?

Attached are letters of support from 8 major UCR departments that are likely to have significant interactions with the proposed School: Anthropology, Economics, Environmental Sciences (CNAS), Management and Marketing (AGSM), Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology. A majority of these letters explicitly discuss the interest of the departments in exploring cooperating and joint faculty appointments with the SPP. Many of the letters also highlight the interest of the departments in offering joint programs with the SPP and in having their faculty serve on dissertation committees of doctoral students in public policy. We believe these letters speak for themselves and demonstrate the strong interest of the core disciplines at UCR in a public policy program.

Please note that the proposal already included letters of support from the then Interim Dean of CHASS, Dean of BCOE, and the Dean of the GSOE. Attached, please find a letter of support from the Interim Dean of CNAS, which was missing from the proposal.

4. What is the timetable for accreditation?

Because public service is not a licensed profession, accreditation of public policy schools is not mandatory. Since 1977, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) has been conducting voluntary peer review evaluation of
masters degree programs in public affairs, administration and policy. At present, 59% of the total number of programs eligible to participate in peer review in the country have been accredited. Of the major public policy programs in California, only USC’s MPA is accredited; UCLA and UC Berkeley’s programs in public administration/policy are not accredited. In light of this, we do not plan to seek accreditation for the MPP program offered by UCR’s SPP until at least full build-out.

5. What is the total number of required hours of coursework? If it is 78 hours, is it not too high for an academic MA?

The proposed MPP curriculum will indeed involve 78 credit units – 52 units of required core coursework, 12 units of electives, 8 hours of thesis, and 6 hours of required colloquia. While this may seem high for an academic MA, it is appropriate for a professional degree. For instance, the MBA offered by UCR’s AGSM is a 92-unit program, although the Graduate Council has just approved a reduction to 80 units effective AY 2007-08. UCLA’s Master of Public Policy program is also a 80-unit program.

6. Why does the course “American Political Institutions” appear twice on the list of core courses on page 7?

There is a typographical error in the list of core courses shown on page 7 of the proposal. However, the sample coursework for the MPP program shown in the table on page 8 is correct. (The typo on page 7 will be corrected.)

7. Will identically-titled courses in the MPP and doctoral programs be separate courses, or will they be taught concurrently with different requirements? This will have implications for faculty resources.

Initially (i.e., until full build-out of the SPP and until the full set of faculty resources are deployed), the identically-titled courses in the MPP and doctoral programs (shown on pages 8 and 10 of the proposal) will be taught concurrently, but with more rigorous requirements imposed for students enrolled in the doctoral program.
Committee on Research

1. Will the 12 faculty FTE lines be enough to realize the ambitious goals spelled out in the proposal?

We have already responded to this question for the Graduate Council, but we will repeat it here. We are confident that a faculty of 12 will be able to deliver the proposed curriculum. First, many other policy programs in the country are able to accomplish their teaching and supervision objectives with comparable faculty strength (e.g., the programs at UCLA and Georgetown). Second, the faculty resources of the proposed School will be leveraged by having MPP students take, at least initially, several of their elective courses in other departments (e.g., Economics, Political Science, Environmental Sciences, and Anthropology). Likewise, the Ph.D. program will rely significantly, at least in the first few years, on courses offered in other departments. The MPP core curriculum will consist of 13 courses, all of which could easily be taught by 12 SPP faculty having a normal course-load.

Obviously, we hope that in the long run, the SPP will obtain significantly more faculty lines from central administration. However, we understand that this can only happen once the proposed School proves itself – in terms of attracting quality students and faculty, generating significant revenue through professional executive programs, and developing solid partnerships with the policy community in the region and the state.

2. Is there preliminary interest from local policy institutions that may provide contacts for the School's required summer internships?

Attached are four letters from the policy community, including the Mayor of Riverside. They attest to the strong support that the proposed School enjoys in the community. In addition, it should be noted that, by the time the proposed School admits its first cohort of MPP students, we will have had some experience with public policy internships. The Public Policy Initiative has begun offering a major and minor in public policy as of AY 2006-07 in CHASS. A public policy internship is required of the public policy major as well.

3. Why not include additional required coursework in religious and ethnic diversity, religion in the public sphere, immigration, environmental history, etc. to the MPP curriculum?

This is a good idea in principle but the MPP curriculum is already very heavy in core course requirements. (Indeed, the Graduate Council would like to see the total number of units required for the curriculum reduced, not increased.) As a result, we will consider offering the courses suggested by the COR as additional electives.
January 12, 2007

TO: Ellen A. Wartella
   Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

FM: Thomas Cogswell, Chair
   Riverside Division

RE: PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

The following Senate Committees have reviewed the proposal for the establishment of a School of Public Policy: Planning and Budget, Committee on Educational Policy, Graduate Council, Faculty Welfare, Library and Committee on Academic Personnel. The committee members felt that there were many meritorious aspects about the proposed school and unanimously agreed that the formation of a School of Public Policy will represent a significant addition to the academic and intellectual environment of the campus and to the overall number of graduate students. Nevertheless the members of the Advisory Committee only gave their preliminary approval to the plan, reserving final approval until they had received further information.

For further details, I refer you to the attached committee reports, especially those from the Graduate Council and the Committee on Educational Policy. A recurrent refrain running through all of them is the need for many letters of support in order to ensure the proposal’s swift passage through the Academic Council as well as through the Riverside Division. In particular, the proposal needs more letters from the following:

- other UC campuses and other peer institutions commenting on “quality and fit of the proposed UCR program” [CEP report];

- UC Riverside Departments [rather than individuals] testifying to their interest in the new program; and

- the EVC testifying to the administration’s general enthusiasm for the program and its specific agreement to commit 12 FTEs to launch the new School.

In addition, the revised proposal would do well to clarify both the program’s anticipated relationship with the Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development and its physical location on a campus already hard-pressed for office space as well as to address the other curricular queries in the reports. Finally it would be wise to answer the Graduate Council’s
anxieties about the wisdom of so many split appointments and about possibility of weakening core programs at the expense of new interdisciplinary programs such as the School of Public Policy.

Further information on these and other queries in the reports will doubtless prompt the Advisory Committee to give the proposal its general and enthusiastic endorsement.
In its meeting on November 8, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) discussed the Proposal for a School of Public Policy at UCR. While CEP found the proposal to be interesting and have considerable merit, the proposal lacked several pieces of information that prevented CEP from giving a strong endorsement at this time. The lacking information includes the following:

1. An impressive number of supporting letters from UCR faculty and college-level administrators were appended to the proposal, but CEP was greatly concerned about the complete lack of supporting letters from faculty and administrators in similar programs at other UC campuses or other peer institutions. Such letters are routinely appended to proposals of this impact to provide expert external analysis of the potential strength of the proposed program and of its fit within the context of other UC and area programs. CEP appreciates the unique link of social policy and environmental policy that the proposal outlines, as well as the focus on regional, rather than global, policy. Nevertheless, other university-based programs in public policy exist at UCLA, USC, CSU-San Bernardino, and Pepperdine University in our immediate area, and at UC Berkeley, CSU-Sacramento, and CSPU-San Luis Obispo elsewhere in the state. Another program is available through Rand. The CEP thinks it highly unlikely that a proposal for a School of Public Policy at UCR would be approved at the systemwide level without supporting, analytical letters from peers at other institutions who give expert analysis of the quality and fit of the proposed UCR program. The CEP would be reassured by expert external opinion that the proposed UCR school would be truly competitive, presenting a market value that would enable it to compete at the needed level with other schools in the area to attract the needed quality and quantity of students.

2. The proposal contained no supporting letters from the top-level UCR administration. The proposal plans for 12 faculty FTE, 6 of which would be split appointments, thereby extending the number of involved faculty persons to 18. Will the Executive Vice Chancellor provide this number of positions, and if so, from where will they come? The importance of assurance of this substantial number of FTE from the Executive Vice Chancellor is heightened by the possibility of the start-up of a School of Medicine at the same time as the build-out of this proposed School of Public Policy. The Office of Planning and Budget
projection shows a substantial continuing contribution from “State Marginal Growth”. CEP trusts that the Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget will have a careful look at these financial matters. The CEP is very concerned about the funding for this proposed school to the extent that problems here could cause existing educational programs elsewhere on campus to suffer, especially if the estimated numbers of students in public policy do not materialize.

3 Although supportive letters from faculty who were interested in collaborating were appended to the proposal, the CEP is concerned about how this proposed school might interact (rather than compete) with the Edward J. Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development. In his attached supporting letter, Professor Warren, Director of the Blakely Center, writes that he sees that “the potential relationships are many and deep” between the Blakely Center and the proposed School of Public Policy. Perhaps the synergism, rather than competition, between these two entities is obvious to Professor Warren, since he is a co-author of the proposal for the School of Public Policy. For the benefit of others, including those at systemwide, who will review the proposal, it might be worthwhile for the proposal to deal more directly with the anticipated relationship to the Blakely Center.

4 Regarding space for the school, the proposal states that options will initially include existing campus space. While we have been told that there are two CHASS buildings under construction, one of our members who is a CHASS department chair understands that the plans for those were downsized by about 30%, and that the new space there is already planned out for existing programs. Where specifically, then, would the new school be housed?

5 Finally, a correction is needed on page 11 of the proposal where, addressing the Ph.D. oral qualifying examination, it is stated that “The student’s dissertation committee will offer this examination.” The composition of the dissertation committee is, in fact, first recommended for appointment by the Graduate Dean on the same form that the results of the qualifying examination are reported, i.e., the dissertation committee is not appointed until after the exam is passed. The CEP trusts that the Graduate Council will also recognize this error in its review of the proposal.

If these additional items of information and the correction are provided, the CEP would be able to deliver a more definite opinion on the proposal.
November 17, 2006

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
      COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

RE: PROPOSAL FOR SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

The Committee on Planning and Budget has reviewed the proposal for a School of Public Policy on the UCR campus. The Committee fully endorses the proposal. The Committee members feel that the existence of the two new degree programs will help in the recruitment of graduate students to UCR. The members noted that 12 FTEs necessary to found the School have already been allocated. However, because it is a professional school, there were budgetary concerns about the issue of raising additional funds. While there is an impressive outline of a Development Plan of fundraising efforts, the Committee is concerned what will be the consequences to the School if the ambitious goals are not achieved.
TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair
   Academic Senate

RE: Proposal for a School of Public Policy

The Council commends the Task Force on Public Policy, particularly its Co-Chairs, Anil Deolalikar and David Warren, for making the strongest possible case for the establishment of a School of Public Policy (SPP) at UCR. We agree that, prospectively, an SPP has much to offer to the academic and intellectual environment of the campus and the community. Nevertheless, serious concerns were raised about the (1) the costs to our core departments of building a robust SPP and (2) the extent to which potentially associated departments have thoroughly vetted and signed on to the proposals for joint appointments and joint programs.

(1) Perhaps to keep the explicit cost low, the authors propose that half of the new school's complement of 12 FTE lines be used for joint appointments in related departments, specifically economics, political science, sociology, psychology, and environmental science. We have several concerns here. First, we wonder whether eight or nine FTE's is sufficient to deliver the rather heavy curriculum of the proposed programs. If not, will additional lines be required? Second, ongoing reviews of our graduate programs have made the Council painfully aware of the serious understaffing of many of our core graduate programs; even eight or nine lines would go a long way toward rectifying some of the shortcomings of these programs. Third is the worry about the potential cost to our core graduate programs of having to configure some of their hires to qualify as a joint appointment in the SPP; a recent external review team emphasized this concern in our discussions about one of the programs expected to play a high profile role in the SPP.

More generally, the Council is increasingly concerned about the campus emphasis on top-down initiatives to build interdisciplinary programs at the possible expense of our core graduate programs. Alluding to the need to enhance UCR's reputational rankings, the Proposal states (page 2) that the "establishment of a SPP will further this goal, as the large majority of AAU member universities in the country have professional public policy schools." We believe that this statement misses the point: it is our impression that the elite schools first built their reputations on the development of strong basic disciplinary programs, which then provided a solid foundation on which to develop interdisciplinary programs and schools. Few (if any) of UCR's core graduate programs are ranked in the top quartile of U.S. graduate programs. We believe that, at this stage, our highest priority should be on building strong core programs and worry that the emphasis on new interdisciplinary initiatives may be detracting from that critical objective.
(2) Especially in the light of the worries expressed in point (1), the Council is concerned about the extent to which the relevant department faculties have been consulted on the joint programs and joint appointments in the proposal. To be sure, the departments are well represented by membership in the Task Force, but we would like to see more evidence that the departmental faculties have had the opportunity to comment on these matters. The letters of support evince a considerable amount of individual interest in participation in the proposed policy programs, but there is little evidence that the departments targeted to be linked to the SPP have signed on to the joint programs and appointments. We would like to see explicit expressions of support from department faculties before going ahead with the proposed school.

A few comments on detail follow:

(i) **Timetable and accreditation.** We didn't see any discussion of the procedures or timetable for accreditation that the new school might seek. This is not a major issue, but perhaps it could be mentioned when the proposal goes forward.

(ii) **Curriculum**  
(a) The total number of required hours of coursework is not clear to us. We understand the proposal to be suggesting an MPP curriculum of 78 hours: 52 hours of required core courses, 8 hours of thesis, 6 hours of required colloquium (assuming 1 hour/quarter), and 12 hours of electives (plus a summer internship). This would be a rather high number of hours for an academic MA but may be fitting for a professional MA. In any event, the overall hours ought to be clearly specified.
(b) The proposal highlights two required first year courses that deserve special mention (page 7), but only one of them is included on the list of core courses on page 7 (although both appear on the chart on page 8). Instead, the list on page 7 includes "American Political Institutions" twice. Is this a typo?
(c) The proposed doctoral program (page 10) contains two courses with titles identical to two MPH courses but described as "more rigorous". Are these, then, separate courses? Are they taught concurrently with different requirements? Clarification would be helpful, as the answers would have implications for faculty resources.

(iii). **Faculty workload**  
In light of the large number of courses, electives, and students, an analysis of faculty workload might be useful, both during build-out and at full development.

On behalf of the Graduate Council,

R. Robert Russell, Chair
TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair  
Riverside Division Academic Senate

FROM: Allen Zych, Chair  
Committee on Academic Personnel

RE: Proposal for Establishment of a School of Public Policy

CAP has reviewed this report and supports the plan. It is estimated that twelve new faculty positions would reside in SPP, with about six FTE for joint appointments with other relevant campus units. Depending on which disciplines are involved different salary scales may become a factor. SPP is encouraged to look to other campuses for guidance.
November 30, 2006

Dear Tom,

On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Welfare, I write to inform you that our members have read the proposal for a School of Public Policy, and we find it thoughtful and well-crafted. We do not see any faculty welfare issues about which to be concerned. We wish the proposal well.

With best wishes,

John

John M. Fischer
Distinguished Professor of Philosophy
UC President’s Chair
DATE: December 6, 2006

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR, RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: KIRIL TOMOFF, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

RE: PROPOSED SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

Dear Tom,

The minority of members of COR who responded to the request to review the proposal for the School of Public Policy give the proposal their enthusiastic support. The following features of the proposal were considered especially strong: the proposed focus on regional policy to capitalize on the growing importance of regional policy globally and the apparent paucity of similar schools in the US and on the opportunities presented by UCR's location in inland Southern California; the proposed concentration on the intersection of social and environmental policy; and the demonstrated synergies between the proposed school and existing faculty and programs already operating at UCR. This last area was most important from the perspective of the charge of this committee, research. There seems little question that the proposed school should improve the research environment for many potential collaborators already on campus.

Members also raised a few questions or areas of concern. Is 12 FTE, many split, enough to realize the ambitious goals spelled out in the proposal? Is there preliminary interest from outside institutions who may provide contacts for the School's required summer internships and if so should not that be documented in the proposal? In other words, it is theoretically convincing that such a school would increase links between UCR and local, state, and regional policy institutions, but evidence of willingness to cooperate with UCR provided by such institutions would strengthen the proposal. Though respondents thought that the proposed curriculum appeared strong, they also suggested there should ideally be additional required coursework which would provide students opportunities to expand their knowledge about such topics as religious and ethnic diversity, religion in the public sphere, immigration, environmental history, the historical roots of contemporary policy issues, and so forth.

These questions or concerns did not outweigh the enthusiastic support with which the general idea to create a School of Public Policy and this specific proposal were both greeted. But again, only a small minority of COR members responded.
December 19, 2006

To: Thomas Cogswell  
Chair, UCR Academic Senate

From: David Crohn  
Chair, Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication

RE: Proposed School for Public Policy

The Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication wholeheartedly supports the Proposed School for Public Policy. The proposed School represents an efficient and valuable evolution of existing University resources.

The library is well grounded in the fields that will comprise the new School, such as Economics, Education, Environmental Sciences, and Sociology, but the Committee believes that additional funds will be needed to develop, organize and deliver Library resources to the new school. The Committee therefore recommends that an initial $50,000 be allocated to the Library during the initiation of the School and that $50,000 per year be allocated to the library to maintain its collections in support of the new program.

The Committee does not, at this time, support the idea of an independent library for the proposed School. Because the proposed School of Public Policy will be highly interdisciplinary, it will draw on many resources that are already part of the University Library collection. Much would need to be replicated for a new Public Policy library and existing Departments would have difficulty accessing materials at such a facility. Instead, resources should be located at the Rivera and Science Libraries, as appropriate. External fundraising for an endowed librarian chair, as mentioned in the proposal, is a creative idea that would help to assure the excellence of UCR Library resources for the new school. We support this idea, with the understanding that the individual occupying the chair would report to the University Librarian.
REVISED

October 24, 2006

TO:  E. A. NOTHNAGEL, CHAIR, EDUCATIONAL POLICY
     ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR, PLANNING AND BUDGET
     ROBERT RUSSELL, CHAIR GRADUATE COUNCIL
     ALLEN D. ZYCH, CHAIR COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
     HELEN HENRY, CHAIR, FACULTY WELFARE
     KIRIL TOMOFF, CHAIR, RESEARCH
     D. M. CROHN, CHAIR, LIBRARY

FM:  THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
     RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE:  PROPOSAL FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

Attached, please find a proposal for the Establishment of a School of Public Policy from the EVCP for your review. Policy requires that your committees review the proposal before submission to Advisory for endorsement and onward transmission to the entire faculty at the Winter Division Meeting.

I would appreciate receiving your response by November 30, 2006.

141
10 October 2006

TO: Thomas Cogswell
Chair, Academic Senate, Riverside Division

FR: Ellen Wartella
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

RE: Proposal for a School of Public Policy

I am pleased to submit this proposal to establish a School of Public Policy to the Academic Senate for a recommendation.

Per our conversation, we will follow the sequential approval process defined in section III.B.1. of the University-wide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units. This implies that the potentially lengthy system-wide review will not begin until the Senate has approved the proposal. I am grateful that you have offered to act expeditiously, and I understand that a recommendation might be possible during the November meeting. However, a careful review of the proposal that improves its chances of passing system-wide review is more valuable to me than saving a few weeks of time. Nevertheless, I thank the Senate for attempting to accomplish both.

Thus far the proposal has generated support from many campus groups and individuals. The Public Policy Task Force included members from key Senate committees, such as Graduate Council, Committee on Research, Committee on Education Policy, and Committee on Faculty Welfare. The proposal also has been presented to and informally reviewed by other Senate committees last spring. Finally, letters of support have been included from multiple center directors; senior-level faculty; and deans from GSOE, BCOE, AGSM, and CHASS. I look forward to the Senate’s advice and partnership to advance this important proposal.

cc: Chancellor Córdova
   Vice Chancellor Bolar
   Interim Dean Deolalikar
   Assistant Vice Chancellor Hull
   Professor Warren

enc: Proposal for the School of Public Policy
UC RIVERSIDE

PROPOSAL FOR A

SCHOOL OF

PUBLIC POLICY

Submitted October 2006
Task Force on Public Policy

Anil Deolalikar, Department of Economics (CHASS) (Co-Chair)
David Warren, Department of Psychology (Emeritus) (CHASS) (Co-Chair)
Michael Allen, Department of Plant Pathology (CNAS)
Steven Bossert, Graduate School of Education (GSOE)
Shaun Bowler, Department of Political Science (CHASS)
Scott Coltrane, Department of Sociology (CHASS)
Paul Green, Graduate School of Education (GSOE)
Glenn Hatton, Department of Cell Biology and Neuroscience (CNAS)
Helen Henry, Department of Biochemistry (CNAS)
Ruth Jackson, University Librarian
Shankar Mahalingam, Department of Mechanical Engineering (BCOE)
Bryce Mason, Office of the Vice Chancellor/Provost
Kathleen Montgomery, Department of Marketing and Management (AGSM)
Thomas Patterson, Department of Anthropology (CHASS)
Ellen Reese, Department of Sociology (CHASS)
Kirk Williams, Department of Sociology (CHASS)
Charles Whitney, Departments of Creative Writing and Sociology (CHASS)
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1. Introduction and Objectives

We propose the establishment of a professional School of Public Policy (SPP) at UCR. The SPP will offer a professional Masters of Public Policy (MPP) degree, a doctorate degree (PhD) in public policy, as well as a doctorate degree in cooperation with a number of existing departments and programs on campus. Beyond the cooperative doctorate programs, the SPP will develop close working relationships with programs, departments, and schools, in order to serve as the institutional framework to facilitate UCR’s scholars in better exploring the policy implications of their research as well as analyzing the effects of existing policies and programs on households, communities and society at large. The SPP will draw upon multiple disciplines and address multiple challenges that public officials face at the regional, state, national, and global levels.

**Mission.** The SPP will have three broad mandates: (i) to train a cadre of students in rigorous policy analysis skills, so that they can pursue careers in local, state, and national governments and in non-profit organizations; (ii) to facilitate research by multidisciplinary teams at UCR on substantive public policy problems that cut across traditional subject boundaries; and (iii) to disseminate key policy research findings to policymakers and administrators.

**Distinctiveness.** Two major themes will define the intellectual character of UCR’s SPP and will serve to distinguish it from policy schools at other universities in the country.

**Intersection of Social Policy and Environmental Policy.** The SPP will focus on a range of social policy issues, particularly those associated with population growth and movement. A high quality of life depends on social systems that enhance the health, education, employment, and cultural development of its members. These systems become challenged under conditions of demographic change, such as population growth and migration. UCR’s SPP will address this broad range of social policy issues related to population growth and movement. At the same time, demographic and other societal changes create stresses on the physical and biological environment, and it is vital to accommodate these changes in ways that maintain and enhance the health of the environment. Many public policy schools focus on social policy issues (e.g., health, education, immigration), and some specialize in environmental policy issues. But, to our knowledge, few schools combine these two areas in an interactive and mutually-informing way. This integrated social-environmental focus will distinguish UCR’s SPP from most policy programs in the country.

**Importance of Regional Policy.** Most public policy schools specialize in some combination of international, federal, state, and municipal policy. Like these other schools, UCR’s SPP also will offer students appropriate curricular experience at these levels. However, it is becoming increasingly evident that key policy issues transcend

---

1 Although not a public policy school, the Bren School of Environmental Science and Management at UC Santa Barbara comes closest to the approach of integrating science, management, law, economics, and policy in the study of the environment.
these traditional jurisdictional boundaries. For example, water and air quality are not well managed within city, county or even state boundaries, nor are issues of immigration, transportation systems, or population growth management. Councils of government such as the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) have emerged to provide a transcending framework to deal with these issues. On a larger scale, alliances such as the European Union (EU) have been formed to deal with economic and social issues that transcend state and national boundaries. “Regional” is the general term applied to these relationships that do not correspond to the traditional structure of jurisdictions based on political or geographic boundaries. Current public policy structures have not generally adapted to the needs of regional policy. UCR’s SPP will specialize in regional relationships and will be a leader in the development of the field of regional policy analysis and policy-making.

Naturally, UCR’s SPP will focus on the policy problems of our own region—Southern California/Northwestern Mexico—given that (i) UCR has strong expertise in the study of socio-cultural, ecological, and geological processes in this region, and (ii) this region offers an unrivaled laboratory for analyzing the social and ecological impact of population growth and movement. Even more importantly, the Southern California/Northwestern Mexico region has great significance in terms of its relevance for comprehending emerging issues in other regions of the United States, as well as at the global level, because many of the problems facing our region—rapid population growth, exurban sprawl, and stresses on the natural and social environment—are common to other mega-regions around the world, such as the Arizona Sun Corridor, the Cascadia Mega-Region, the Shanghai-Jiangsu mega-province, and the Hyderabad-Bangalore Corridor. Thus, a distinguishing characteristic of UCR’s SPP would be to emphasize the larger linkages that our region has with the rest of the world, and to compare explicitly our region with other world regions. This “think locally, act globally” mind-set will pervade the research and curricular programs of the SPP.

2. How a School of Public Policy Will Further UCR Goals

The SPP will assist UCR in achieving several of its most important overarching goals.

Enhancing UCR’s Reputational Rankings. UCR is seeking to improve its rankings and have the profile of an AAU member university. The establishment of a SPP will further this goal, as the large majority of AAU member universities in the country have professional public policy schools.

Graduate Student Population. UCR is vigorously seeking to improve the ratio of graduate to undergraduate students. The establishment of the SPP, with its graduate student population of 30 doctoral and 150 MPP students (at maturity), will provide significant progress toward this objective.

Professional Schools. One of the Chancellor’s key goals is to offer expanded professional education in areas that respond to the needs of the state and region and that help
to stimulate a knowledge-based economy. The SPP is an excellent example of such a professional school. Because of its intended programmatic themes, the SPP will also complement and enjoy synergies with the other professional schools that are currently under development at UCR. The health care system is challenged by population growth and is thus an important aspect of the social-policy component of the SPP; the potential synergies with a UCR medical school are thus clear. As well, there are legal aspects of the entire range of social/environmental policy issues that the SPP will address. A close relationship between the SPP and UCR’s intended law school will enhance the agenda of both schools in mutually-supportive ways.

Closer Ties with the Community. Another of the Chancellor’s key goals is to forge closer ties with the community, to be responsive to regional issues, and to coordinate with local and community organizations in pursuing common goals for prosperity and sustainability of the Inland Empire through technology transfer and attraction of highly-skilled jobs and industries. The establishment of the SPP will further this goal in three ways: (i) it will bring the world-class research of UCR faculty to bear on the policy problems facing the region; (ii) it will engage in a two-way policy dialogue with policy makers and planners in the region; and (iii) it will create a pool of students trained in rigorous policy analysis to pursue careers in local and state government agencies and regional policy organizations.

Expand Opportunities for Students. The Chancellor’s key goals call for the campus to expand opportunities for learning and personal growth for all students, undergraduate and graduate. The SPP will fulfill this goal at the graduate level, complementing the undergraduate program in public policy which is currently under review by the Committee on Education Policy. Students are increasingly interested in explicit pre-professional and professional training, and relate well to curricula that are connected to real-world issues and problems. Thus, the availability of both graduate and undergraduate programs in public policy will considerably increase the attractiveness of UCR to prospective students.

Investing in Areas of Strength. As noted earlier, UCR has an impressive array of assets in social and environmental policy-related areas. A relatively modest investment of additional resources will help UCR to be “recognized for its distinction among all research universities in selected areas which exhibit quality and momentum,” thus addressing another of the Chancellor’s key goals.

3. Synergies with Other UCR Strengths

UCR presently has a substantial array of assets that will interact with and help to build the strength of the SPP. For example:

- The Graduate School of Education is building a focus in higher education policy – in particular, policy relating to California’s extensive network of community colleges – and is dedicating significant resources to this mission.
• Several faculty in the Department of Environmental Sciences are engaged in computer modeling of air, water, and soil quality interactions and their implications for human populations and ecosystems.

• The campus is engaged in a major new Health Sciences Initiative, which will have health policy as an important focus.

• The Center for Conservation Biology conducts research on the conservation and restoration of species and ecosystems that form the natural heritage of Southern California – issues that a very clear policy focus.

• Several faculty members in the Departments of Political Science, Economics, Sociology, and Anthropology are engaged in research on important problems facing societies and the solutions to these problems. These faculty members provide policy advice to local, state, national, and international agencies. Further, these departments have recently hired additional faculty members whose research is directly in the area of public policy.

• The mission of the Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development is to conduct and disseminate research on issues of suburban growth and the impact of this growth on social, environmental, and transport systems.

• The Presley Center for Crime and Justice Studies works with the criminal justice system in and around Riverside on the many challenges of youth violence prevention.

• The Air Pollution Research Center conducts basic and applied research into photo-chemical air pollution and its effects on plants.

• The Environmental Research Institute seeks to provide policy makers with models that can forecast the impact of various social and environmental policy decisions.

• The Biotechnology Impacts Center provides a forum to identify relevant policy issues, acts as a clearinghouse for credible information on those issues, and initiates research that addresses the potential benefits and consequences of the genomics revolution.

• The University of California Center for Water Resources is headquartered at UCR and sponsors water-related research, including the conservation, development, management, distribution, and utilization of water resources.

• Among its other mission components, the Center for Environmental Research and Technology (CERT) conducts research that seeks to improve the technical basis for environmental regulations and policy.
All of these organizations and groups of faculty are potential contributors to, and support for, the proposed SPP. Given the presence of these existing assets, the SPP will be able to create a remarkable critical mass of policy-related expertise with the addition of a relatively small group of additional faculty FTE.

4. Main Features of a UCR School of Public Policy

We envision a School of Public Policy that is actively engaged with existing areas of the campus, one that is integrated with the campus rather than standing alone. These relationships will involve faculty, students, and research. All students, whether Master's of Public Policy (MPP) or doctoral candidates, will choose a substantive area of concentration to accompany their core study in public policy, and they will take appropriate courses in that concentration, either in the SPP or in other academic departments at UCR. Their research projects will have a policy theme but will be grounded in the methods – both analytical and empirical – of their particular discipline. This task will be made easier by the fact that several faculty in the SPP will hold joint appointments with departments in the other colleges. In addition, currently-appointed faculty at UCR who have strong policy-related research and teaching interests will have adjunct and courtesy appointments in the SPP. The themes of the SPP will, as appropriate, both shape and be shaped by the research and teaching interests of other units at UCR.

We envision an allocation of 12 new faculty FTE for the SPP. Approximately one-half of the FTEs would be used for appointments fully in the SPP. The other half would be split appointments that would be shared with other departments and colleges where there are actual or potential synergies and where it is desirable to add faculty strength with a policy focus without distorting the unit’s existing academic plans. The multidisciplinary approach of the SPP would enable joint appointments with disciplines such as economics, political science, law, sociology, social psychology, environmental science, and demography, where a public policy focus would be consistent with the academic planning ambitions of the discipline. The use of joint appointments would not only raise the faculty headcount of the SPP but would also tightly integrate the SPP with other programs on campus. In addition, it is anticipated that some existing enrollment-driven FTE positions will be designated by deans/departments as public policy-related. In all, a headcount of 20-25 faculty is envisioned for the SPP. This would place UCR’s proposed SPP roughly equivalent in size to the public policy schools at UC Berkeley (25 faculty) and UCLA (28 faculty), but significantly larger than Cal State Sacramento’s Department of Public Policy and Administration (13 faculty) and much smaller than the University of Southern California’s School of Policy, Planning, and Development (40 faculty).
5. Proposed Curriculum

The mainstay of the SPP will be a Master's program in public policy (MPP) and a smaller public policy doctoral program. In addition, an undergraduate major and minor in public policy, situated in the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, has already been approved (to be offered as of Fall 2006), and will have a close relationship to the SPP. We anticipate considerable demand for all of these programs (see Section 6 below).

A. Master's in Public Policy (MPP)

The MPP degree will be offered as a two-year, full-time program consisting of a core curriculum, a policy internship in the summer following the first year, a second-year policy analysis project, and elective courses (including but not limited to those offered by the SPP).

The program will focus on the practical and applied aspects of policy-making and policy implementation, and attempt to develop student skills in

- Identifying human, social, and environmental problems that are amenable to policy interventions;
- Examining techniques for developing policy options and evaluating their social consequences;
- Choosing among a variety of alternative policy interventions based on their relative benefits and costs; and
- Developing strategies for the successful implementation of public policies once they have been adopted.

More specifically, the curriculum will be designed to develop the following skills in students:

- written and oral communication skills,
- knowledge of the organizational and bureaucratic structures involved in program development and implementation,
- an understanding of political institutions and processes, as well as ethical issues, associated with policy formulation and adoption,
- skill in application of economic analysis to questions of economic trade-off and policy choice and efficiency,
- familiarity with cost-benefit analysis and other applications of quantitative analysis and modeling, as well as the use of statistical software,
- an understanding of social science methodologies for dealing with problems of data collection, analysis, and program evaluation, and
- the ability to apply legal analysis where appropriate to the creation and implementation of public policies and to recognize the role of courts and administrative law in program development and implementation.
(i)  Core Courses

The core courses are meant to provide training in the fundamental concepts and research methods of the discipline of public policy. These courses will emphasize practical applications of analytical skills and encourage students to “learn by doing” through numerous exercises and projects conducted in teams and individually. Fieldwork activities will also be a part of the core curriculum, involving real clients, written reports, and oral presentations of the reports. In addition, students will be required to attend colloquia with outside speakers that will explore in detail many of the policy issues covered in the core courses. A sample course-plan for a typical student enrolled in the MPP program is shown below.

The core courses will include:

The Policy Process (4 courses)
- Introduction to Policy Analysis
- American Political Institutions and Processes
- Policy Formulation and Implementation
- Integrated Policy-Making and Problem-Solving at the Regional Level

Institutional Context (4 courses)
- Political and Organizational Aspects of Public Policy
- American Political Institutions and Processes
- Working with Legislatures
- Ethics, Law, and Public Policy

Policy Methods (5 courses)
- Applied Microeconomics for Policy Planners
- Applied Policy Statistics
- Public Budgeting and Finance
- Monitoring and Evaluation of Programs and Policies
- Decision Analysis, Modeling, and Quantitative Methods

Two required courses to be taken in the first year deserve special mention. One of these will introduce students to the interactions among population growth, environmental stress, and societal institutions, and the implications of these interactions for policy planners. Another course will introduce students to the concept of mega-regions that transcend traditional city, county, and state (sometimes even national) boundaries, and the problems of integrated policy-making and problem-solving for these mega-regions. As noted earlier, UCR’s SPP will be specializing in these two niche issues, and it will therefore be important to introduce students early in their Master’s program to this way of thinking and problem-solving.
Fall Political & Organizational Aspects of Public Policy

Winter Introduction to Policy Analysis

Spring American Political Institutions and Processes

Applied Microeconomics for Policy Planners

Elective 1: Critical Issues in Environmental/Health/Education/Social Policy

Interactions among Population Growth, Technology, Environment, and Societal Institutions

Integrated Policy-Making and Problem-Solving at the Regional Level

Colloquia/Seminar

Colloquia/Seminar

Colloquia/Seminar

Summer Policy Internship

Second Year

Policy Formulation & Implementation

Public Budgeting & Finance

Working with Legislatures

Decision Analysis, Modeling, & Quantitative Methods

Elective 3

Monitoring & Evaluation of Programs & Policies

Elective 2

Advanced Policy Analysis (Thesis Independent Study)

Colloquia/Seminar

Colloquia/Seminar

Colloquia/Seminar

(ii) Elective Courses

MPP students will specialize in one of four areas: environmental policy, health policy, higher education policy, and social policy (e.g., immigration, crime prevention, and urban development). In the first year itself, students will have to take one elective course that will introduce them to critical issues in their chosen area of specialization. In the second year, students will take two more elective courses in the same area. Most elective courses in the four specialization areas will be offered in the SPP, but students, in consultation with their advisors, will also be able to choose electives from a limited number of courses offered by other UCR academic departments.

(iii) Internship, Colloquia, and Thesis Requirements

In both years of the program, students will need to attend talks sponsored by the SPP Policy Seminar Series. The Series will feature occasional (about 3-4 per quarter) lectures and seminars by outside speakers – typically, policy makers, administrators, and researchers – on important and timely policy issues facing the region, the state, the nation, and the world.

To translate the analytical skills learned in the classroom, MPP students will also be required to do an internship during the summer between the first and second year of study. Students will be assisted by the Career Advising Office in the SPP to find positions as apprentices to policy practitioners in local, state, federal or international government agencies; non-profit organizations; private-sector corporations and consulting firms; and public affairs firms. For instance, a student could work as a summer intern in the Riverside City Manager’s or Mayor’s office, the Riverside County’s Economic Development
Agency or Environmental Health Office, or with a nonprofit organization working in a policy area.

Finally, during their second year, students will be required to do a thesis project, which will involve identifying a real policy problem of the student’s choice and then working with a real client on addressing this problem with field work, data collection, and data analysis. The project will consist of a written report as well as an oral presentation of the thesis findings. The thesis project could follow from the summer internship and could possibly lead to a position with the client agency upon the student’s graduation.

The MPP program discussed above will also be offered to mid-career students (typically, policy professionals already working in the public sector who are seeking to strengthen their analytical and quantitative skills and move into positions of greater responsibility). Mid-career students will have an opportunity to “stretch” the two-year program over three or even four years, and will be exempted from the summer policy internship. In addition, they will have the option of reducing academic year course loads or shorten the total duration of the program by taking summer classes offered by the SPP.

B. Ph.D. in Public Policy

There will be two types of students that will be interested in the doctoral program offered by the SPP. The first will be students who wish to pursue teaching and/or research careers in public policy programs at other universities or at policy think-tanks (such as RAND, Public Policy Institute of California, or the Urban Institute). The second type will include students who are primarily interested in an existing doctoral program, such as the ones offered by the Departments of Environmental Sciences, Anthropology, Political Science or Economics at UCR, but who wish to pursue an additional specialization in public policy. These students might have an interest in pursuing a career in a specialized policy agency, such as the United States Forestry Service, California Environmental Protection Agency, or the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The SPP will offer a Ph.D. in Public Policy program for the first type of student and a Ph.D. Minor in Public Policy for the second type of student. The latter program is explained in more detail below.

Students enrolled in the Ph.D. in Public Policy program will select, upon acceptance into the program, a work advisory committee consisting of three members of the faculty participating in the graduate program to assist in the planning of an individualized curriculum. While extensive customization will be possible, we sketch out below a generic curriculum for the doctoral program in public policy.

In their first year in the program, students will typically follow a core course curriculum, which will include courses in research design, institutional perspectives, public policy processes, applied microeconomics, applied policy statistics, policy analysis and evaluation, and a data analysis practicum. While some of the core courses will be the
same as those taken by MPP students (e.g., Ethics, Law, and Public Policy; Political and Organizational Aspects of Public Policy; Integrated Policy-Making and Problem-Solving at the Regional Level), others (e.g., Applied Microeconomics and Applied Policy Statistics) will be taught at a more rigorous (doctoral) level. In addition, doctoral students, like the MPP students, will have to attend the occasional colloquia/seminars offered by the SPP Policy Seminar Series.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Coursework for the Doctoral Program In Public Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Yearordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Microeconomics*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Organizational Aspects of Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy Processes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics, Law, &amp; Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Policy Statistics*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Policy-Making and Problem-Solving at the Regional Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Qualifying Examinations (Summer)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Inter-Disciplinary Research*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis Practicum*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Seminar (Preparation of Dissertation Proposal)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Seminar (Preparation of Dissertation Proposal)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Year (Dissertation Research)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Year (Dissertation Research, Final Examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fifth Year (optional) (Final Examination)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following demonstration of professional competence in the core areas, as evidenced by the successful completion of the core qualifying examinations at the end of the first year, students will specialize in an area of concentration, such as environmental policy, education policy, health policy, or social policy. In the second year, students will take five elective courses in their chosen field, as well as take courses to continue building their analytic and methodological skills. The elective courses can be taken from among the courses offered in the SPP or from other academic departments or programs at UCR.\(^2\) Students will continue to enroll in the policy seminar/colloquia course. Toward the end of the second year, students will take a comprehensive field examination to test their knowledge in their area of concentration.

\(^2\) For instance, the Department of Environmental Sciences currently offers only a few courses that would be suitable for a student pursuing a doctoral degree in Public Policy with a specialization in environmental policy (e.g., a course on Environmental Management). A number of additional elective courses in environmental policy would need to be created and offered by the SPP faculty.
During the spring and summer quarters of the second year, doctoral students typically will establish a dissertation committee and prepare a dissertation proposal in consultation with the committee. The dissertation committee will normally be composed of three faculty members, at least one of whom should be from outside the SPP. Before the beginning of the third year (i.e., late summer after their second year), students will need to pass an oral qualifying examination, which will cover the dissertation prospectus and subject matter related to the student's field of concentration. The student's dissertation committee will offer this examination. Upon successful completion of the oral qualifying exam, students will advance to candidacy.

The third and fourth years of the program will be spent researching and writing the Ph.D. dissertation. The entire program of study will be complete when the dissertation is finished, under the direction of the dissertation committee, and the student passes a final examination defending the dissertation. This will typically take place at the end of the fourth year or during the fifth year in the program.

C. Ph.D. Minor in Public Policy

As noted earlier, a minor field in public policy will also be offered by the SPP for doctoral students in other departments and programs at UCR who wish to add a specialization in public policy. In this case, students will have to complete all the requirements of their home doctoral program and, in addition, (i) take a cluster of courses in the SPP; (ii) successfully attempt a written field exam that covers basic concepts in policy analysis and methodology; and (iii) include at least one faculty member from the SPP on their dissertation committee. The course cluster will include courses in policy analysis, public policy processes, applied microeconomics, and applied policy statistics. The cluster of courses required for the minor will naturally differ for students from different departments, since some departments already require their students to take some of the courses required by the public policy minor. For instance, a doctoral student in economics wishing to pursue a minor in public policy will not need to take a course in applied microeconomics or applied policy statistics in the SPP since he/she would have already taken these courses as part of the doctoral program in economics; however, a student in environmental sciences will need to take both of these courses as these are not required by that program. Thus, the cluster of courses required for the Ph.D. minor in public policy will be customized for each individual student. Sample programs for doctoral students in Environmental Sciences, Economics, and Anthropology who wish to add a policy minor to their degrees are shown in Appendix A.

D. Executive MPP Program and Certificate Courses

In addition to the mid-career MPP option (already discussed in A above), which will allow working professionals to stretch the regular two-year MPP over three or four

---

3 Note that, at UCR, the oral qualifying examination committee is composed of five faculty members, one of whom is outside the student's home department. Typically (although not necessarily so), the doctoral dissertation committee, which administers the final (oral) examination to the student, is a subset of the oral qualifying examination committee.
years on a part-time basis, the SPP will also offer an Executive MPP (EMPP) program, which will be a fast-track degree program for experienced and busy professionals working in government, non-profit, and community agencies. The EMPP will be a 15-month program that will include three week-long residential seminars and nine three-day weekend modules (Friday-Sunday once a month during the academic year). Each module will be self-standing, and will cover advanced concepts in policy analysis and methodology. In between the on-campus sessions, students will be given advanced readings and homework assignments which they will have to submit online and which will prepare them for the subsequent module. Owing to its fast-track status, the EMPP will be attractive to senior professionals in the field – typically, senior managers and directors from federal, state and local agencies, city managers, police professionals, senior foundation employees, NGO leaders, and elected officials. It is important to stress that like other public policy schools with EMPP programs, UCR’s EMPP will include the full set of requirements for the MPP in all their rigor.

In addition to the Executive MPP, the SPP will also offer a few non-degree certificate programs for professionals working in or with the public sector who are interested in career-enhancing training outside of a formal degree program. These certificate programs will be offered in specific areas, such as Methods of Policy Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Environmental Policy, among others.

6. Market Demand for Policy Programs

Nationwide, there is vigorous and growing student demand for policy programs at the Master’s level. Indeed, the MPP/MPA is the fastest growing degree program in the United States in the last ten years. The table below shows 2001-05 data on applications, admissions, and enrollments in about 30 comparable MPP/MPA programs in the country. Between 2001 and 2005, the number of applications has increased by 50-60 per cent, even after controlling for the number of graduate programs reporting enrollment statistics to the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM).

Obviously, the main reason for the enrollment increase is a robust labor market for MPP/MPA graduates. MPP/MPA graduates are used to perform a number of functions and services throughout the policy-making process – from feasibility studies, to budget analysis, to implementation, and finally to evaluation. The MPP degree provides a student with a set of research, analytical, and management skills that are transferable across sectors and across issue areas. According to the U.S. News & World Report on Colleges and Universities, students find MPP programs particularly attractive for this reason – the generality of the degree allows professionals to more easily transfer between different positions and careers. According to Newsweek magazine, the Master of Public Policy is a true “generalist degree.” It provides students with public policy analysis and management tools that help to navigate them into and out of different careers and job opportunities.
Admissions and enrollment data in MPP/MPA programs in the United States, 2001-05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total No. of Applications</th>
<th>No. of Admissions Offers</th>
<th>No. Enrolled (Total)</th>
<th>No. Enrolled (Women)</th>
<th>No. Enrolled (Int'l students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td>3,326 (58% of app's)</td>
<td>1,563 (47% of admits)</td>
<td>921 (60% of enrolls)</td>
<td>243 (16% of enroll)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6,913</td>
<td>4,276 (62% of app's)</td>
<td>1,972 (46% of admits)</td>
<td>1,149 (58% of enrolls)</td>
<td>318 (16% of enroll)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>9,928</td>
<td>5,152 (52% of app's)</td>
<td>2,258 (44% of admits)</td>
<td>1,320 (58% of enrolls)</td>
<td>379 (17% of enroll)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10,289</td>
<td>6,070 (59% of app's)</td>
<td>2,588 (43% of admits)</td>
<td>1,570 (61% of enrolls)</td>
<td>358 (14% of enroll)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10,692</td>
<td>6,179 (58% of app's)</td>
<td>2,586 (42% of admits)</td>
<td>1,442 (56% of enrolls)</td>
<td>417 (16% of enroll)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Because of overlapping applicants among the participating institutions, the information in this summary table must be interpreted with care.

Source: Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM)

Among some of the job positions that MPP graduates typically occupy are:

- Policy analyst for state or local governments;
- Advocates for policy interests in the state legislature and in city and county governments;
- Governmental relations officers for private-sector firms;
- Local government administrators, including city/county management and budget and personnel analysts;
- Program administrators in state and local governments and community-based organizations.

The table below shows the trend in MPP/MPA job placements over the last two decades. Local governments absorbed nearly a third of all MPP/MPA graduates in 2000, as they did in 1977. State and federal government agencies account for another 30 percent of graduates. Thus, approximately two-thirds of all MPP/MPA graduates are employed in government agencies of one type or another. In recent years, the non-profit sector has sharply increased its recruitment of policy graduates, and now accounts for 16 percent of all MPP/MPA graduates.

The demand for MPP/MPA graduates is projected to remain strong into the future, particularly as one-half of all current federal employees will be eligible to retire in the next five years, according to the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. At the same time, with the trend in population movement from cities to exurbs, there will be strong growth in the number of smaller towns and communities hiring professional managers.
Trends in placement of MPP/MPA graduates, by sector, 1977-2000 (% of total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Government</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Sector</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Graduate Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to home country</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or Unclassified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Question was not asked this year
** Includes University, International, and Unknown

Source: National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA)

Despite being the largest state in the country, there are only a few institutions in California that offer graduate programs in public policy or public administration. These include five public universities (UC Berkeley, UC Los Angeles, California State University at Sacramento and at San Bernardino, and California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo), two private universities (Pepperdine and University of Southern California), and one non-university entity (RAND). Of these, only four have separate Schools of Public Policy or Affairs – UC Berkeley, UCLA, USC, and Pepperdine. Cal State Sacramento and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo offer the graduate program in public policy through the Department of Public Policy and Administration and the Department of Political Science, respectively. Cal State San Bernardino offers an MPA program through its College of Business and Public Administration. RAND’s Pardee Graduate School only offers a Ph.D. program in public policy – not a MPP program.

More importantly, there is not a single graduate policy program in the Inland Empire region – one of the fastest growing regions in the United States. As noted earlier, this region faces major environmental and social challenges in managing its rapid growth and represents a natural laboratory for studying the effect of population growth and movement on the natural and human ecosystem. The policy problems facing this region are also similar to those faced by many rapidly-growing mega-regions around the world. The absence of a rigorous policy program in this important region is thus a major lacuna in the professional education system. We anticipate very strong demand for the MPP and the doctoral degrees to be offered by UCR’s SPP.

---

* The program offered by the College of Business and Public Administration at Cal State San Bernardino is more focused on public administration than on public policy.
7. **Resources**

**Faculty FTE.** The proposed SPP assumes the allocation of 12 faculty FTE (of which one will be occupied by the dean). Approximately half of these will support faculty located wholly in the SPP while the others will be used for joint appointments with relevant departments or schools. The joint appointments will be made with appropriate departments in areas that will contribute strength to the SPP as well as furthering existing or developing departmental academic plans. Generally the joint appointments should be made at the tenured level. The deployment of faculty FTE will take place over a period of approximately six years.

**Staff FTE.** Based on comparisons with comparable schools, a support staff of 7 FTE is envisioned when the SPP is mature.

**Space.** Options for housing the SPP will initially include existing campus space. The new and release space associated with two College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (CHASS) buildings currently in construction will provide the opportunity to re-program and reassign space within CHASS to SPP on an interim basis. In the long term, the development of the SPP will be accommodated on the West Campus. At present, the campus 2007-12 State-funded Capital Improvement Program includes the West Campus Professional and Graduate Center at a total project cost of $37.5 million. Initial state funding for the design phase of the project is assumed in 2009-10, and State funds for the construction phase are assumed in 2011-12. Occupancy of the facilities is anticipated in 2013-14.

This proposed complex would encompass approximately 51,000 assignable square feet, including space for a School of Public Policy and the Graduate School of Education. In addition, the West Campus Professional and Graduate Center would provide seminar and conference spaces, general assignment class rooms, and support and pre-function areas as shared resources for both Schools.

**Financial projections.** A financial model has been developed for the SPP and is attached in Appendix B. The model is being constructed according to the following key assumptions.

- Fund sources include Marginal Cost of Instruction (MCOI), professional school fees, and revenue generated from executive and other self-supporting programs.
- MCOI and professional school fees associated with SPP students will be allocated to the SPP.
- Revenues generated from SPP executive programs will be allocated to the SPP.
- The SPP will not draw upon campus resources beyond the fund sources noted.

---

5 The Office of Academic Planning and Budget at UCR helped prepare these financial projections.
As Table I in Appendix B demonstrates, the SPP will be self-supporting at full build-out, with both revenue and expenses amounting to approximately $2.9 million per annum. However, in the start-up phase (lasting the first six years), expenses will exceed revenue. The cumulative shortfall during the start-up phase will amount to $3 million. As the chart below shows, tuition from the executive MPP program as well as from professional development courses will contribute a little more than one-quarter of total revenue at full build-out.

The shortfall of $3 million will be met through an active fund-raising effort. Indeed, fund-raising for the SPP is part of the campus’ upcoming comprehensive seven-year capital campaign. It is expected that there would be two types of gifts to the SPP. The first would be a gift of $20 million from a potential donor to name the school. The second would include gifts to support the following programs and buildings:

- Naming opportunity for the building(s) housing the SPP
- Naming opportunities for rooms within the building (classrooms, conference rooms, etc)
- Naming opportunity for the SPP library
- Named library endowed fund $50,000 each
- Chair SPP library librarian $1 million
- Endowed chairs: Dean $3.5 million, Distinguished professorships $1.5 million each, Faculty researchers $1 million each
- Endowed visiting professor (prominent scholars/researchers on a short-term basis) $350,000 each
- Endowed faculty excellence fund (to enable promising junior faculty to do research) $100,000 each
- Named graduate fellowships $200,000 each
- Named distinguished lecturer fund $100,000 each

The UCR fund-raising program has experienced significant growth in the past year. The program expects to achieve 100% growth in funds raised by the end of this fiscal year. Gifts for student support have increased by over 200 donors in this fiscal year alone. Because the School of Public Policy touches so many areas on campus, all of

6 The Office of Development at UCR helped prepare this part of the proposal.
which are growing in their donor bases and in their broad-based philanthropic successes, the campus is confident that we can fund this endeavor.

In addition to the gifts, we expect the proposed School to be actively supported by program research grants from foundations and federal grant agencies. Foundations such as the Haynes, Hewlett, and Packard Foundations make grants for research on major economic, social, and environmental problems of Southern California - areas of important concern for the SPP. Likewise, the National Science Foundation supports research on the "... dynamics of human action and development, as well as knowledge about organizational, cultural, and societal adaptation and change" via its Human and Social Dynamics program grants. Some of the UCR faculty who would be part of the proposed School of Public Policy have already received NSF HSD funding in the past, and we expect them to apply for more funds from this competitive program under the auspices of the SPP. Finally, given its strong interdisciplinary focus, the SPP would be ideally suited to seek funding from the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) program of the NSF, which supports innovative new models for graduate education and training in collaborative scientific research that transcends traditional disciplinary boundaries.
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE PROGRAMS

FOR THE

PH.D. MINOR

IN PUBLIC POLICY
1. Doctoral Degree in Environmental Sciences with a Minor in Public Policy

Students pursuing a doctoral degree in Environmental Sciences currently have to take one course from each of #1 and #2 below and two courses from #3:

1. Transport and Fate of Chemicals
   CHEM 246/ENSC 200/ENTX 200 (Fate and Transport of Chemicals in the Environment)
   ENSC 202 (Principles and Application of Environmental Modeling)

2. Interactions and Cycling in the Biosphere
   ENSC 208/ENTX 208/SWSC 208 (Ecotoxicology)
   ENSC 232/SWSC 232 (Biogeochemistry)

3. Environment Policy and Management
   ENSC 201 (Environmental Management)
   ENSC 206/POSC 206 (Environmental Law and Policy)

Students are also required to enroll in a seminar course CHEM 257/SWSC 257 each quarter and give an oral presentation at the annual student seminar or retreat. The elective courses prescribed by the student's course work advisory committee depend on the research interests of the student.

Students wishing to pursue a doctoral degree in Environmental Sciences with a minor in Public Policy will have to fulfill all of the above requirements and, in addition, take the following four courses offered by the School of Public Policy:

1. Policy Analysis
2. Applied Microeconomics
3. Applied Policy Statistics
4. Conducting Inter-Disciplinary Research

Before the start of their third year, students will also have to successfully complete a written field examination in public policy. At least one member of the student's doctoral dissertation committee will have to be drawn from the faculty of the SPP. Students will have to meet all the existing examination requirements of the Department of Environmental Sciences.
2. Doctoral Degree in Economics with a Minor in Public Policy

Students pursuing a doctoral degree in Economics have to complete the following core sequence:

1. Economic Theory
   ECON 200A, 200B and 200c (Microeconomic Theory)
   ECON 201A, 201B and 201c (Microeconomic Theory)
   ECON 212 (History of Economic Thought) or ECON 213 (Methods in Economic History)

2. Quantitative Methods
   ECON 205A (Econometric Methods I)
   ECON 205B (Econometric Methods II)
   ECON 205C (Econometric Methods III)

   In addition, students have to complete coursework in either two major fields (consisting of three courses each) or one major field and two minor fields (consisting of two courses each). At the end of the first year in the program, students have to take two cumulative examinations – one in microeconomic theory and another in macroeconomic theory. The quantitative methods requirement is satisfied by obtaining a “B” average in the sequences ECON 205A,B,C. Students are also required to enroll in a seminar course ECON 289 in each quarter.

   Students wishing to pursue a doctoral degree in Economics with a minor in Public Policy will have to select Public Policy as a major field and take the following three courses in the SPP:

   1. Policy Analysis
   2. Public Policy Processes
   3. Conducting Inter-Disciplinary Research

   Before the start of their third year, students will also have to successfully complete a written field examination in public policy. At least one member of the student’s doctoral dissertation committee will have to be drawn from the faculty of the SPP. Students will have to meet all the existing examination requirements of the Department of Economics.
3. Doctoral Degree in Anthropology with a Minor in Public Policy

During their first year, doctoral students in anthropology have to complete the year-long seminar sequence, ANTH 200A, ANTH 200B, and ANTH 200C (Core Theory in Anthropology). Students must acquire a basic understanding of three of the four subfields (socio-cultural anthropology, biological anthropology, archaeology, and linguistics). To fulfill the breadth requirement, students must take at least two courses in two of the subfields outside their subfield of specialization. At least one course in each of the two subfields must be a graduate-level course. For students not specializing in socio-cultural anthropology, one of the subfields selected for the breadth requirement must be socio-cultural.

In addition, students must demonstrate competency in a qualitative or quantitative methodological skill such as GIS, lithic analysis, statistics, or hieroglyphic analysis. The choice of methodological skill is generally determined in consultation with the student's advisor.

Students wishing to pursue a doctoral degree in Anthropology with a minor in Public Policy will have to fulfill all of the above requirements and, in addition, take the following three or four courses offered by the School of Public Policy:

1. Policy Analysis
2. Applied Microeconomics
3. Conducting Inter-Disciplinary Research

Before the start of their third year, students will also have to successfully complete a written field examination in public policy. At least one member of the student's doctoral dissertation committee will have to be drawn from the faculty of the SPP. Students will have to meet all the existing examination requirements of the Department of Anthropology.
## UCR School of Public Policy
### Start-Up Revenue and Expenditure ReCAF

(All Costs Stated in FY 2005-06 Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT FTE</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0-$0.00</th>
<th>80.01</th>
<th>135.00</th>
<th>160.50</th>
<th>175.00</th>
<th>180.50</th>
<th>185.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Marginal Growth (100% Allocated to Institution)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$341,195</td>
<td>$847,100</td>
<td>$1,088,073</td>
<td>$1,228,396</td>
<td>$1,270,660</td>
<td>$1,270,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Fees (@MCOI)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$131,670</td>
<td>$282,600</td>
<td>$365,750</td>
<td>$429,640</td>
<td>$424,270</td>
<td>$430,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional School Fees (Net of Financial Aid)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$125,087</td>
<td>$274,972</td>
<td>$349,956</td>
<td>$395,961</td>
<td>$405,956</td>
<td>$410,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive MPP Tuition</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$159,200</td>
<td>$358,200</td>
<td>$437,600</td>
<td>$507,600</td>
<td>$597,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Courses</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$$638,852</td>
<td>$$1,419,873</td>
<td>$$2,233,796</td>
<td>$$2,485,741</td>
<td>$$2,696,324</td>
<td>$$2,925,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$283,600</td>
<td>$430,052</td>
<td>$612,651</td>
<td>$654,679</td>
<td>$804,900</td>
<td>$928,999</td>
<td>$991,600</td>
<td>$1,049,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Operational Support</td>
<td>$283,600</td>
<td>$430,052</td>
<td>$612,651</td>
<td>$654,679</td>
<td>$804,900</td>
<td>$928,999</td>
<td>$991,600</td>
<td>$1,049,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive MPP</td>
<td>$283,600</td>
<td>$430,052</td>
<td>$612,651</td>
<td>$654,679</td>
<td>$804,900</td>
<td>$928,999</td>
<td>$991,600</td>
<td>$1,049,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Courses</td>
<td>$283,600</td>
<td>$430,052</td>
<td>$612,651</td>
<td>$654,679</td>
<td>$804,900</td>
<td>$928,999</td>
<td>$991,600</td>
<td>$1,049,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$283,600</td>
<td>$430,052</td>
<td>$612,651</td>
<td>$654,679</td>
<td>$804,900</td>
<td>$928,999</td>
<td>$991,600</td>
<td>$1,049,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNUAL SURPLUS/(SHORTFALL)</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ (283,600)</td>
<td>$(810,562)</td>
<td>$(681,486)</td>
<td>$(443,048)</td>
<td>$(356,060)</td>
<td>$(207,100)</td>
<td>$(164,216)</td>
<td>$(21,568)</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# UCR School of Public Policy
## Executive Masters in Public Policy Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year Cohorts</th>
<th>Start-up Yr -1</th>
<th>Start-up Yr 0</th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>Y4</th>
<th>Y5</th>
<th>Y6</th>
<th>Yn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 - Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 - Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 - Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 - Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 - Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FTE By Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FTE Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Executive MPP & Professional Development Courses Budget at Full Enrollment

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive MPP Tuition</td>
<td>$597,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Courses</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$797,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Executive MPP Program Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Compensation</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging &amp; Meals</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Officer III</td>
<td>$5,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant III</td>
<td>$9,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Overhead</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Overhead</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Executive MPP Program Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$361,353</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Development Courses Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Compensation</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging &amp; Meals</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Development Courses Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$160,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Program Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Executive MPP Program Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$361,353</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Development Courses Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$160,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$521,353</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$275,647</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT TYPE</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPAID ENROLLMENT BUDGET</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE EDUCATION COSTS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXECUTIVE PROGRAM COSTS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COURSES</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salaries</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COURS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE EDUCATION</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUE</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET REVENUE</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBINED NET REVENUE</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# UCR School of Public Policy
## Student and Faculty FTE Start-up Model

### Enrollment - FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year Cohorts</th>
<th>Start-up Yr 0</th>
<th>Start-up Yr 1</th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>Y4</th>
<th>Y5</th>
<th>Y6</th>
<th>Yn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 - Masters</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 - Doctoral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 - Masters</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 - Doctoral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 - Masters</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 - Doctoral</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 - Masters</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 - Doctoral</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 - Masters</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 - Doctoral</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 - Masters</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 - Doctoral</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total FTE By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year Cohorts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total FTE Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>80.56</th>
<th>135.56</th>
<th>160.56</th>
<th>175.56</th>
<th>180.56</th>
<th>185.56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Marginal Increase

|                        | 80.56   | 55.00   | 25.00         | 15.00         | 5.00          | 5.00          |

### Faculty FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>5.00</th>
<th>8.00</th>
<th>10.00</th>
<th>12.00</th>
<th>12.00</th>
<th>12.00</th>
<th>12.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UCOP FTE Allocation @18.7 -1

|                      | 0     | 0     | 4.31 | 7.25 | 8.59  | 9.39  | 9.66  | 9.92  | 9.92  |

Prepared by the Office of Academic Planning and Budget

10/10/2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Avg Sal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>$201,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Sal &amp; EB</strong></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>$1,206,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Teaching/Research Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>$237,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>$ 38,688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FACULTY</strong></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>$1,481,688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ADMINISTRATION & SUPPORT    |     | $923,466 |          |

<p>| GRAND TOTAL                 | 19.20| $2,405,154 |        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student FTE</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Marginal Growth (100% Allocated to Instruction)</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>8,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Fees (@MCOI)</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>2,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional School Fees (Net of Financial Aid)</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,129,508</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# UCR School of Public Policy
## State Funded Program Start-Up Recap
(All Costs Stated in FY 2005-06 Dollars)

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT FTE</th>
<th>State Marginal Growth (100% Allocated to Instruction)</th>
<th>Educational Fees (@MCOI)</th>
<th>Professional School Fees (Net of Financial Aid)</th>
<th>TOTAL REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$381,195</td>
<td>$638,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$947,100</td>
<td>$292,600</td>
<td>$349,965</td>
<td>$2,129,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,058,675</td>
<td>$365,750</td>
<td>$409,640</td>
<td>$2,058,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,185,940</td>
<td>$409,640</td>
<td>$424,270</td>
<td>$1,987,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,229,295</td>
<td>$438,900</td>
<td>$419,958</td>
<td>$1,871,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,270,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL BUILD-OUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,129,508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>START-UP YEAR</th>
<th>START-UP</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
<th>YEAR 6</th>
<th>FULL BUILD-OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>$707,688</td>
<td>$1,153,188</td>
<td>$1,340,688</td>
<td>$1,544,688</td>
<td>$1,481,088</td>
<td>$1,481,088</td>
<td>$1,481,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Operational Support</td>
<td>$283,500</td>
<td>$430,500</td>
<td>$612,551</td>
<td>$654,679</td>
<td>$864,509</td>
<td>$908,399</td>
<td>$901,899</td>
<td>$901,899</td>
<td>$923,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>$283,500</td>
<td>$810,500</td>
<td>$1,320,442</td>
<td>$1,807,867</td>
<td>$2,205,597</td>
<td>$2,463,087</td>
<td>$2,383,687</td>
<td>$2,383,687</td>
<td>$2,405,164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Surplus/(Shortfall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>START-UP</th>
<th>START-UP</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
<th>YEAR 6</th>
<th>FULL BUILD-OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Surplus/Shortfall</td>
<td>$(283,500)</td>
<td>$(1,094,063)</td>
<td>$(1,775,551)</td>
<td>$(2,163,747)</td>
<td>$(2,594,754)</td>
<td>$(3,070,301)</td>
<td>$(3,395,384)</td>
<td>$(3,649,444)</td>
<td>$(275,646)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## UCR School of Public Policy
### State Funded Program Faculty Start-Up Budgetary Plan

All Costs Stated in FY 2005-06 Dollars

### Permanent Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Build-Out</th>
<th>Start-Up Year 1</th>
<th>Start-Up Year 2</th>
<th>Start-Up Year 3</th>
<th>Start-Up Year 4</th>
<th>Start-Up Year 5</th>
<th>Start-Up Year 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>$ 375,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>$ 180,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>$ 45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Faculty</strong></td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>$ 690,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Employee Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Teaching/Research Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 237,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Assistant - Sal &amp; Fee Remissions</strong></td>
<td>$ 0.80</td>
<td>$ 38,688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 0.80</td>
<td>$ 38,688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Faculty One-Time Funding</strong></td>
<td>$ 401,500</td>
<td>$ 224,000</td>
<td>$ 1,451,688</td>
<td>$ 1,451,688</td>
<td>$ 1,451,688</td>
<td>$ 1,451,688</td>
<td>$ 1,451,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cumulative Permanent Budget

|                       | $ 1,451,688 |

### Student FTE

|                       | 185.56      |

### Grand Total Annual Funding

|                       | $ 1,451,688 |
### UCR SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

#### STATE FUNDED PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL SUPPORT START-UP BUDGETARY PLAN

**(All Costs Stated in FY 2005-06 Dollars)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>START-UP 0</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 1</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 2</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 3</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE $</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>135.56</td>
<td>160.56</td>
<td>175.56</td>
<td>185.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE $</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135.56</td>
<td>185.56</td>
<td>185.56</td>
<td>185.56</td>
<td>235.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ADMINISTRATION OF ACADEMIC DEAN'S OFFICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>START-UP 0</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 1</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 2</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 3</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE $</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE $</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>235,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DEVELOPMENT/COUNSELOR, SR. ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>START-UP 0</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 1</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 2</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 3</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE $</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE $</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ADDITIONAL PERMANENT FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>START-UP 0</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 1</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 2</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 3</th>
<th>スタート-アップ 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE $</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE $</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRAND TOTAL ANNUAL FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>思される 1</th>
<th>思される 2</th>
<th>思される 3</th>
<th>思される 4</th>
<th>思される 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE $</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE $</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Costs transferred to the Self-Supporting programs.
APPENDIX C

LETTERS OF SUPPORT
FROM UCR UNITS
AND FACULTY
April 27, 2007

Dear Professor Deolalikar:

I am pleased to offer this letter of support for the UC Riverside proposed school of public policy.

I have reviewed the proposal and believe you make a compelling case that a school of public policy could flourish at Riverside and tap many resources that are currently untapped or under-utilized.

My view is that your location in Inland Southern California, which is marked by rapid growth and ethnic diversity, presents important economic, environmental and social policy challenges that would be a natural market for students of public policy.

Your proposal makes clear that the proposed School would build on existing UCR strengths in environmental sciences, biotechnology, higher education, the health sciences and social sciences. Done correctly, these could provide substantial building blocks to create a highly competitive institution.

The educational programs you propose are fully consistent with the curricula developed and deployed at major public policy schools across the nation: the tools of policy analysis; quantitative methods, ethics and law, and regional and global policy issues.

Moreover, you propose distinctive areas of specialization. Your emphasis on regional-level policy analysis and policy-making is quite different from normal offerings in state and national issues offered at most institutions. And your proposed connections between environmental and social policy are also refreshing, since most schools treat them as separate sub-fields.
Recently, UCLA Dean Barbara Nelson took the lead to convene a meeting of all public policy programs in California—within the UC system, the Cal state system, and among private institutions (e.g., USC, Pepperdine). This was a highly instructive session that permitted us to compare and contrast our similarities and differences and to identify areas of future cooperation.

I look forward to attending subsequent meetings in which UC Riverside is fully represented.

Sincerely yours and best wishes,

Michael Nacht
Aaron Wildavsky Dean and Professor of Public Policy
April 18, 2007

Professor Anil B. Deolalikar
Director, Public Policy initiative
University of California, Riverside
Sproul Hall 4120
Riverside CA 92521

Dear Prof. Deolalikar:

It is with pleasure that I write to endorse, without any reservations whatsoever, the proposal to establish a School of Public Policy at The University of California, Riverside. I have reviewed the proposal that you sent me and I strongly believe that the School of Public Policy will add unique strength to the spectrum of Schools of Public Policy within the University of California system. The Riverside program will have a strong emphasis on regional-level policy that will differentiate the new program from the existing programs at U.C. Berkeley, U.C.L.A. and U.C. San Diego, and the recently-approved public policy program at U.C. Irvine.

The design for the Riverside program responds to the major environmental and social challenges that the Inland Empire will face as it copes with dramatic growth in its population and the consequent changes in its employment base in the impact on the environment. The program's focus on the interactions between environmental and social policy in a regional context creates added value by building on and enhancing the strengths of existing programs at Riverside in environmental sciences (especially air and water quality and conservation biology) and biotechnology. The program can also draw on Riverside's strengths in health sciences, social sciences (particularly in economics and political science) and in education.

The plan to build on existing strengths at U.C. Riverside is wise and feasible. The UCLA Public Policy Department was created relatively recently (the first students were admitted in the fall of 1996) using a strategy similar to that proposed at Riverside. A task force of existing faculty from various fields, all of whom had policy interests, came together to form the new Department. At UCLA, this approach has had the benefit of forging ongoing linkages between Public Policy and other departments and Schools on campus (e.g., Anderson School of Management, Department of Political Science, UCLA Law
School), and has also fostered interdisciplinary collaborations. The UCLA experience convinces me that the approach you propose to develop the School of Public Policy at Riverside is likely to be highly successful.

The proposal outlines several different degree programs that the School of Public Policy will offer: a Masters in Public Policy (MPP), a Ph.D. in Public Policy and a Ph.D. Minor in Public Policy as well as an Executive MPP Program and Certificate courses.

The structure of the MPP program consists of required core policy skills courses, policy electives, a required thesis and a policy internship, which will be completed between the first and second year of the program. This plan is well-thought out and will provide a rigorous training for MPP students, although students may wish for more than three electives over the course of two years. For example, students interested in education policy might enhance their education-specific credentials if they could substitute courses in the School of Education for courses on population growth, technology and the environment. It is important to build into the budget for this new program sufficient funding to support the services required to support professional masters students. Our experience at UCLA indicates that these students require dedicated career counselors to obtain the types of jobs and internships that they seek. Faculty are not well positioned to provide these services, as they would be for doctoral students. Thus, I see the request for a support staff of seven FTE as well justified.

The plan for coursework for doctoral students also appears very rigorous. The Ph.D. minor in Public Policy is a very creative idea, which should enhance the value of the disciplinary doctorates and further increase linkages between Public Policy faculty and faculty in disciplinary departments. The Executive MPP and Certificate courses are excellent ways to increase the influence of the Public Policy program in the region. However, it may be risky to count on these programs as sources of net revenue to the School, especially in the near term, because these programs will require additional resources to serve these differently scheduled programs.

The demand for public policy programs appears to be strong in Southern California and the proposal presents a convincing argument that this is particularly the case for the Inland Empire. As an example, the UCLA Public Policy program received over 300 applications this year for 50 places. Many of our MPP graduates would like to enroll in a Ph.D. program in Public Policy, but there are only two choices within the L.A. area (RAND, USC). Therefore, the doctoral program at University of California Riverside will be a most welcome development.

In closing, I would like to reiterate my strong support for the proposal to develop a School of Public Policy at U.C. Riverside. The proposal reflects an understanding of what is needed to create a rigorous Public Policy program, offering both MPP and PhD degrees. Adding new faculty with policy expertise to the current strengths of faculty in existing departments at Riverside will result in a strong and unique program. These linkages will not only provide a strong support for the Public Policy program, but will also enrich the offerings of existing departments. The emphasis on regional policy and
the interactions between environmental and social policy are clear strengths. The proposed curriculum is rigorous and will develop students' policy analytics, quantitative skills, ethics sensibilities, as well as regional and global policy perspectives.

I am confident that such a creative and well-thought out program will attract highly qualified graduate students who will contribute to the sustainable growth of the Inland Empire. I wish you every success in this endeavor. I look forward to working with you and your colleagues in the near future.

Sincerely,

Arleen A. Leibowitz
Professor and Chair
April 19, 2007

Professor Anil Deolalikar
University of California - Riverside
The Public Policy Initiative
Sprout Hall 4120
Riverside, CA 92521

Dear Professor Deolalikar,

I am pleased to offer strong support for the proposed School of Public Policy at the University of California - Riverside. The Task Force has developed an excellent proposal that is academically rigorous, has characteristics that distinguish it from most other public policy programs, and complements important strengths of the University. Its courses and degree programs would expand educational and career opportunities for UC-R students. Equally important, the School would provide major benefits to the region that the University serves and to California more broadly.

The Master’s in Public Policy (MPP) curriculum is well thought out. The core courses are typical of those in the cores of high quality MPP programs. By providing students a strong foundation in policy methods, policy analysis and process, and the institutional context of American public policy, the core will provide the broad range of skills graduates need to effectively design and implement public policies. Specializations in substantive policy areas are standard in MPP programs. The four to be offered — in environmental, health, higher education, and social policy — make sense and capitalize on strengths at UC-R. The internships and thesis requirement are also standard in good programs. Requiring students to attend colloquia is not standard, but adds a worthwhile element to the curriculum.

The two other required first year courses (Interactions among population..., and Integrated policy-making...at the regional level) particularly distinguish this program from others. Education that fosters understanding of the complex interrelationships among population change, the environment, social problems, and social policy will be cutting-edge. Training in regional analysis is usually provided in urban planning programs. Making regional analysis and policy-making central to an MPP program is innovative. Moreover, the MPP core will give students interested in regional issues stronger skills and a broader perspective.
than they would typically receive in an urban planning master's program. These 2
courses and the centrality of their issues to the School's intellectual character will
give the School a nationally competitive niche that will attract students from the
region, the state, other parts of the US, and potentially other countries.

The Executive MPP will likely be very attractive to senior professionals in both
public and non-profit agencies. I would suggest holding off on the EMPP for a few
years until the MPP curriculum is implemented and revised and the faculty gets
experience teaching policy students, who tend to have different expectations and
goals than both undergraduates and doctoral students, and offer unique teaching
challenges.

Like the MPP, the Ph.D. component of the proposal is well crafted. The
curriculum of the doctoral program in public policy is rigorous. In bridging analytic
and institutional intellectual traditions, it is much like the PhD curriculum we
recently implemented at the University of Washington. Here, too, the training on
regional analysis offers a competitive niche.

I predict that the Ph.D. minor will be very popular. It is intellectually sound and will
provide a significant competitive advantage for students earning doctorates in
UC-R's social and environmental science departments.

In addition to the quality of its curricula, the regional context and the School's
synergies with current strengths of UC-R bode well for the School's success.
First, given the absence of similar programs in the Inland Empire region and its
rising population, demand for the School's programs is almost certain to be strong
and sustainable. The region's policy challenges will provide a terrific "laboratory"
for research, internships and field education, and offer excellent opportunities for
strengthening ties between the University and local communities.

Second, the focus on population-environment-social policy interactions and
regional policy analysis draws on many existing areas of strength at UC-R. Such
synergies will improve the quality of the School's programs and help attract strong
scholars and students interested in the intersection of public policy and those
areas (e.g. biotechnology, education, environmental and conservation science,
water resources). Thus, the School will enhance other University departments
and programs as well as drawing strength from them.

In sum, I highly support the proposal to establish a school of public policy. The
proposed degree programs are soundly conceived, fill clear educational and public
service needs for the region and state, and will be competitive locally, in
California, and nationally.

I congratulate the Task Force for its excellent proposal. Best wishes as you move
forward to implement it.

Sincerely,

Robert Plotnick
April 24, 2007

Anil B. Deolalikar
Interim Dean, Anderson Graduate School of Management
Director, The Public Policy Initiative
Professor of Economics
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521, USA

School of Public Policy at UC Riverside

Dear Dr. Deolalikar,

Professor John Melack, Associate Dean of our School felt it was appropriate for me to respond to your e-mail.

I am pleased to express fullest support to the plan of creating a School of Public Policy at UCR and wish you all success in pursuing this plan.

The outline of your plan provides strong evidence for the demand a school of public policy can count with. As you rightly say, MPP/MPA education has been the fastest growing degree program in the USA in recent year. I also support the interpretation that there is a strong demand for “generalist degrees”.

Obviously, I am fascinated by your intention to offer as one important option for students an intersection with environmental policy. The strong presence at the Riverside campus of environmental sciences (Department of Environmental Sciences, Air Pollution Research Center, UC Center for Water Resources, Center for Environmental Research and Technology - CERT, and the Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development) make this combination both suggestive and attractive. Let me emphasize that most environmental problems are closely linked with the whole range of public policy questions.

In your plan, I see a convincing intention for high academic excellence, allowing also the creation of an ambitious PhD program.

The only little comment on possible improvements relates to the contents of the intended core curriculum. In the “Institutional Context”, I suggest to offer at least some exposure to the international dimension. At a time at which global warming has moved to the top of environmental concerns, public policy is in need of international cooperation.

With my best wishes and regards also from John Melack

Sincerely

[Signature]

PHONE: (805) 893-7363 • E-MAIL Ernst@bren.ucsb.edu • FAX: (805) 893-7612
April 23, 2007

Professor Anil B. Deolalikar
Director, Public Policy initiative
University of California, Riverside
Sproul Hall 4120
Riverside CA 92521

Dear Prof. Deolalikar:

I am happy to endorse the program in Public Policy proposed for UC Riverside. The program is oriented to policy analysis and will serve to provide students with valuable tools for engaging in the public policy issues in the Inland Empire, in California and in the United States. The program is different enough from the public policy program proposed at UCI that the two programs should be highly complementary.

I wish you luck with this program and look forward to seeing it become a reality.

Sincerely,

Martha S. Feldman
Johnson Chair for Civic Governance and Public Management
Anil B. Deolalikar  
Director, Public Policy Initiative  
Interim Dean, Anderson Graduate School of Management  
University of California, Riverside  
Riverside, CA 92521, USA

Dear Dr. Deolalikar:

I am honored to write to encourage your committee and university to seriously pursue the design and implementation of a new School of Public Policy at the University of California at Riverside. It would seem that the university has already developed significant strength and experience in areas such as the health sciences, environmental sciences, education, and economics, the latter of which has been the basic discipline for existing schools of public policy.

Clearly the Inland Empire is one of the most robust areas in the nation today and there should be such a program housed and nurtured there to meet the growing and complex needs of such a vibrant region.

I feel strongly that there is a need for programs that move beyond mere analysis to develop skills and talent pools of leaders who understand local and regional issues which are increasingly important as we deal with complex challenges of the environment, regional economic development, urban planning, and related issues. (I have enclosed a copy of my recent comments to the deans of public policy programs from throughout California which emphasizes related concerns, in case my comments might be of interest as you design your program, taking advantage of the experience of other programs.)

Be assured of my best wishes in your plans. If I or my faculty and staff can assist in any way I assure you we would be prepared to encourage your new program.

Sincerely,

James R. Wilburn
Dean

Enclosure
Dear Professor Deolalikar,

I write in support of UC Riverside's proposal to build a school of public policy. I believe that such a program will be of enormous benefit to the intellectual life and reputation of the campus, while furthering the vital mission of the University of California to promote the public interest through research. I certainly would welcome the addition of a public policy school and would welcome the chance to work under its auspices.

A school of public policy will benefit in particular the existing social science departments at UCR. In fact, a public policy school could supply a much needed research infrastructure that the social sciences currently lack. At the same time, channeling research through a public policy school would also encourage academic researchers to pursue problem-driven research on matters of pressing practical and public import.

My own work is driven in substantial part by policy concerns. I study and conduct research on the relationship between law and political economy, and focus on the regulation of corporate governance, securities markets, and labor relations in comparative perspective. Each of these areas is enormously important in and structured by considerations of public policy. Indeed, law is largely an output of policy processes and should be constructed and analyzed as such. Likewise, the structure and operation of economic institutions, ranging from corporations to sophisticated markets, are the product of public policies and their means of execution. Just as the study of the regulatory state can be profitably informed by the study of public policy, public policy can benefit from systematic research on the regulatory state.

I am gratified by the strategy of incorporating many current members of the UCR faculty, myself included, in the public policy effort. The plan builds from strength to strength on campus. We can build an impressive policy school roster quickly and cost-effectively. As a consequence, a public policy program is the most feasible professional school to develop in the short-term and within the financial constraints within which we at UCR find ourselves.

Please let me know if there is anything further I can do to be of assistance.

Very truly yours,

John W. Cioffi
Assistant Professor of Political Science
Dear Anil and David,

Thank you for trying to make the School for Public Policy a reality at UCR. From what I remember at the last meeting, issues of environmental management, sustainable growth, and demographic diversity are among the research and teaching priorities for the school. As a faculty member, I look forward to teaching graduate courses in the proposed school and am happy to help out in other ways as well. As you know, the Policy Brief series will be up and running next year. Once established, the SPP would be a perfect home for the journal and other similar endeavors.

Best,
Karthick
June 21, 2006

To whom it may concern:

I write to express my support for the current effort to establish a school of public policy at UC Riverside. My research focuses on the intersection of politics and policy, and I would benefit from having a community of scholars also interested in substantive policy problems. A policy school would help to bring together campus scholars across disciplines who have an interest in substantive policy issues and in the production and implementation of public policy.

My primary research interests focus on the role of policy analysis on lobbying in U.S. congressional politics. My book, The Political Economy of Expertise: Information and Efficiency in American National Politics (University of Michigan Press, 2004), illustrates institutional conditions where interest groups, in attempting to advance their special interests, pressure Congress to harness policy research and expertise to produce legislation. I test a game theoretic model using qualitative data on lobbying over environmental, education, and health care reforms at the national level.

I also have a second major project that focuses on the politics of Medicare and Medicaid. The project explores the conditions that lead lobbyists to use research to support their arguments in committee hearings on the Medicare program, and the conditions that lead members of the committee to attend to research based evidence.

In addition, I teach classes on statistical methods, game theory, public policy analysis, and political institutions, all of which are central to the training of public policy students.
Please let me know if I can lend any further support to the effort to establish a school of public policy at UCR. My office number is 951-827-3833, and my email address is kevin.esterling@ucr.edu. Thank you for considering this letter.

Sincerely,

Kevin M. Esterling
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
June 16, 2006

To: Profs. Anil Deolalikar and David Warren

Fr: Steven T. Bossert, Dean and Professor

Re: Support for the School of Public Policy

The Graduate School of Education (GSOE) strongly supports the establishment of a School of Public Policy.

The GSOE already has an outstanding graduate program (MA and PhD) in Institutional Leadership and Policy Studies that offers courses and research opportunities in areas related to education policy, including the politics of education, educational law, educational finance, and educational policy. Students in the School of Public Policy will be able to enroll in these courses. Faculty members will contribute to the training of graduate students and serve on doctoral committees.

Moreover, the GSOE has just launched the California Community College Collaborative (C4), a joint system-wide effort between the University of California and the California Community College Chancellor’s Office. C4’s mission is to improve the quality of student learning in California’s community colleges by providing influential data-driven policy research that addresses the growing diversity of students and complexity of mission. C4’s policy research and professional development agenda will help prepare faculty and administrators to be leaders in transforming their own institutions and higher education in our State. This program will provide students from the School of Public Policy with faculty and research resources for engaging in higher education policy studies.

The GSOE is also considering creating an undergraduate minor in Education (separate from the track that leads towards a teaching credential) that emphasizes current social and philosophical issues concerning education in today’s world. This academic minor could easily include undergraduate courses from the School of Public Policy and provide students with core knowledge in education policy that would prepare them for the graduate programs in the new School of Public Policy.

The Graduate School of Education is open to the establishment of cooperating appointments and, if the possibility arises, to joint appointments between the School of Public Policy and our Graduate School of Education.

If further elaboration is needed, please let me know.
Dear Anil and David,

I would like to convey my support for the proposed School of Public Policy. I believe the establishment of the SPP will enhance the reputation of UCR, particularly since its focus is on graduate education and training. The school will also benefit Bourns College of Engineering because of its focus on integrated social-environmental issues. In particular, it will help our Center for Environmental Research and Technology (CE-CERT). As you know, a main emphasis of CE-CERT has been to develop partnerships among industry, government, and academia in basis for regulations and policy, a creative source of new technology, and a contributor to a better understanding of the environment. In other words, CE-CERT conducts research that seeks to improve the technical basis for environmental regulations and policy.

I wish you and your colleagues the best, and look forward to collaborating with you.

Best regards,

Reza Abbaschian
Dean, Bourns College of Engineering
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521
CHANCELLOR FRANCE CORDOVA

Re: Proposal for a School of Public Policy at UC Riverside

I am writing to communicate my support for a School of Public Policy at UCR. This proposed school is consistent with the academic plan for the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences -- and has been for several years. A school of public policy will build on existing strengths and contribute to our achieving new distinction in the future.

A School of Public Policy would generate an exciting synergy with core research and instructional programs in CHASS – Political Science, Sociology, Economics, Film & Visual Culture, Global Studies, to name just a few. With the planned major and minor in Public Policy, the connections to the College are clear. The potential for joint hires of outstanding faculty would be an exciting benefit of the School.

The creation of the School of Public Policy will also support the ongoing work of several CHASS research centers, such as the Presley Center for Crime and Justice Studies and the Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development. Pulling together expertise from across the campus will make the School an exciting and innovative addition to the University.

A UCR School of Public Policy is also of crucial importance to UCR graduates and undergraduates. Critical policy issues face our region, our state, our nation, and our world, and a Public Policy School could help us address them. Having a public policy school at UCR would provide an opportunity for students to engage in real-life issues with immediate and apparent impact, making UCR an exciting place for students.

In short, a UCR School of Public Policy seems to me to be an appropriate step in UCR's development. It is consistent with the direction of the campus and will serve both student and faculty interests. I believe that with the energy and vision of our leadership, the commitment to and achievement of diversity, and the strength of our distinguished faculty, we are fully capable of creating a truly outstanding school of public policy, one which not only UCR, but UC and the State of California, can be exceedingly proud. I pledge my very strong support to the effort.

Sincerely,

Joel W. Martin
Interim Dean
Professor of Religious Studies
September 29, 2006

To: Chancellor France Cordova

From: Anil B. Deolalikar, Interim Dean

Re: Support for a UCR School of Public Policy

I am writing to express my strong support for the establishment of a School of Public Policy (SPP) at UCR.

As you can imagine, there are strong synergies between public policy and management. Many business schools, including ours, offer courses on management of non-profit organizations, including government agencies. Indeed, if I am not mistaken, AGSM started out at UCR some thirty years ago as a school of public and business administration!

AGSM is currently in the midst of creating several new programs, such as a self-supporting executive MBA program, a Ph.D. in marketing, and MA programs in financial management and accounting. In addition, the highly-popular undergraduate major in business administration will soon be shifted from CHASS to AGSM. I see the opportunity for AGSM to partner with the SPP in many of these activities. For instance, our faculty could help co-teach specialized courses in the proposed SPP in such areas as management and organization of public entities, application of operations research and decision-making theory to policy-making, government budgeting and accounting, and risk management in public agencies. Our proposed executive MBA program would complement the executive MPP program being proposed by the SPP. Finally, some of the courses required for the undergraduate major in business administration could be shared with those required for the newly-developed public policy major.

AGSM is open to the establishment of cooperating faculty appointments and, if needed, even joint appointments with the SPP.

In closing, I strongly endorse the proposal to establish a School of Public Policy at UCR. There will be significant benefits to AGSM from having such a professional school at UCR. Likewise, the presence of AGSM will facilitate the development of a first-rate public policy program at UCR.
June 23, 2006

TO: Anil Deolalikar, Coordinator
   Public Policy Initiative

FR: Scott Coltrane, Associate Dean
   CHASS

RE: Proposed School of Public Policy

I am pleased to write in support of the proposal to develop a graduate school of public policy at UCR. Many faculty in the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences conduct research on policy-relevant issues and a large number of them have expressed interest in working with the campus to create a new graduate policy school. Not only would such an initiative provide research synergies for faculty in other units on campus, but creating a school of public policy could also benefit the community and the State of California.

We have recently developed an undergraduate major in Public Policy in the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, and adding a graduate component to that initiative in a new professional school is a logical next step. Several faculty in the social sciences would be good candidates for cooperating appointments in such a school and undoubtedly will be willing to work with graduate students in the area. We have expertise in policy related to children and family, health and medicine, criminology, human rights, environmental quality, education, media and culture, and many aspects of civic engagement in a multicultural society. I think the year-long public policy planning initiative that you headed was a good test of the campus’ commitment to the idea of a new policy school. The Town Hall meeting was well attended and I could see new potential collaborations and cooperative relationships being forged. A new policy school would further those collaborations.

Please accept my endorsement of the proposal for a graduate school of Public Policy and let me know what I can do to help plan for its positive review by the campus and by the University of California system.
To: Anil Deolalikar  
Director, Public Policy Initiative

From: Georgia Warnke  
Professor of Philosophy and  
Associate Dean, College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences

Re: School of Public Policy

I am writing to express my support for the proposed establishment of a Graduate School of Public Policy at UCR. Under Professor Deolalikar's leadership, the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences has recently initiated a public policy major and minor at the undergraduate level. One of the distinctive traits of this new program is its attention to normative issues. While many public policy professionals simply assume the adequacy of a utilitarian ethical approach, UCR’s program understands the need to attach questions of public policy to broader moral and ethical reflection.

This attention to normative concerns will also distinguish the Graduate School of Public Policy. The gain for the campus will be cross-discipline research not only between the School and the Social Sciences but also between the School and the Humanities. Philosophers and cultural critics will have the opportunity to discuss real life issues in the environment, health care policy and the like while students in the School of Public Policy will be able to take advantage of on-going reflection on questions of moral action, moral psychology and questions of the good life.

UCR’s location in a diverse section of the country and in a region undergoing all the growing pains of suburban sprawl and environmental worries, the establishment of a School of Public Policy is a natural step for us. I endorse the proposal whole-heartedly.
September 27, 2006

TO: Anil Deolalikar, Director of the Public Policy Initiative
FR: David Fairris, Associate Dean of Student Academic Affairs
RE: School of Public Policy

This note is to strongly endorse efforts to establish a School of Public Policy at UCR. Developments over the past year or so have convinced me that this is an excellent idea and that the time is right. There is a critical mass of faculty interested in affiliating with such a "school." External grants will be far easier to attain when interdisciplinary groups of researchers apply under the auspices of an interdisciplinary unit such as a "school." Finally, a School of Public Policy at UCR would be the perfect vehicle for addressing one of the Chancellor’s primary goals – namely, fostering greater links with, and contributing to, the local community through the involvement of students and faculty.

I support the idea wholeheartedly.
June 13, 2006

Anil B. Deolalikar
University of California, Riverside

Dear Professor Deolalikar:

The Center for Conservation Biology strongly supports the proposal to establish a School of Public Policy for the University of California, Riverside. Since its inception in 1998, the Center for Conservation Biology has been involved in the several activities related to threatened and endangered species in the region. These include mitigation efforts for many governmental and private organizations. Our largest outreach program involves the review of the Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and developing monitoring protocols for the MSHCP and the Coachella Valley MSHCP, which encompasses hundreds of thousands of acres, almost two hundred species, and billions of dollars.

I initially was interested in this idea as a part of our outreach program here at the CCB. We have intentionally avoided taking a public stand on issues, or addressing the specifics of policy decisions. Our goals here at the Center are to provide the science only, and allow the policies to develop as they may. Nevertheless, the biggest problem with this approach is that the staff at all level of government, from local to federal, is comprised of individuals with degrees in planning (spatial structure of roads, suburbs, sewers, etc.), economics, or other social-policy- oriented disciplines. All of these levels of staffing are almost completely unprepared for the enormous conservation and environmental implications to their decisions. Even with a few "scientists" on staff (generally MA-level folks- such as Fish and Game, or Forest Service)- they are rarely really part of the real decision process. In addition, there are many NGOs, think-tanks, and other groups advising on policy. Again, they have expertise on either social science, or on science, but without any training on integrating the two.

From an outreach perspective for the CCB, when we present the needs to the planners, generally they have no idea if or how to proceed, because they have little or no understanding of even the basic issues. I don't believe that having the CCB comment directly is a good idea, but having an entity like the proposed school would make a good linkage.

The focal areas are appropriate for our programs, both topically and regionally. Every development between the San Gabriel Mountains and La Paz Mexico will run into an endangered species issue. At the CCB, we have expertise in the topic and the region. We are expanding our research program into the Baja California Peninsula in collaboration with research stations in the States comprising Baja California. Our collaborations with the San Diego Zoological Society (managers of the Wild Animal park- and CRES- the Center for Research on Endangered Species) expand our local research and outreach program, also within the region identified for concentration.

I do believe that we could develop courses appropriate for The School of Public Policy in environmental and conservation issues. I especially also support the idea of a minor in policy for CNAS students, from the School, upon taking a couple of courses in policy and economics focused toward our students. This could well strengthen their vitae as they apply for the highly competitive positions in teaching and research institutions.
Finally, I strongly believe that there is a large open opportunity to train students who would work in areas from governmental to NGOs. We desperately need people who can synthesize these topics. It may well be a good opportunity for an IGERT, or even provide foundation support to our college as well as the School.

I hope this helps, and do not hesitate to contact me for further information.

Sincerely yours,

Michael F. Allen  
Professor, Departments of Plant Pathology and Biology  
Director, Center for Conservation Biology  
Chair, Department of Plant Pathology
Dear David et al.:

Thanks for sharing the proposal. It is skillfully drafted.

A) I think that what's been written regarding the Biotech Impacts Center is accurate. I anticipate some limited synergies between that Center and the new School. Whether or not the School stimulates stronger interactions depends on the faculty who become involved and how they become involved.

B) As a scientist involved in research that informs the evolution of policy, I would be pleased to contribute to the School to the extent that such contributions are of mutual benefit.

Norm Ellstrand
Professor of Genetics
Dear Anil,

I am writing in my capacity as Director of the Blakely Center to emphasize the potential synergistic relations between the Center and the proposed School of Public Policy. In short, the potential relationships are many and deep. The Blakely Center is concerned with suburban communities as the primary repository of the rapid population growth that characterizes our region but many others as well nationally and internationally. We are concerned with the broad range of impacts of population growth, from the social/economic/political aspects to the environmental impacts. As a research center the Blakely Center does not offer degrees or courses, but we would welcome the addition of faculty members in a variety of departments as well as the policy school itself with whom we can work to develop the policy aspects of the issues that face us.

You can count on the Blakely Center to be a very active partner with the policy school!

David

David H. Warren
Director, Edward J. Blakely Center
for Sustainable Suburban Development
June 5, 2006

Dr. David Warren  
Director, Edward J. Blakely Center  
for Sustainable Suburban Development

Dear Dave,

I am strongly supportive of a new School of Public Policy for UCR. My own research has shifted largely into water resources management, and I would benefit greatly from the presence of a policy school. I am currently working on a book on global water issues and plan to develop a course on the subject matter. I also am involved in research on modeling the fate of the Salton Sea, and estimating the pollutant loading of California watersheds, both topics with huge policy implications.

UCR has significant strength in environmentally related disciplines, and could well become a major leader in environmental policy research. The presence of a school of public policy will assist greatly in achieving that goal.

Sincerely,

Bill Jury  
Distinguished Professor of Soil Physics
DATE: June 15, 2006

TO: David Warren

FROM: Matthew Barth, Director
College of Engineering-Center for Environmental Research and Technology

RE: Establishment of a School of Public Policy

Dear Dave:

The Bourns College of Engineering-Center for Environmental Research and Technology (CE-CERT) strongly supports the establishment of a School of Public Policy at UC Riverside. There have been many instances in the past where having such a School would benefit our activities here at CE-CERT. As you know, we carryout a variety of transportation, air quality, and energy projects, many of which have a direct public policy implication.

The contribution of our Center to the Public Policy School is twofold:

1) **Teaching:** we can help support teaching in the Public Policy curriculum. Many of the courses our faculty teach could potentially be cross-listed in the proposed Master's and Ph.D. programs. In addition, we will also be able to direct dissertation work and to contribute to the advanced training of graduate students.

2) **Research:** there are clear synergies between the research agendas of many of our faculty and the socio-economic-environmental issues that are in the domain of a Public Policy School. Indeed, most faculty at our Center will be able to contribute to the development of the research mission of the Public Policy School.

We are open to the establishment of cooperating appointments and, if the need arises, to joint appointments between the SPP and our Center.

If you need further elaboration, please let me know. With best wishes,

Matthew Barth  
Professor, Electrical Engineering
From: "Shankar Mahalingam" <shankar@engr.ucr.edu>
To: "Anil B. Deolalikar" <anil.deolalikar@ucr.edu>
Cc: "David H. Warren" <david.warren@ucr.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 11:25 AM
Subject: RE: New version of SPP proposal

Anil/Dave,

The proposal looks very good. I am impressed with the level of thought apparent in the proposal. It is apparent that such a school is necessary and timely. I endorse it fully and wish you success in getting it approved.

-Shankar

Shankar Mahalingam
Department of Mechanical Engineering
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521
Tele: 1 (909) 787 2134
Fax: 1 (909) 787 2899
e-mail: shankar.mahalingam@ucr.edu
web page: http://www.me.ucr.edu/people/mahalingam.html
June 5, 2006

Chancellor France Cordova
University of California, Riverside

Dear Chancellor Cordova:

This is to express my support for the establishment of a School of Public Policy at the University of California, Riverside. I have read the UCR proposal and find it quite convincing as regards the need for a top-flight public policy school in the Inland Empire, and the comparative advantages for the region and the state that would accrue from establishing this new professional school in Riverside. The Inland Empire has experienced extraordinary population and economic growth in the last decade. A Public Policy School at UCR would also be of great benefit to my own research on global governance, regional and global environmental issues and the formation of institutions of world citizenship. Environmental policy scholars will be valuable colleagues and I very much want to collaborate with them in academic programs and research projects.

The environmental, international and regional aspects of the Public Policy School proposal are uniquely fitted to benefit from existing UCR strengths, and would greatly enhance the educational and research goals of the University by attracting talented students and faculty. The commitment and support that have already been demonstrated for a UCR Public Policy School are impressive, and the plans for generating additional resources are sound. I appreciate the massive effort that leaders on the UCR faculty have invested in this initiative.

Sincerely,

Christopher Chase-Dunn
Distinguished Professor of Sociology and
Director of the Institute for Research on World-Systems
To Whom It May Concern,

I wanted to express my strong support for the School of Public Policy proposal. I think this school promises to be highly beneficial to UCR our students, and the surrounding communities. It would provide important opportunities for our students, many of whom have a strong interest in improving policy and serving the community and help to ensure that governmental and non-profit organizations in the area, both of which have rising demands for labor, have a highly qualified applicant pool. The proposed school also has a number of innovative dimensions, such as its transnational and regional focus, and its emphasis on the interface between the environment and society. This makes it stand out from other public policy schools in California.

Since many of the courses that I teach are relevant to policy issues, I have a strong interest in teaching in this area and would be happy to offer courses for the school if needed.

All the best,
Ellen Reese
Department of Sociology
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521--0419
Phone: 951-827-2930
Fax: 951-827-3330
Dear Dave,

I am very attracted to the possibility of a School of Public Policy at UCR and have valued the opportunity to be involved in some of the preliminary planning and discussions. My own research in health care management and delivery is inherently linked to public policy decisions, and I would be very interested in contributing to the formal development of a School of Public Policy, through research collaborations and teaching/course development.

Kathleen
Toby Miller, Departments of English, Women’s Studies, and Sociology

Thanks Dave

I would like a formal affiliation with such a school, as I regard citizenship and media and cultural policy as key questions for such an endeavor—and these subjects are important to my own research. I also believe UCR is well-placed to make a serious intervention in both internationalizing public policy and, at the same time, making it locally relevant, given the internationalism of our area’s demography.

In terms of my own relevant work, it would include the following books:

The Well-Tempered Self: Citizenship, Culture, and the Postmodern Subject (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993)
Cultural Policy (Sage Publications, 2002 – with George Yúdice)
Critical Cultural Policy Studies: A Reader (Blackwell, 2003 – edited with Justin Lewis)
Cultural Citizenship: Cosmopolitanism, Consumerism, and Television in a Neoliberal Age (Temple University Press, in press)
Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, for the Department of Economics

David and Anil,

The Department of Economics supports the establishment of a School of Public Policy. The contribution of our department to the PP School is twofold:

(i) teaching in the PP curriculum: we will offer the foundational Economics courses in the proposed Master's and Ph.D. programs; we will also be able to direct dissertation work and to contribute to the advanced training of graduate students.

(ii) research: there are clear synergies between the research agendas of many of our faculty and the socio-economic issues that are in the domain of a PP School. It can be said that every faculty in the Economics department will be able to contribute to the development of the research mission of the PP School. From the economic theorists, who build the micro and macro foundational analysis, to the applied economists, who deal with focused questions, i.e. labor, development, growth, health, nutrition, etc, to the econometricians, who develop empirical methods, all of us can potentially contribute to the mission of a PP school.

We are open to the establishment of cooperating appointments and, if the need arises, to joint appointments between PP and Economics.

If you need further elaboration, please let me know. With best wishes,

Gloria
Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Department of Economics

Dave and Anil,

I would like to express my interest in a formal affiliation with the Public Policy School. My contribution to the School will be for the most part within the area of quantitative methods applied to environmental data. The theoretical strand of my research agenda deals with the development of econometric methodology, which is fundamental to the understanding and modeling of economic data. The applied strand deals with the modeling and evaluation of uncertainty and risk. Though this is an area with wide applications to the analysis of financial markets, I currently have some research projects that aim to bring similar concepts of risk assessment to the modeling of environmental data, which is one of the area do distinctiveness of the PP School.

With best wishes,

Gloria
Anil and David,

Consider this note to be an expression of my willingness to participate wholeheartedly in the proposed School of Public Policy. I am already serving as co-editor of the newly launched policy brief series "Policy Matters" which will presumably be housed in the Public Policy School. In addition, I teach three policy related economic electives (Health Economics, Labor Economics, and Women in the Economy) which could easily become courses in a policy school. I have also developed a graduate level empirical methods course which would work well in a policy school.

Finally I conduct applied research and may be able to support research assistants from a Masters program in public policy.

Sincerely,

Mindy Marks
Anil and David,

This is to inform you about my interest and commitment to participate in the initiative to create a new school of public policy.

Best,
Roberto Sanchez
June 6, 2006

Professor David Warren
Director, Edward J. Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development
B110 Highlander Hall
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521

Dear Dr. Warren:

I am pleased to offer my support and the support of the Department of Psychology for the planned UCR School of Public Policy. Such a School could be an important asset to each of many academic departments as well as the campus as a whole, through useful collaborations between researchers interested in basic issues and experts on the implications of those issues for public policy. The Department of Psychology can participate through its research interests in areas such as aging, child development, and cultural influences on thinking, learning, and behavior. The plan for the School presents a clear and compelling vision and I look forward to seeing its fruition.

Sincerely,

David C. Funder
Professor and Chair
June 8, 2006

David H. Warren, Director
Edward J. Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521

Dear David:

I am writing in support of the proposal to create a School of Public Policy at The University of California, Riverside. This School would clearly be in alignment with the Presley Center for Crime and Justice Studies. One of the primary objectives of the Center since its inception has been informing legal policy and criminal justice practice in California by new developments in criminological research. This translational component of the Presley Center mission surely falls squarely in the public policy arena, meaning a connection between the Center and the School of Public Policy could be a natural fit.

Moreover, I am the chair of the Criminology and Socio-Legal Studies specialization in the Department of Sociology, and many of the graduate students in this specialization work in the Presley Center or the CDC funded Academic Center of Excellence in Youth Violence Prevention, which is a partner with the Presley Center and the Department of Psychology. I can easily envision graduate students in the School of Public Policy having an emphasis in crime and criminal justice and thus taking courses in this specialization. We could entertain the possibility of creating a special course focusing on criminal justice policy and perhaps explore ways of providing internships, independent study or research assistantships if available for graduate students in Public Policy through the Presley Center.

In short, a relationship between the Presley Center and the School of Public Policy could be mutually advantageous and possibly generate synergies for criminal justice policy relevant scholarship that otherwise would not be possible.

Best wishes in your effort.

Sincerely,

Kirk R. Williams
Professor of Sociology and Acting Director
David H. Warren, Director  
Edward J. Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development  
University of California, Riverside  
Riverside, CA 92521  

Dear David:

I am writing in support of the proposal to create a School of Public Policy at The University of California, Riverside. This School would clearly be in alignment with the Presley Center for Crime and Justice Studies. One of the primary objectives of the Center since its inception has been informing legal policy and criminal justice practice in California by new developments in criminological research. This component of the Presley Center mission surely falls squarely in the public policy arena, meaning a connection between the Center and the School of Public Policy could be a natural fit.

Moreover, as a member of the Criminology and Socio-Legal Studies specialization committee in the Department of Sociology, I know that many of the graduate students in this specialization work in the Presley Center or the CDC funded Academic Center of Excellence in Youth Violence Prevention, which is a partner with the Presley Center and the Department of Psychology. I can easily envision graduate students in the School of Public Policy having an emphasis in crime and criminal justice and thus taking courses in this specialization. We could entertain the possibility of creating a special course focusing on criminal justice policy and perhaps explore ways of providing internships, independent study or research assistantships if available for graduate students in Public Policy through the Presley Center.

In short, a relationship between the Presley Center and the School of Public Policy could be mutually advantageous and possibly generate synergies for criminal justice policy relevant scholarship that otherwise would not be possible.

Best wishes in your effort.

Sincerely,

Robert Nash Parker  
Professor of Sociology and Director
DATE: June 15, 2006

TO: David H. Warren
    Director, Edward J. Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development

Anil Deolalikar
Professor of Economics

FROM: Marylynn V. Yates
      Professor of Environmental Microbiology
      Chair, Department of Environmental Sciences

RE: Proposal for a School of Public Policy

The faculty of the Department of Environmental Sciences support the proposal to develop a School of Public Policy at UCR. Several of the faculty conduct research that is directly applicable to the development of policy; many of them have worked directly with policy makers on various topics related to environmental issues.

The Department is currently recruiting a director for a Center for Water Quality Science and Policy. The vision of the Center is as follows, "The center will become the focal point for faculty research in water science and policy, the catalyst for developing collaborative projects, and a conduit to recruit graduate students and to reach out to stakeholders. It will be a clearinghouse where policy and management decision-makers and the public may obtain objective, science-based information on water-related issues impacting the region, state, nation, and world." Clearly, the expertise that the faculty in a School of Public Policy would bring to the campus would be invaluable to the Center.

The Department has recently submitted a proposal to reorganize the Graduate Program in Environmental Sciences. In this proposal, students will be able to choose from a number of filed areas; one of these is Environmental and Natural Resource Economics and Policy. There are clear potential opportunities to co-direct graduates students in this field area, as well as others within the program.

Clearly, the establishment of a School of Public Policy would be of benefit to the research and educational programs of the Department of Environmental Sciences. I would be happy to elaborate on any of these areas if you wish.
June 6, 2006

Professor Anil Deolalikar
Department of Economics
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521

Dear Professor Deolalikar:

I am writing this letter in reference to the proposed School of Public Policy here at the University of California, Riverside. I would like it to be known that I am very interested in participating in this School on a variety of levels if possible. First, if there are opportunities to be affiliated with the School in a manner similar to that of Cooperating Faculty between departments, I would very much be interested in such. Second, I would be interested in serving as an advisor to students in this School since I believe many of their interests would overlap with my research areas. Third, I believe that some of the courses I currently teach or plan to teach in the future would serve the general interests of those students in the School who have an interest in public policy issues surrounding the environment. Finally, and at the very least, I would certainly be interested in collaborating and interacting with the faculty in such a program since much, if not most, of my research is motivated by public policy concerns.

Sincerely,

Kurt A. Schwabe
Associate Professor of Environmental Economics and Policy
Department of Environmental Sciences
Ken Baerenklau, Department of Environmental Sciences

A School of Public Policy (SPP) is needed to provide a bridge between the research capabilities of UCR and the practical needs of rapidly growing communities in inland Southern California and beyond. My own research in the field of environmental and natural resource economics—agricultural pollution control, water resource management, habitat conservation, outdoor recreation—clearly would contribute to and benefit from the SPP. I would seek to engage the faculty and students of the SPP on applied research topics in these areas. I also anticipate there would be significant collaboration on these and other environmental topics between the SPP and CE-CERT, APRC, CCB, the Water Resources Center, the Blakely Center, and my colleagues in the Department of Environmental Sciences. For these reasons I fully support the proposal to develop the SPP at UCR.
Hi Anil and David,

I am sending this email to support the development of a School of Public Policy. In the brainstorming sessions you have held and proposal, there are clear links to interdisciplinary participation from multiple departments including ours for both courses and research opportunities. As part of the environmental and resource economics group, I'll participate where there is potential to overlap on mutual topics of interest such as water. There are multiple dimensions of the water problem, including both human and ecosystem impacts; both water quantity and water quality issues; both problems and solutions; and both science, policy and management.

Because of our environmental and resource economics group interest in hiring a Risk Analyst/Health Economist, and a Land Use Planner, there's potential that these positions and the courses which could be taught by individuals tied with the Public Policy School and study of policy and research issues in public health and land management. Analysis of risk is becoming an increasingly important component of regulatory policymaking for environmental and other issues.

Sincerely,

Linda Fernandez
Bowman Cutter, Department of Environmental Sciences

June 13, 2006

To Whom it May Concern

I am very interested in the proposed School of Public Policy. If it comes to fruition, I plan to seek an adjunct or other affiliation with the school. Also, I believe I could recruit graduate students to the school and serve on the committees of other graduate students. Finally, I plan on at least cross-listing a course I currently teach. I would also like to explore offering a new course that would be suited to policy master's or Ph.D. students.

I believe the policy school is a critical link in developing UCR because it will be a forum where students interested in topics that cross disciplinary borders will be able to interact with a number of faculty from different department. This will seed new research and grants that will benefit both the policy school as well as existing department. Finally, the research initiatives generated by the policy school will raise the public profile of UCR because policy initiatives are more visible in the press and community than most other types of research.

Sincerely,

W Bowman Cutter
Assistant Professor,
Department of Environmental Sciences
Gentlemen:

I am delighted to offer a statement of interest and support to the School of Public Policy, and I look forward to advising you in the future as the School moves closer to realization.

With very best regards,

D. Charles Whitney
April 17, 2007

To: Professor Anil Deolalikar, Director, Public Policy Initiative

From: Shaun Bowler, Professor and Interim Chair

Re: Support for the School of Public Policy

This letter is written in support of the proposed School of Public Policy at UCR and the specific proposal advanced by the campus public policy task force.

The Inland Empire region encompasses a series of problems and issues that promise to be at the forefront of social and political issues nationwide in the next generation. Indeed the problems of crowding, of infrastructure development, and of resource (especially environmental resource) management promise to be at the forefront of issues facing many areas worldwide.

The setting up of a school of public policy dedicated to research and training in addressing these issues thus presents an exciting opportunity for any campus, and UCR is ideally placed to be a site for such a school.

What is especially exciting about the current proposal is that it seeks to go well beyond many traditional models for public policy programs. Many policy schools and policy programs provide a means of credentialing civil servants interested in professional advancement. This, more traditional, vocational, approach offers little in the way of research synergy or standing. Furthermore, this region already has several such programs available. But the proposed UCR policy school stands from this model out by setting ambitious sights on an innovative cross-disciplinary issue driven research agenda that, if implemented, will move it well beyond the programs aimed at simply providing vocational credentials and should establish it as a school of distinction.

As a discipline, political science clearly has many interests in public policy. Not all scholars of public policy are political scientists but the study of policy at a theoretical level is central to political science as a discipline. And the emphasis upon research and theory building in the proposal for a policy school is an especially appealing one. Faculty members in political science thus welcome the possibilities for collaborative research and teaching with new, research oriented, colleagues in a public policy school. A school of public policy with a strong commitment to high quality research and high quality faculty hires would offer many opportunities for synergy with members of the political science department.

Because the proposed school does not seek to replicate existing schools within the region but, instead, promises to pursue an innovative, research driven profile with a concern for quality, the Department of Political Science strongly supports the proposal.
Department of Economics

April 19, 2007

Professor Anil Deolalikar
Director, Public Policy Initiative
UC Riverside

Dear Anil:

The Department of Economics enthusiastically supports the establishment of a School of Public Policy at UCR.

We see our department's contribution to the proposed School as two-fold:

(i) **Teaching in the Public Policy Curriculum**: Our department can offer the foundational economics courses in the Master's and Ph.D. programs in the proposed School. Our faculty will also be able to participate in (and supervise, if necessary) dissertation committees and to contribute to the advanced training of graduate students in public policy.

(ii) **Research**: There are clear synergies between the research agendas of many of our faculty and the mission of the proposed School of Public Policy. Indeed, almost every faculty member in the Department of Economics – from the economic theorists, who study issues of resource allocation, social choice and welfare, and public economics, to the econometricians and applied economists, who apply empirical tools to evaluate the impact of public policies on economic and social outcomes – will be able to contribute to the development of the research mission of the proposed School.

Additionally, the Department is open to the idea of cooperating and, if the need arises, joint faculty appointments between the School of Public Policy and the Department of Economics.

Sincerely,

Gloria González-Rivera
Chair and Professor
April 17, 2007

Professor Anil Deolalikar
Director, Public Policy Initiative
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521

Dear Anil:

The Department of Anthropology enthusiastically supports the creation and establishment of a School of Public Policy at UCR. We have read the excellent proposal that the campus-wide task force on public policy has put together, and we wish to lend our strong support to the initiative.

The proposed School will provide instruction in areas that are not duplicated in other departments at UCR, although there is the kind of overlapping of interests that will allow fruitful collaborative training and research with faculty and students in other departments. Anthropology has several faculty members whose research – whether in globalization, health inequalities, or social and gender stratification – has important bearings on and implications for public policy. There is also a good deal of interest in public policy issues among our graduate students. This is why our department worked with your task force in suggesting a doctoral program in anthropology with a minor in public policy. I am glad that this proposed program is presented in Appendix A of the proposal.

The School you propose establishing is a highly-focused one that will strive to do a few things very well rather than everything in not so thorough a manner. The niche areas that the proposed School will focus on – environment, health, and higher education – are not only significant policy problems facing the Inland Empire region but also represent the faculty strengths at UCR. This is appropriate for a growing school with a small and distinguished faculty. It is a sound decision that will help the School to achieve national prominence quickly.

In addition to joint programs (such as the minor in public policy for our doctoral students), the Department of Anthropology is open to the idea of cooperating or shared faculty appointments with the School of Public Policy. We can discuss the specifics of these appointments at a later date.

In closing, let me reiterate the Department of Anthropology’s enthusiastic support for the proposed School of Public Policy. Please let me know if we can be of assistance in other ways.

Sincerely,

Thomas C. Patterson
Distinguished Professor and Chair
DATE: June 15, 2006

TO: David H. Warren
    Director, Edward J. Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development

    Anil Deolalikar
    Professor of Economics

FROM: Marylynn V. Yates
      Professor of Environmental Microbiology
      Chair, Department of Environmental Sciences

RE: Proposal for a School of Public Policy

The faculty of the Department of Environmental Sciences support the proposal to develop a School of Public Policy at UCR. Several of the faculty conduct research that is directly applicable to the development of policy; many of them have worked directly with policy makers on various topics related to environmental issues.

The Department is currently recruiting a director for a Center for Water Quality Science and Policy. The vision of the Center is as follows, “The center will become the focal point for faculty research in water science and policy, the catalyst for developing collaborative projects, and a conduit to recruit graduate students and to reach out to stakeholders. It will be a clearinghouse where policy and management decision-makers and the public may obtain objective, science-based information on water-related issues impacting the region, state, nation, and world.” Clearly, the expertise that the faculty in a School of Public Policy would bring to the campus would be invaluable to the Center.

The Department has recently submitted a proposal to reorganize the Graduate Program in Environmental Sciences. In this proposal, students will be able to choose from a number of filed areas; one of these is Environmental and Natural Resource Economics and Policy. There are clear potential opportunities to co-direct graduates students in this field area, as well as others within the program.

Clearly, the establishment of a School of Public Policy would be of benefit to the research and educational programs of the Department of Environmental Sciences. I would be happy to elaborate on any of these areas if you wish.
Dear Anil:

The Department of Sociology would like to endorse strongly the proposal prepared by the campus-wide task force on public policy to set up a School of Public Policy at UCR.

Most of the faculty in the Department of Sociology work in research areas that are germane to public policy. Indeed, it is difficult to think of research in sociology that does not have a public policy angle to it. In our own graduate program, at least six of the seven specializations we offer - criminology and socio-legal studies, family and social psychology, gender studies, organizations and institutions, political economy and global social change, and race and class inequality - all have obvious policy dimensions.

There are many ways in which the Department of Sociology could participate with the proposed School of Public Policy. Our faculty could serve as committee members on doctoral dissertations in the proposed School. Faculty in the Department and in the School could collaborate on joint research projects in such diverse areas as global development, education policy, and criminology, to name a few. There might even be opportunities for joint or shared faculty appointments between the two units. The important point to emphasize is that there are numerous possibilities of cooperation and collaboration between the Department of Sociology and the School of Public Policy.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that the faculty of the Department of Sociology enthusiastically support the establishment of a public policy school at UCR.

Sincerely,

Adalberto Aguirre, Jr.
Professor and Chair

Aa:bm
April 19, 2007

Professor Anil Deolalikar  
Director, Public Policy Initiative  
University of California, Riverside  
Riverside, CA 92521  

Dear Anil:

The Department of Philosophy would like to express its strong support for the proposed School of Public Policy at UCR.

We have read the proposal prepared by the campus task force on public policy, and wholeheartedly endorse its recommendations. A distinctive feature of the proposed curriculum for public policy is its attention to normative issues. While many public-policy professionals simply assume the adequacy of a utilitarian ethical approach, the proposed program for the School of Public Policy understands the need to attach questions of public policy to broader moral and ethical reflection.

The gain for the campus from the establishment of the proposed School will be cross-disciplinary research not only between Public Policy and the Social Sciences but also between Public Policy and the Humanities. Philosophers and cultural critics will have the opportunity to discuss real-world issues in environmental, health care, and social policy, while students in the School of Public Policy will be able to take advantage of on-going research in moral and political philosophy (focusing on questions about right conduct, moral psychology, social justice, and the nature of the good human life).

The Department of Philosophy has several faculty members whose research has a public policy dimension. These faculty members would be able to serve on dissertation committees of graduate students in the policy school. Some of our department courses could be offered as electives to students undertaking a master’s program in public policy. In addition, if the need arose, the Department would be happy to discuss the possibility of cooperating or shared faculty appointments with the School of Public Policy.
Let me close by reiterating the Department of Philosophy's keen support for the proposed School of Public Policy at UCR. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Andrews Reath
Professor and Chair
June 6, 2006

Professor David Warren
Director, Edward J. Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development
B110 Highlander Hall
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521

Dear Dr. Warren:

I am pleased to offer my support and the support of the Department of Psychology for the planned UCR School of Public Policy. Such a School could be an important asset to each of many academic departments as well as the campus as a whole, through useful collaborations between researchers interested in basic issues and experts on the implications of those issues for public policy. The Department of Psychology can participate through its research interests in areas such as aging, child development, and cultural influences on thinking, learning, and behavior. The plan for the School presents a clear and compelling vision and I look forward to seeing its fruition.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David C. Funder
Professor and Chair
April 17, 2007

Professor Anil Deolalikar  
Director, Public Policy Initiative 
UC Riverside 
Riverside, CA 92521

Dear Anil:

The faculty of the Department of Management and Marketing lend their unqualified support to the creation of a School of Public Policy at UCR. We believe that the proposed School will have significant synergies with the research and teaching of several of our faculty.

Obviously, the principles of management apply as much to the public and non-government sector as to private enterprises. In addition, management subfields such as strategy, corporate governance, entrepreneurship, and e-commerce – in which our departmental faculty specialize – all have important public policy dimensions. For instance, one of most important challenges facing policy-makers today is how to respond to the growing commercialization of the Internet – a niche area of research in our department.

I see many potential opportunities for collaboration between the proposed School of Public Policy and the Department of Management and Marketing in AGSM. There are a range of topics on which our faculty could conduct joint research with faculty in the proposed School. Students in the MPP program could cross-register for MBA courses that AGSM offers in organizational theory; business, government and society; human resource management; and management science. Faculty from both Schools could serve as committee members on doctoral dissertations of students in either School. Further down the road, our department would be interested in exploring cooperating or even joint faculty appointments with the School of Public Policy.

Please accept our department’s strong endorsement of the proposal for a School of Public Policy at UCR, and let me know what I can do to help plan for its positive review by the campus and by the UC Office of the President.

Sincerely,

Donna L. Hoffman  
Chancellor’s Chair, Professor of Marketing, and Department Chair
April 20, 2007

Anil B. Deolalikar  
Interim Dean A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management  
University of California, Riverside  
900 University Ave  
Riverside, CA 92521

Dear Dean Deolalikar:

Writing as Mayor (1994-) and UCR Political Science Professor (1965-), I support the proposed UCR School of Public Policy. I find the arguments for the School to be compelling and persuasive.

There is an extraordinary disconnect between university research and local public policy. The School of Public Policy offers one important step to lessen this disconnect for Riverside, and the Inland Empire.

Somehow the best of research from the University of California needs to help frame and understand the policy choices before local governments. I especially applaud the focus on the intersection of social and environmental policy. Sustainability will increasingly become a primary focus of local government. (Riverside recently committed itself to becoming a Clean & Green City.)

Also, the 21st Century will be the century of regions. Our economic success and quality of life cannot be separated from the dynamics and problems of the region. There is no major focus/study of public policy anywhere in the Inland Empire. It is time for such a School.

Kudos to all those at UCR who will make this happen. It will help define the campus, and the region. Research, dialogue, and students are needed, and soon!

Sincerely,

"Ronald O. Loveridge"

Mayor
22nd February 2007

Anil B. Deolalikar  
Director, Public Policy Initiative  
Co-Chair of Task Force on Establishment of a School of Public Policy  
University of California, Riverside  
Riverside, CA 92521  
BY FAX: 714 649 5260  

Dear Anil:  

Re: Proposed School of Public Policy at UC Riverside  

I am delighted to see the excellent proposal for a new School of Public Policy at the University of California, Riverside. This new school for me is a dream come true. As you and many others know, I have been a champion of public policy schools focusing on regional issues and regional policy for more than two decades. My background in urban policy internationally and my long service as a Dean and Department Chair provide me with an unusual perspective on the potential for this new school. So, it is exciting to see this approach in the proposal for a new school at UCR. The proposed school will fill not just a local but an international void for a school of this scope. No place in the nation could be better for such a School of Public Policy than Riverside because of the fast growing urban environment of the region.

The Public Policy School will have a very strong base as well with the very fine work that is going on in environmental affairs on the campus as well as with the Blakely Center. These strong building blocks combined with the social science programs already on campus mean the School of Public Policy fits very well into the campus and the future of the region. You can be sure I will do everything I can to insure its success.

Yours sincerely  

Edward J. Blakely  
Executive Director, Office of Recovery Management
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Letter of Support from Norm King, Executive Director, San Bernardino County Transportation Commission, San Bernardino, CA

David H. Warren
The Public Policy Initiative
University of California, Riverside

Dear David:

I am delighted to have the opportunity to express my support for the proposed School of Public Policy for UCR.

My perspective on public policy is from the view of a 35 year career of public management in the Inland Empire, as a city manager in three communities and director of a county-wide transportation commission.

Over the years I have counseled many students and younger employees about career advancement. Often missing in their own academic background was a broad understanding about how the relationships among various aspects of economics, politics, demography, and environmental factors play out at the local and regional level. Too many times I have had to recommend that they look to universities outside the Inland Empire for programs which in my opinion begin to meet this need.

In addition increasingly there is a need for local elected officials and local appointed officials to better understand the same relations mentioned above. Having a School of Public Policy at UCR would enhance the ability of the University to have an impact on those most involved in dealing with the cross-cutting influences and issues which we face.

Finally, having occasionally taught public policy courses I believe the UC Riverside proposal focuses on the right objectives and purposes to maximize the investment in this endeavor.

I am most hopeful that the School will soon be established.

Sincerely yours,

Norman R. King
Director, Leonard University Transportation Center
California State University, San Bernardino
February 16, 2007
To: David Warren and Anil Deolalikar
From: Jane Block
Re: Proposed UCR School of Public Policy

This letter is to express my support for the proposal to create a School of Public Policy at UCR. As a community activist/citizen volunteer; board member, president and/or founder of non-profit organizations; and appointed member of public boards, commissions and committees at the city, county, state, and UCR and statewide University of California levels, I have long been involved with a wide range of public policy issues. These include environmental issues and issues involving women and children. In these various activities, I have become acquainted with the need for academic expertise and research on a number of topics, some of which are especially relevant to the Inland Empire.

For example, consider the problem of preservation of habitat for rare species in rapidly developing areas such as western Riverside County. The issue involved ad hoc efforts to preserve particular species at the cost of frequent sudden disruption of normal development whenever such a species was declared endangered or threatened, versus a coordinated effort to preserve large swathes of land that is habitat for a range of species. I served on Riverside County’s Multiple Species Habitat Plan Advisory Committee, which assisted in the crafting of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan. The Committee’s work involved a number of competing interests, including those of the building industry, agriculture, environmentalists, and private landowners. This work was benefited greatly by the contacts I was able to establish with UCR academics in environmental disciplines. Since the establishment of UCR’s Center for Conservation Biology, the use and exchange of information from such experts has been greatly facilitated.

The availability of academic expertise in the public policy arena, together with the use of public policy graduate student interns, will enable elected officials and advisory bodies to arrive at better-informed decisions.

I strongly support the establishment of the School of Public Policy, and look forward to the positive effects this will have on civic life in our region.

Sincerely,

Jane Block
424 Two Trees Rd, Riverside, CA 92507
(951) 683-0304, jblock29@charter.net
April 18, 2007

Professor Anil B. Deolalikar  
Director, Public Policy initiative  
University of California, Riverside  
Sproul Hall 4120  
Riverside CA 92521

Dear Prof. Deolalikar:

It is with pleasure that I write to endorse, without any reservations whatsoever, the proposal to establish a School of Public Policy at The University of California, Riverside. I have reviewed the proposal that you sent me and I strongly believe that the School of Public Policy will add unique strength to the spectrum of Schools of Public Policy within the University of California system. The Riverside program will have a strong emphasis on regional-level policy that will differentiate the new program from the existing programs at U.C. Berkeley, U.C.L.A. and U.C. San Diego, and the recently-approved public policy program at U.C. Irvine.

The design for the Riverside program responds to the major environmental and social challenges that the Inland Empire will face as it copes with dramatic growth in its population and the consequent changes in its employment base in the impact on the environment. The program’s focus on the interactions between environmental and social policy in a regional context creates added value by building on and enhancing the strengths of existing programs at Riverside in environmental sciences (especially air and water quality and conservation biology) and biotechnology. The program can also draw on Riverside’s strengths in health sciences, social sciences (particularly in economics and political science) and in education.

The plan to build on existing strengths at U.C. Riverside is wise and feasible. The UCLA Public Policy Department was created relatively recently (the first students were admitted in the fall of 1996) using a strategy similar to that proposed at Riverside. A task force of existing faculty from various fields, all of whom had policy interests, came together to form the new Department. At UCLA, this approach has had the benefit of forging ongoing linkages between Public Policy and other departments and Schools on campus (e.g., Anderson School of Management, Department of Political Science, UCLA Law
School), and has also fostered interdisciplinary collaborations. The UCLA experience convinces me that the approach you propose to develop the School of Public Policy at Riverside is likely to be highly successful.

The proposal outlines several different degree programs that the School of Public Policy will offer: a Masters in Public Policy (MPP), a Ph.D. in Public Policy and a Ph.D. Minor in Public Policy as well as an Executive MPP Program and Certificate courses.

The structure of the MPP program consists of required core policy skills courses, policy electives, a required thesis and a policy internship, which will be completed between the first and second year of the program. This plan is well-thought out and will provide a rigorous training for MPP students, although students may wish for more than three electives over the course of two years. For example, students interested in education policy might enhance their education-specific credentials if they could substitute courses in the School of Education for courses on population growth, technology and the environment. It is important to build into the budget for this new program sufficient funding to support the services required to support professional masters students. Our experience at UCLA indicates that these students require dedicated career counselors to obtain the types of jobs and internships that they seek. Faculty are not well positioned to provide these services, as they would be for doctoral students. Thus, I see the request for a support staff of seven FTE as well justified.

The plan for coursework for doctoral students also appears very rigorous. The Ph.D. minor in Public Policy is a very creative idea, which should enhance the value of the disciplinary doctorates and further increase linkages between Public Policy faculty and faculty in disciplinary departments. The Executive MPP and Certificate courses are excellent ways to increase the influence of the Public Policy program in the region. However, it may be risky to count on these programs as sources of net revenue to the School, especially in the near term, because these programs will require additional resources to serve these differently scheduled programs.

The demand for public policy programs appears to be strong in Southern California and the proposal presents a convincing argument that this is particularly the case for the Inland Empire. As an example, the UCLA Public Policy program received over 300 applications this year for 50 places. Many of our MPP graduates would like to enroll in a Ph.D. program in Public Policy, but there are only two choices within the L.A. area (RAND, USC). Therefore, the doctoral program at University of California Riverside will be a most welcome development.

In closing, I would like to reiterate my strong support for the proposal to develop a School of Public Policy at U.C. Riverside. The proposal reflects an understanding of what is needed to create a rigorous Public Policy program, offering both MPP and PhD degrees. Adding new faculty with policy expertise to the current strengths of faculty in existing departments at Riverside will result in a strong and unique program. These linkages will not only provide a strong support for the Public Policy program, but will also enrich the offerings of existing departments. The emphasis on regional policy and
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the interactions between environmental and social policy are clear strengths. The proposed curriculum is rigorous and will develop students' policy analytics, quantitative skills, ethics sensibilities, as well as regional and global policy perspectives.

I am confident that such a creative and well-thought out program will attract highly qualified graduate students who will contribute to the sustainable growth of the Inland Empire. I wish you every success in this endeavor. I look forward to working with you and your colleagues in the near future.

Sincerely,

Arleen A. Leibowitz
Professor and Chair
Dear Professor Deolalikar,

I am pleased to offer strong support for the proposed School of Public Policy at the University of California - Riverside. The Task Force has developed an excellent proposal that is academically rigorous, has characteristics that distinguish it from most other public policy programs, and complements important strengths of the University. Its courses and degree programs would expand educational and career opportunities for UC-R students. Equally important, the School would provide major benefits to the region that the University serves and to California more broadly.

The Master's in Public Policy (MPP) curriculum is well thought out. The core courses are typical of those in the cores of high quality MPP programs. By providing students a strong foundation in policy methods, policy analysis and process, and the institutional context of American public policy, the core will provide the broad range of skills graduates need to effectively design and implement public policies. Specializations in substantive policy areas are standard in MPP programs. The four to be offered — in environmental, health, higher education, and social policy — make sense and capitalize on strengths at UC-R. The internships and thesis requirement are also standard in good programs. Requiring students to attend colloquia is not standard, but adds a worthwhile element to the curriculum.

The two other required first year courses (Interactions among population..., and Integrated policy-making...at the regional level) particularly distinguish this program from others. Education that fosters understanding of the complex interrelationships among population change, the environment, social problems, and social policy will be cutting-edge. Training in regional analysis is usually provided in urban planning programs. Making regional analysis and policy-making central to an MPP program is innovative. Moreover, the MPP core will give students interested in regional issues stronger skills and a broader perspective.
than they would typically receive in an urban planning master's program. These 2 courses and the centrality of their issues to the School's intellectual character will give the School a nationally competitive niche that will attract students from the region, the state, other parts of the US, and potentially other countries.

The Executive MPP will likely be very attractive to senior professionals in both public and non-profit agencies. I would suggest holding off on the EMPP for a few years until the MPP curriculum is implemented and revised and the faculty gets experience teaching policy students, who tend to have different expectations and goals than both undergraduates and doctoral students, and offer unique teaching challenges.

Like the MPP, the Ph.D. component of the proposal is well crafted. The curriculum of the doctoral program in public policy is rigorous. In bridging analytic and institutional intellectual traditions, it is much like the PhD curriculum we recently implemented at the University of Washington. Here, too, the training on regional analysis offers a competitive niche.

I predict that the Ph.D. minor will be very popular. It is intellectually sound and will provide a significant competitive advantage for students earning doctorates in UC-R's social and environmental science departments.

In addition to the quality of its curricula, the regional context and the School's synergies with current strengths of UC-R bode well for the School's success. First, given the absence of similar programs in the Inland Empire region and its rising population, demand for the School's programs is almost certain to be strong and sustainable. The region's policy challenges will provide a terrific "laboratory" for research, internships and field education, and offer excellent opportunities for strengthening ties between the University and local communities.

Second, the focus on population-environment-social policy interactions and regional policy analysis draws on many existing areas of strength at UC-R. Such synergies will improve the quality of the School's programs and help attract strong scholars and students interested in the intersection of public policy and those areas (e.g. biotechnology, education, environmental and conservation science, water resources). Thus, the School will enhance other University departments and programs as well as drawing strength from them.

In sum, I highly support the proposal to establish a school of public policy. The proposed degree programs are soundly conceived, fill clear educational and public service needs for the region and state, and will be competitive locally, in California, and nationally.

I congratulate the Task Force for its excellent proposal. Best wishes as you move forward to implement it.

Sincerely,

Robert Plotnick

Robert Plotnick
April 21, 2007

To: Professor Anil Deolalikar, Director, Public Policy Initiative

From: Vijaya Ramachandran, Assistant Professor and Chair, International Policy and Development Track, Georgetown Public Policy Institute

Re: School of Public Policy at UC Riverside

I am writing to express my strong support for the proposal to create a School of Public Policy at UC-Riverside. The proposal written by the task force is excellent and highlights several very important points:

1. There is undoubtedly a large and under-served market for public policy education in the Inland Southern California area. This part of the country faces some very important challenges, including the environmental and resource-use problems created by rapid growth.

2. The proposal emphasizes cross-disciplinary research and study rather than the usual set of courses on policy-making and policy analysis. This approach is both innovative and extremely useful. It will equip the students in the program with a set of skills that are drawn from a variety of disciplines. This will in turn give them a unique advantage in tackling key policy problems in Southern California and beyond. It is rarely the case that the solution to a policy problem is found in the application of a single discipline. In particular, the requirements for the first year of study in the MPP are very innovative and will equip students very well to understand the complex interactions of the environment, the social structure, and the process of economic development. The PhD program is also well thought-out and distinguishes itself from other available PhD programs in public policy with its emphasis on cross-disciplinary thinking.
3. It is clear from the proposal that the public policy school will draw on several existing resources at UC-Riverside. This is important in that the program will quickly become a very strong one, rather than relying heavily on a process of external faculty recruitment which can be time consuming. The availability of strong faculty and existing research programs in environmental sciences, biotechnology, higher education, health sciences and social sciences is a huge advantage to giving the policy school a strong start.

4. The school’s proposed specializations—in regional-level policy-making and in the interaction between environmental and social policy—is very different than most public policy schools. It distinguishes this program from other programs and will serve a very important role in creating a new generation of policy analysts who are equipped to serve the region as best as they can.

5. In sum, I believe that the school and its programs will rapidly become very competitive, both regionally and nationally. Curricula focusing on regional development are relatively rare in public policy schools and my sense is that this will become very popular with students in California and beyond. The task force has done an excellent job putting together this proposal and I wish them all success.
ADDITIONAL LETTERS OF SUPPORT
Memorandum

19 April 2007

TO: Chair Cogswell

FR: Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Wartella

RE: Administration Support of School of Public Policy Proposal

The UCR administration enthusiastically supports the creation and establishment of a School of Public Policy at UCR. The Public Policy Initiative is a truly bottom-up initiative; it arose as a result of faculty across campus proposing a venue for discussing and disseminating their policy-related research. The Public Policy Initiative has had an active interdisciplinary seminar series during the past two years. The Initiative has resulted in the creation of an undergraduate major and minor in public policy in CHASS. To support these activities, the Chancellor and I appointed a campus-wide task force in 2005-06, chaired by Anil Deolalikar and David Warren, to explore the establishment of a School of Public Policy at UCR. The task force has prepared a strong and innovative proposal that the administration strongly supports. In fact, the administration is committed to provide 12 new faculty FTEs to launch the School. In addition, I am confident that several colleges and schools on campus will be forthcoming with additional joint or shared faculty appointments with the proposed School in the coming years.

The Chancellor and I believe that the School will help fulfill several of the key Chancellorial goals set for UCR. The establishment of this School is one of the highest priorities of the administration.
April 20, 2007

Anil B. Deolalikar
Department of Economics

Dear Anil:

I strongly support the proposed School of Public Policy at UCR. There are a number of areas in the natural and agricultural sciences of our College that would benefit from collaborations with such a school. Several of our faculty have already expressed interest in interacting with the school in areas that impact their research, outreach, and educational programs. These include our five natural resource economists in the Department of Environmental Sciences, Mike Allen and others in the Center for Conservation Biology, and Norm Ellstrand, Director of the Biotechnology Impacts Center. We have also been working with the College of Engineering on a new initiative to develop solutions to the impacts of climate change on agricultural sustainability through genomics and other technologies. Implementation of these and other agricultural technologies will increasingly require attention to public policy issues.

There are many other current and future areas of science within CNAS that I am sure could benefit from the presence of a School for Public Policy. It is a natural for UCR as a land-grant university with an obligation for public engagement.

Sincerely,

Donald A. Cooksey
Interim Dean
Professor, Plant Pathology
May 24, 2007

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL
CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE

and

ROBERT R. RUSSELL
CHAIR, GRADUATE COUNCIL

FROM: ADALBERTO AGUIRRE, JR.
CHAIR, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

SUBJ: PROPOSAL FOR A SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

Earlier today, on May 22nd, the Department of Sociology met to discuss the proposal for a School of Public Policy (SPP) at UCR. The SPP proposal was distributed to all faculty members last week, so that they could come to the meeting with any questions, concerns or objections. In addition to concerned faculty in the department, Dean Stephen Cullenberg and Anil Deolalikar were also present at the meeting.

There was strong endorsement of the SPP proposal at the faculty meeting. It was noted that several faculty in the department were engaged in policy-related research and that the proposed School would add significant value to this research. Faculty also expressed interest in the possibility of the department offering a minor in Sociology to doctoral students in the School of Public Policy and the proposed School offering a minor in Public Policy to graduate students in Sociology. Finally, the faculty supported the idea of cooperating and/or joint faculty appointments with the proposed School on a case-by-case basis.

In closing, the faculty of the Department of Sociology enthusiastically support the proposal to establish a School of Public Policy at UCR.
May 22, 2007

To: Tom Cogswell, Chair, Academic Senate
    Robert Russell, Chair, Graduate Council

From: Shaun Bowler, Professor and Interim Chair

Re: Support for the School of Public Policy

Faculty of the Department of Political Science met on May 21st to discuss the proposal for a School of Public Policy (SPP). This meeting followed a series of earlier meetings and discussion on the establishment of the SPP in which department faculty took part.

Department faculty fully support the establishment of the new school and wish it every success. The department looks forward to co-operating with the SPP in undergraduate and graduate teaching, graduate student supervision, and joint research on a range of policy issues. We believe that the new school will create new, synergistic opportunities for our department faculty.

Department faculty anticipate being closely involved in the development of SPP and would like to be consulted as the School moves forward in designing coursework and curriculum and in helping maintain and sustain the quality of the programme. Political Science, as a department, is also supportive of the idea of arranging cooperative and even joint appointments between the department and SPP.

Department faculty look forward to helping build and support a high-quality and high-profile public policy school at UCR. Faculty believe the school offers many exciting opportunities for research and teaching that conform well to their interests: faculty are persuaded that the policy school offers an opportunity for a rewarding academic partnership.
May 22, 2007

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL  
CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE

and

ROBERT R. RUSSELL  
CHAIR, GRADUATE COUNCIL

FROM: GLORIA GONZÁLEZ-RIVERA  
CHAIR, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

RE: PROPOSAL FOR A SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY AT UCR

The faculty of the department of Economics met on May 18th to discuss the latest proposal for a School of Public Policy (SPP) at UCR. I am happy to report that the department supports the establishment of the new school. We welcome the opportunities that should arise from serving as program faculty, teaching and supervising graduate students, and collaborating in interdisciplinary research projects within the prospective programs. The research and teaching interests of the Economics faculty when aligned with those of SPP will create a rich environment for academic interactions, which will enhance further the reputation of UCR.

To maintain the quality of the prospective courses in Economics within SPP and to ensure the success of our prospective graduate students interested in a minor in public policy, the faculty of the department of Economics expects to be fully involved in the planning and development of the SPP curriculum, especially the programs that relate to Economics. We welcome the establishment of cooperating appointments for the current Economics faculty, and we expect that, if there is a mutually-felt need for joint faculty appointments between Economics and SPP, the search and the appointment process for these appointments will conform to the standard recruitment procedures of the Department of Economics.

In summary, we support the development of a school with rigorous public policy programs, which in turn will contribute to the enrichment of our existing programs.

We look forward to an exciting collaboration.
DATE: May 18, 2007

TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair, Academic Senate
    Robert R. Russell, Chair, Graduate Council

FROM: Marylynn V. Yates, Chair

RE: Proposal for a School of Public Policy at UCR

At 8 a.m. on Friday, May 18, the faculty in the Department of Environmental Sciences had a meeting to discuss the proposal for a School of Public Policy. In addition to the department faculty, Tom Cogswell, Scott Coltrane and Anil Deolalikar were present to answer any substantive or procedural questions related to the proposal.

The faculty were very supportive of the proposed School, and felt that the addition of this School would help to strengthen our own graduate program. We informed Drs. Cogswell, Coltrane, and Deolalikar that we have proposed substantive changes to the graduate program in Environmental Sciences that will facilitate the pursuit of a Ph.D. in Environmental Sciences with a minor in public policy (as discussed in the Appendix of the proposal).

Some faculty pointed out that the joint program was a niche program that would initially appeal only to the few students in environmental sciences, especially those with an interest in the natural sciences aspects of environmental sciences, who wish to pursue careers in public agencies (e.g., the EPA) and who therefore wish to acquire the tools and the language of policy analysts and researchers. Others indicated that as awareness of the program grew, so would interest and enrollment.

There was also a great deal of discussion about how a policy program that truly offered an integration of environmental and social policy issues could quickly establish a niche and a name for UCR’s School of Public Policy. As pointed out by one of our faculty, there are very few policy programs that offer such integration. At the same time, many timely policy issues, such as global warming, water and air quality, and conservation of species, lend themselves well to (and indeed require) an integrated economic-social-science approach. However, some faculty felt that to achieve true integration, it would be important for the School to offer courses on cross-disciplinary policy themes jointly taught by environmental science and social science faculty.

There was also some discussion in the faculty meeting about joint appointments between the School and other Colleges and Schools on campus. There was general agreement that joint appointments should be limited to senior faculty. In addition, it was felt that joint appointments could apply not only to new faculty being recruited but also to existing faculty on campus who wished to move part of their appointment to the SPP.

In summary, there was general agreement among the faculty present that the establishment of a School of Public Policy at UCR would benefit the campus and the Department of Environmental Sciences in many ways and that the department should lend its unqualified support to this proposal.
November 7, 2007

TO: Members, Riverside Division
   Academic Senate

FM: Advisory Committee

RE: BOARS “UC Freshman Eligibility Reform Proposal"

After considering the responses from the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee on Preparatory Education and the Undergraduate Council, the Advisory Committee had a lengthy discussion of the BOARS “UC Freshman Eligibility Reform Proposal,” and in the end, it resolved on the following.

The Advisory Committee heartily agreed with BOARS on the urgent necessity of a fundamental reconsideration of the current admission criterion and it congratulated BOARS for its innovative approach of suggesting an entirely new system rather than tinkering with the existing one. The plan, as the Undergraduate Council rightly noted, attempted to “move the identification of the top 12.5% of high-school graduates from the blunt instruments of eligibility to the more discriminating tools of selection.”

Towards that end, the Advisory Committee endorsed BOARS’ position that the mere taking of SAT II (regardless of performance) is an inappropriate, not to say absurd, criterion for admission; indeed several members were stunned to learn that it is currently used in the eligibility process. Thus to BOARS’ proposal to eliminate this requirement, the Advisory Committee can only echo Voltaire – écrasez l’infame!

For their boldness and their willingness to think outside of the standard bureaucratic box, the members of BOARS deserved a vote of thanks. Nevertheless the members of the Advisory Committee also echoed the concerns of the other Riverside committees and concluded, with considerable regret, that they could not endorse the current proposal. At the same time, the Advisory Committee members wish to encourage BOARS to rethink its plan in light of the attached reports. In particular, they would like BOARS to consider the following issues.

While the proposal does an excellent job in detailing the many problems with the status quo, it is markedly less persuasive in arguing how the new proposal would correct them. The anxieties that individuals inevitably feel over leaping into the dark are only compounded when a venerable institution ponders such a radical move. Consequently, the revised proposal should address this matter with as much precision as possible, sketching out in particular how the new proposal would result in a different freshmen class.
Furthermore the Advisory Committee was baffled by the need to abandon the traditional guarantee on admission to the top 1/8th of a graduating class. Admittedly, this does not guarantee admission to the UC campus of a student’s choice, but it remains a valuable public relations tool for a system whose PR toolbox can at times seems rather empty. While everyone expressed a willingness to consider an alternate admissions process, all became uneasy when the new plan appeared to include a unilateral repudiation of the 1960 Master Plan. While this document may have its flaws, it certainly has served the citizens of the state – and the university itself – exceedingly well. In the circumstances, the revision should avoid the slightest hint of altering the Master Plan. Perhaps the way out of this difficulty might be for the revision to stress its alignment with the Master Plan and to argue that the new scheme will simply alter the definition of the top 1/8th. The Advisory Committee also suggests that while the proposal is undergoing revision, BOARS should immediately implement a major change to the existing system. On any UC campus, up to 6% of the first year class can be admitted by exception even though they are not formally eligible for admission. This entry way into the university needs to be highlighted in all admissions materials, which should carefully rehearse the various criteria that students could mention in their application for admission by exception. In short, let us cast a floodlight in this accession point, which is currently somewhat shrouded in bureaucratic shadows.

Again, the Advisory Committee congratulates the members of BOARS for their diligence and encourages them to revise this potentially invaluable proposal.

T. Cogswell, Chair (Department of History)
W. P. Beyermann, Vice Chair (Department of Physics and Astronomy)
J. E. Allison, (Department of Political Science)
W. A. Ashmore, (Department of Anthropology)
C. Chase-Dunn, (Department of Sociology)
J. M. Ganim, (Department of English)
P. E. Green, (Department of Ethnic Studies)
J. Halebian, (Department of Management and Marketing)
A. S. Jacobs, (Department of Religious Studies)
D. Jeske, (Department of Statistics)
P. Keller, (Department of Philosophy)
M. L. Molle, (Department of Computer Science & Engineering)
A. W. Norman, (Department of Biochemistry)
L. P. Nunney, (Department of Biology)
T. C. Patterson, (Department of Anthropology)
R. A. Redak, (Department of Entomology)
P. M. Sadler, (Department of Earth Sciences)
T. Shapiro, (Department of Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages)
K. Vafai, (Department of Mechanical Engineering)
F. M. Vahid, (Department of Computer Science & Engineering)
October 31, 2007

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR  
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: PIERRE KELLER, CHAIR  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: PROPOSAL TO REFORM UC’S FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY POLICY

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) discussed at length the BOARS proposal to reform UC’s freshman eligibility policy during two of its recent meetings (10/17 and 10/24). The committee feels that the language of the proposal is insufficiently clear for implementation. The proposal argues that comprehensive review should determine admission to a UC campus, but dispenses with comprehensive review for those students defined as belonging to the top 4% of their class. A guarantee of UC admission is thus defined not just independently of UC eligibility, but also of the outcome of comprehensive review. The result is at best a confusing, and arguably a confused set of admission criteria lacking a coherent rationale (see below for more on this). Finally, we have concerns about the timeline under consideration for adoption of the proposal. The suggestion that the ETR policy ought to apply to freshmen first enrolling in the fall of 2009 is precipitous if students now in secondary school are not to be “adversely affected” by the proposed changes.

Under the proposal, some students are offered a guarantee of admission independently of and prior to any comprehensive review of their merits; according to “the BOARS Eligibility-Reform Proposal: Q and A,” the proposal would guarantee admission to those students whose honor weighted GPA in the UC approved college-preparatory curriculum (“a-g” courses) place them in the top 4% of their class. The offer of guaranteed admission to these students undercuts the rationale behind a comprehensive review of a student’s file. The proposal notes that “the continued reliance on a simple index for eligibility” with rigid minimums is “educationally unjustifiable”. This line of thought leads the proposal to recommend a comprehensive review of students by each campus to determine their eligibility for admission. But given the reservations about a “simple index of eligibility” expressed in the proposal, it is hard to see why a simple index guaranteeing admission would be appropriate.

The comparison with private institutions that engage in comprehensive review suggests that comprehensive review must include the whole applicant pool. Dividing the applicant pool into those who are guaranteed admission to UC and those who are eligible for comprehensive review by individual UC campuses leads to a confusing distinction between two different kinds of eligibility criteria. As such, it could easily be misconstrued as an effort by the UC system to move away from its guarantee to admit the top 12.5% of California students towards a more restrictive guarantee of admission only for the top 4% of students. If all students are subject to comprehensive review, this perceptual problem disappears, since those students admitted in the comprehensive review process define the top 12.5% of students, as UC understands that notion.

The Committee on Educational Policy will be happy to revisit the proposal if and when it is suitably modified and revised. Please let us know if you have any questions for us concerning our response to the proposal.
Dear Tom:

Here is a brief summary of points made by Committee on Preparatory Education members about the BOARS eligibility proposal after your visit. Members present at the meeting generally agreed with the proposal's claim that the current method of determining UC eligibility is problematic, especially in its use of SAT II exams. Current eligibility standards do warrant revision. However, members also expressed concern about the apparent ambiguity of the policy BOARS is proposing as an alternative. By switching from a guarantee of admission if certain criteria are met to a guarantee only of "consideration for admission through comprehensive review," UC would be making the admissions process less transparent and hence more likely to arouse the public's suspicions of bias. Some might see it as a sneaky way to get around the ban on race-based admissions; others as a way for UC to be even more elitist than before. Given a public already anxious about UC's now-notorious lack of transparency in administrative salaries, this move toward lack of transparency in another area would seem to be particularly ill-timed. Members were not persuaded by the proposal's claim that this new approach would bring "much-needed clarity to the public message conveyed by UC admissions" promised in Section 5B (paragraph 2), fearing instead that the reverse would occur. One member expressed fear that the proposal would be interpreted by the public as "repudiating the compact"; another called the proposal "disingenuous" and "naive."

In addition, one committee member recommended that BOARS consider having students apply to UC as a whole, rather than to individual campuses. Any of the nine campuses could then admit the student and make a bid to recruit him/her. This might be especially helpful to campuses (such as UCR) that currently get fewer applications than Berkeley and UCLA. Other members of the committee liked this idea. We encourage the Advisory Committee to consider recommending it to BOARS.

Another area of concern for our committee was the possibly negative consequences for math preparation if applicants only have to complete 11 out of 15 a-g courses by the end of 11th grade. Would more students take only the minimum requirement for math (i.e. through Algebra II) rather than the recommended (but not required) four courses (i.e. through pre-calculus)? UCR cannot afford to have even more underprepared math students than we are already getting.

After the meeting ended, one member wrote in to expand upon his concerns about the potential for unfairness in the revised policy advocated by BOARS:

My general response to the BOARS recommendation is that it transforms the admissions system in a way that threatens the very existence of comprehensive review. In our current system the UC campuses can use comprehensive review so extensively because they are fortified by UC's guarantee of UC admission to students who meet clear and definite requirements. Those requirements provide what is generally accepted, though not in all quarters, as a fair frame within which the comprehensive reviews do their work. The requirements of that framework are accepted as fair largely because they are accessible and comprehensible to persons other than insiders, and because they depend upon clearly-defined academic goals toward which students, their schools, and their advisors can work.
The BOARS recommendations spend their energy on identifying what it considers to be unfairness in the results of UC's admissions policies. The report does not make a case for the fairness of the specific principles and requirements upon which it would base the new admissions policy. Fairness is much more than a perceived equality of results, and in fact an enrollment policy cannot be credible or fair according to California law if it is based fundamentally upon outcomes. Students and their schools need to know what they should work toward. Such and expectation is just. It in fact helps the UC system work with prospective students and their schools to improve their prospects of admission.

The state of California and all Californians have a right to expect a clear explanation of why some students are admitted and others are not. Confidence in the general process allows for measured exceptions, of which there are many (and many good ones, I think) in the current system. With our current system, some of those exceptions might conceivably be enlarged. The new admissions policy set forward by BOARS would universalize Berkeley's "black box" admissions system to the point that the future of comprehensive review would itself be jeopardized. BOARS has not shown that its new system is based on principles of fairness.

Thank you for your illuminating visit to our committee. We hope you will come again soon!

Best,
Deborah

Deborah Willis
Chair, Committee on Preparatory Education
and Associate Professor
Dept. of English
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521

office phone: 951-827-1939
email: deborah.willis@ucr.edu
November 1, 2007

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: PETE SADLER, CHAIR
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

RE: BOARS PROPOSED REFORM OF FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY

Undergraduate Council respectfully submits its review of BOARS proposal to reform freshman eligibility for admission to the University of California.

Council Members:
- P. M. Sadler, (Department of Earth Sciences) [Chair]
- C. Allgor (Department of History) [On leave Fall quarter]
- C. Amrhein (Department of Environmental Sciences)
- P. Chatterjee (Department of Women's Studies)
- M. Faloutsos (Department of Computer Science & Engineering)
- J. M. Heraty (Department of Entomology)
- P. M. Johnson (Department of Political Science)

Ex-Officio and Guest Members:
- L. Lundgren  AVC Enrolment Management
- M. Campos  Undergraduate Admissions Director
BOARS PROPOSED REFORM OF FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY

SUMMARY
The changes proposed by BOARS move the identification of the top 12.5% of high-school graduates from the blunt instruments of eligibility to the more discriminating tools of selection.

Currently, the University of California determines which freshman applicants are eligible for admission by a convenient formulaic consideration of quantifiable achievement without regard to the applicant’s circumstances. In the second phase of the admission process, each campus may select from this eligible pool by re-evaluating achievement in the context of the opportunities available to each applicant as revealed by a comprehensive analysis of the whole application. The initial eligibility threshold is adjusted to meet our mandate to draw from the top 12.5% of high school graduates. The comprehensive review allows us to meet our mandate to represent all portions of the State. In essence, the proposed new framework simply moves the identification of the top 12.5% (which task is also mandated to the University) to the comprehensive review of the entire application at the campus level. To enable this selection process, the current pool of eligible applicants is replaced by a somewhat broader pool that is “entitled to review” at the campus level. The enlargement is achieved in part by relaxing the GPA threshold and not requiring SAT II test-taking, while allowing UC campuses to select markers of excellence they will consider in choosing students consistent with the current comprehensive review process. The mandated 12.5% would be maintained by setting enrolment limits for each campus.

The proposed change should be encouraged to the extent that it empowers the Academic Senate to devise criteria that more intelligently and fairly select applicants likely to succeed at UCR, while not jeopardizing our chances of reaching the enrolment targets needed to fund our programs. The best interests of the UCR faculty are served by admitting the most able students. Comprehensive evaluation of achievement in the context of opportunity and circumstance is the best route to this goal, especially for applicants close to the current eligibility barrier. It allows us to avoid two errors of admission for this group of applicants: admitting less able applicants and not considering more able applicants, based solely on their position relative to the formulaic eligibility limit. The proposed changes can allow UCR to better serve the Inland Empire, where educational opportunity and family circumstance too rarely confer any advantage. Because the proposed change could also alter the balance of the intercampus competition for the best applicants, UCR should be concerned about the implementation of the new policy. Of particular concern are the allotment and enforcement of campus enrolment ceilings and the mechanisms for prompt referral of applicants to campuses other than their initial preferences. Finally, any plan to raise admission standards ought to be coupled with plans to improve retention.
1. GOALS OF THE ADMISSIONS PROCESS
The interests of members of the Academic Senate are best served by admitting those applicants with the greatest likelihood of succeeding at U.C. Riverside and helping us add impressive cohorts of alumni that attract more and better applicants. This quest for the best must be undertaken through a process that honors two state mandates:

- The Organic Act of 1868 charges the University of California “according to population, to so apportion the representation of students, when necessary, that all portions of the State shall enjoy equal privileges therein.” (sec. 14).
- The 1960 Master Plan for higher education directed the University of California to draw from the top 12.5% of high-school graduates, leaving criteria for identifying the “top” to the University.

Accordingly, Regents’ policy (RE-28, 2001) directs us to seek and enroll students “with high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompass the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California.” The current admissions process, devised by Academic Senate committees and with the Regents’ approval, attempts to achieve these goals in two stages.

2. THE CURRENT TWO STAGE ADMISSION PROCESS
To appreciate the logical simplicity of the proposed changes, it is essential to distinguish between the two stages of the current admission process – “eligibility” and “selection.” Although the distinction is not everywhere well understood, the process is widely believed to have the virtue of “transparency” and to confer a “guarantee of admission.” As a prelude to our evaluation of the proposed changes, we offer a brief summary of these four concepts and their significance to UCR.

2.1 ELIGIBILITY is a system-wide determination designed to identify that top 12.5% of high-school graduates from which the campuses may select applicants for admission. Eligibility is determined by conveniently simple formulaic measures of raw achievement, but four pathways have been devised in an attempt to achieve some degree of equal representation.

- “Eligible in the Local Context” are students in the top 4%, by GPA, in every Californian high school. These applicants must take 11 courses in the UC “a-g” subject categories by the end of the junior year and plan to take SAT subject tests. (The proposal would not change this pathway, except to remove the requirement to take SAT subject tests.)

- “Eligible in the Statewide Context” are the majority of applicants. They exceed a minimum GPA- and SAT/ACT-based index of raw achievement that is adjusted to limit the sum of statewide and locally eligible applicants to approximately 12.5% of graduates. These applicants are also required to complete a set of “a-g” courses and take examinations. (The proposal would expand membership in this category but change its status to “entitled to review” reflecting the intent to identify the top 12.5% using the fairer and more insightful selective processes of comprehensive review.)
• “Eligible by Exam” are 200-300 applicants each year who achieve unusually high examination scores but are technically ineligible in the local and statewide contexts. This pathway can admit talented students who did not follow a traditional high-school curriculum. (No change is proposed.)

• “Ineligible but Admitted by Exception” (A-by-E) is a pathway that allows campuses to admit students with extraordinary talents who would be unreasonably disqualified from all other pathways. The thresholds for A-by-E to UCR% are determined by Undergraduate Council and reviewed annually. No more than 6% of admissions on any campus may use this escape clause. (No change is proposed.)

Eligibility sets a sharp limit in terms of raw achievement below which UCR may not effectively seek applicants with the ability to succeed on our campus. It invites us to make two kinds of error: admitting applicants whose above-the-limit achievements are actually unimpressive, given the rich opportunities available to them; and not admitting (perhaps not even seeing) applicants whose below-the-limit achievements indicate superior talent and perseverance, given their lack of opportunity. The ability to search intelligently for “good risks” among students near the current statewide eligibility limit is particularly critical for a campus like UCR. It matters less to flagship campuses that seek “best bets” by drawing primarily from applicants with the highest eligibility indices. For these campuses, eligibility is already hardly relevant.

2.2 SELECTION (also called “comprehensive review”) encompasses all the local processes by which individual campuses select and de-select from their eligible applicants and make offers of admission. Selection is based on a potentially comprehensive evaluation of each applicant’s achievement in the context of their individual opportunities and circumstances. It offers the best opportunity to apply scholarly insight to predict ability and the likelihood of success.

Campuses choose mechanisms and criteria for selection that meet broad system-wide guidelines. Selection may be based on a subjective summary of the entire application file (e.g. at UCB and UCLA), on a weighted numerical formulation of achievement and opportunity (e.g. at UCD and UCR), or a hybrid of these two approaches.

Until recently, UCR was considered to be one of only 2-3 non-selecting UC campuses. This was surely a disadvantage to our reputation among potential applicants. We are now selective; that is, a selection process developed by Undergraduate Council is in place and leads to the de-selection of a small number of applicants each year. In order to become more effectively selective, we need to chose from a larger pool of applicants. The plan is to migrate from a formulaic process to a fully nuanced reading of applicant files in which the Academic Senate’s guidelines for selection gain greater influence on the quality of students that attend our classes. The proposed changes in eligibility will likely hasten this transition.

2.3 A GUARANTEE OF ADMISSION? Eligibility is widely perceived to bestow upon applicants a guarantee of admission to the U.C. System, though not necessarily to a campus of their choice. Fulfillment of the guarantee depends upon campuses that seek to enroll more students than can be attracted from those that apply to them directly. It is achieved by the
"referral pool." As a mechanism to keep good applicants within the U.C. system, the referral pool is not very effective. Only about 6% of eligible applicants who are not selected by campuses of their choosing then accept offers from other campuses. In other words, applicants seek admission to campuses of their choice not to the system as a whole.

For UCR's enrolment goals, the referral pool is a source of small but significant numbers of students whose academic achievements are higher on average than those of our direct applicant pool. It is likely that the referral process could be more effective for us, if referrals could be made sooner. It is not an admission pathway that we should lightly relinquish. Academic and staff representatives from UCR have ensured that the proposed eligibility changes retain some referral mechanism and seek to increase its efficiency.

2.4 THE VIRTUE OF TRANSPARENCY lies in the perceived simplicity of the eligibility formula. But is it selection, not eligibility, that determines whether or not applicants achieve the admission decisions they want. Transparency allows applicants to estimate their own eligibility – based on quantified achievement (test scores and raw GPA) alone. Transparency also carries the risk that able students may de-select themselves (decide not to apply) even though a proper analysis of achievement in context would have found them better able to succeed at a UC campus than some eligible applicants. These worries are most acute in the Inland Empire and near the lower limit of eligibility where UCR seeks to meet its enrolment targets.

3. ADVANTAGES OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES
Admission to the UC system is currently a complex process. Its various parts serve different constituencies and have different advocates. Of the many ways to summarize the proposed changes we take one that is simple and most relevant to UCR: the changes proposed by BOARS move the identification of the top 12.5% from the blunt instruments of eligibility to the more discriminating tools of selection. The proposal would encourage the best practices of comprehensive review to become the major pathway to admission throughout the UC system and eliminate some indefensibly arbitrary aspects of eligibility.

In order to allow selection of the top 12.5%, the statewide pool must be enlarged somewhat and accorded a different status – "entitled to review." The guarantee of admission is replaced by a guarantee of comprehensive evaluation that considers the opportunities afforded by the local school system and the circumstances of family and neighborhood. The pool would be enlarged by relaxing the GPA threshold to an unweighted GPA of 2.8 in all a-g courses taken in the 10th and 11th grades. This was the eligibility cut-off until the most recent adjustment to 3.0 was applied to limit the pool to 12.5%. To be entitled to review, students must complete 11 of the 15 required courses by the end of the 11th grade and the full 15 will be required before enrolment. They must also take the SAT reasoning test or the ACT with writing, but will not be required to take the SAT subject tests.

The enlargement of the pool will be balanced by campus enrolment targets that limit the system to 12.5% of the graduating seniors.
UCR should be able to search for talent more effectively in the new pool. We may still use mitigating criteria such as first-generation college attendance and low family wealth, but may apply these insights to applicants just below the current eligibility limits. This year UCR was permitted to consider students at the old GPA threshold of 2.8.

Eligibility in the local context includes some allowance for circumstance, it remains essentially unchanged. Eligibility by exam and admission by exception provide safety nets to catch those rare unconventional applicants whose achievements are considerable, but not conveniently captured by the eligibility formula; these safety nets remain unchanged.

4. CONCERNS ABOUT PERCEPTION
Although the proposed changes can benefit UCR, they will surely provoke criticism from various constituencies. While welcoming the changes, we should be prepared to manage our image with the public and in the press. Some of these criticisms will be unfair and might have been avoided had the proposal been worded or presented differently.

Proponents of the guarantee of admission may charge that it has been unfairly cut from 12.5% to 4%. In fact, the top 12.5% will still be offered admission, but the members of the top-12.5% pool will be selected with fairer and more logical consideration of the circumstances of their achievements. There might seem to be room for a middle way in which an upper portion of those currently eligible in the statewide context would retain this status and an enlarged lower portion would become entitled-to-review. This would, of course, increase the complexity of the pathways to admission and still leave one substantial pathway in which achievement is measured without regard to context.

Guardians of the Master Plan may charge that the University is opening its doors to more than the allotted top 12.5%. The faculty may worry that the changes will admit more poorly prepared students. In fact the proposal seeks fairer and better justified predictive measures of the ability to succeed. These measures should enable some campuses, like UCR, to enroll better prepared students without changing the number of admissions. As the statewide pool of potential applicants shrinks in coming years, our Inland Empire pool is predicted to grow. But relatively few school children in our school districts are advantaged by educational opportunity or family circumstance. As part of a strategy to serve this region more effectively, we can take advantage of the proposed replacement of the eligibility index by entitlement to comprehensive review.

Champions of standardized tests will likely be distressed by the proposal that SAT II subject tests no longer be required. Many studies show that these tests add very little to the predictive power of the GPA alone for identifying potential success in college. More significantly, the current eligibility threshold requires only that a prospective student take one of these tests and ignores their achievement on it. Mere test-taking was a simple means to limit the size of the eligible pool; it is not a logically justifiable measure of ability. A CPEC study from 2003 estimated that this test-taking requirement eliminated 10,000 students who completed the SAT and required a-g courses, graduated with GPAs of 3.5 or better, but did not take the subject tests. Estimates based on the California Basic Educational Data System indicate that only 35% of African American and 38% of Chicano/Latino students, for example, who complete the a-g
course requirements take the subject exams. Mere test-taking is hardly a measure of
achievement but it appears to prevent the eligible pool from representing the State and capturing
the top students.

5. CONCERNS ABOUT IMPLEMENTATION
Although the proposed changes have defensible goals and potential benefits to UCR, we should
be vigilant about the details of implementation. Our campus calculation of the number of offers
of admission needed to meet our enrolment targets have been developed through hard-won
experience in a context of competition with other campuses, notably UCI. As all campuses
adjust their practices in response to the proposed changes, our staff will be challenged to modify
their calculations in response. We will need assurances that system-wide mechanisms can hold
campuses to the admission limits that will be set to meet our 12.5% mandate. We must seek
assurances that the new referral procedures will yield at least as many able students as at present.
In short, the advantages of the “Power of Ten” need to be realized and enforced.

To implement comprehensive review we must train and pay for skilled readers. It may be true
that the quality of our enrolled student body should not be compromised merely to reduce the
cost of the admission process. It may be claimed that the Academic Senate should identify best
policies without regard to cost. Nevertheless, we should ask whether other services will be
compromised to pay for comprehensive review. This concern could be reduced by implementing
some system-wide sharing of insights gained from the reading of applications – an idea that
appears to have support at UCOP. Currently the vast majority of applicants’ files are read at
UCLA and/or UCB. UCLA has shown recently that selection procedures can be swiftly and
radically changed, with assistance from a sister campus (UCB). Cost estimates at UCB indicate
that, once comprehensive review is well developed, the cost of reading a file is substantially less
than the application fee.

If SAT II subject exams are no longer required, the practices of some committees, Honors and
Scholarships for example, may need to be modified.

6. ADMISSION AND RETENTION
UCR’s admission targets include some allowance for students who leave prior to graduation.
We should be able to reduce our admission targets and increase our selectivity by reducing
attrition. There is surely an unfortunate cycle in which admission of more poorly prepared
students leads to lower retention rates which, in turn, requires admitting more students.
Consideration of freshman admission policy ought to be coupled with plans to improve our
retention rate.
September 12, 2007

TO:    PIERRE KELLER, CHAIR
        EDUCATIONAL POLICY

        P.M. SADLER, CHAIR
        UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

        THEDA SHAPIRO, CHAIR
        PREPARATORY EDUCATION

FM:    THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
        RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE:    PROPOSAL TO REFORM UC’S FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY POLICY

On behalf of Chair Brown, the attached proposal to reform UC’s Freshman Eligibility Policy is being sent out for your review. The proposal, which would substantially alter UC’s existing eligibility policy, was presented at the June 27, 2007, Academic Council meeting, where Council agreed to send out the proposal for systemwide Senate review in the fall.

Please forward your committee’s response to me by October 31, 2007.

Attachment (1)
Dear Colleagues:

The enclosed document is being forwarded for your review and comments. As background information, BOARS voted unanimously to endorse the BOARS Proposal to Reform UC’s Freshman Eligibility Policy at its May 4, 2007 meeting. The proposal, which would substantially alter UC’s existing eligibility policy, was presented at the June 27, 2007, Academic Council meeting, where Council agreed to send out the proposal for systemwide Senate review in the fall.

The Council would very much appreciate receiving responses by December 5, 2007. Please be advised that the practice of the Academic Council for general reviews is to send the comments to all Systemwide Committees. Each committee may decide whether or not to opine. Please notify the Senate Office either directly, by emailing Executive Director María Bertero-Barceló (maria.bertero-barcelo@ucop.edu), or through your Committee Analyst, if your committee chooses not to participate in this review.

Sincerely yours,

John B. Oakley, Chair
Academic Council

Encl: 1
Copy: María Bertero-Barceló, Executive Director
Divisional Senate Directors
Academic Senate Committee Analysts
June 11, 2007

JOHN B. OAKLEY, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: BOARS’ UC Freshman Eligibility Reform Proposal

Dear John,

I am pleased to report that BOARS, at its May 4, 2007 meeting, unanimously endorsed the enclosed UC Freshman Eligibility Reform proposal. As you know, this year the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has undertaken a comprehensive examination of UC’s freshman eligibility policy. Presentation of BOARS’ UC Freshman Eligibility Reform proposal to the Academic Council this month is an exciting threshold for BOARS, which looks forward to continued work to see this proposal to its fruition with the Board of Regents next year.

On behalf of BOARS, I respectfully request that the Academic Council approve BOARS’ UC Freshman Eligibility proposal to be distributed for systemwide Senate review.

I look forward to Council’s action at the June 27 meeting.

Best wishes,

Mark M. Rashid, Chair
BOARS

Encl: 1
cc: BOARS
    Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Executive Director, Academic Senate

MMR/mr
A PROPOSAL TO REFORM UC'S FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY POLICY

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools
16 May, 2007

I. SUMMARY

At present, UC determines who, among California's graduating high-school seniors, is in the top one-eighth based on an Eligibility Index involving GPA and standardized test scores. California's Master Plan for Higher Education instructs that UC should "draw from" this portion of the graduating class for its freshman entrants. UC has long construed this Master Plan provision to imply a guarantee of admission, somewhere in the system, to all students who meet the GPA/test score Eligibility Index.

In recent decades, space limitations have obliged most campuses to select from among their UC-eligible applicants, with a few campuses becoming extremely selective. Selection for freshman admission to a particular UC campus is made on the basis of a comprehensive review of the entire application file, which contains much information about academic and non-academic achievements, as well as the circumstances and context in which those achievements were made. Admission to the UC system (i.e. UC eligibility), on the other hand, is based simply on course-taking and GPA in those courses, and test-taking and scores on the required tests. UC eligibility engenders rigidly-enforced criteria which are, individually, arbitrary and difficult to justify educationally. Further, recent data suggests that eligibility depends heavily on merely taking UC's required pattern of standardized tests, which itself is not an educationally valid metric of academic achievement.

In short, UC's values and goals in freshman admissions, with respect to both academic quality and equity in access to the University, would be better served by establishing eligibility for UC on the basis of a complete review of each UC aspirant's qualifications. Accordingly, a replacement for the existing eligibility policy is proposed. The main purpose of the proposed change is to invite applications from a larger number of qualified applicants, and then use full information from the application itself to decide which applicants are truly in the top one-eighth.

II. BACKGROUND

Freshman admission to the University of California is defined by two main concepts: eligibility and selection. Eligibility identifies students who are invited to apply, and simultaneously guarantees them admission to the UC system, though not necessarily to a campus to which they apply. Selection is the process by which campuses choose from among applicants. Since 2001, selection has employed "comprehensive review" of each entire application. The eligibility concept originated in 1960, and since 1968 has relied only on the grade-point average across all UC-approved courses, and test scores.

The 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education instructs UC to "draw from the
top one-eighth” of the State’s graduating high school seniors. This stipulation has, since 1988, been interpreted as a guarantee that UC will admit, to some campus in the system, all California high school graduates in the top one-eighth who apply. Eligible status does not, however, guarantee admission to a campus of the applicant’s choosing. Applicants who wish to enroll at a campus with more eligible applicants than space permits must be selected by that campus. At present, seven of the nine general campuses are obliged to select from among their eligible applicants. The Riverside and Merced campuses currently admit all eligible applicants who apply to them. To fulfill UC’s guarantee of admission, UC-eligible applicants who are not admitted to any campus to which they apply are referred to Riverside and Merced for admission. These referral-pool admission offers are declined by the vast majority of their recipients: in 2006, only 6% of referral-pool admits submitted a Statement of Intent to Register.

The main route to UC eligibility – called “eligibility in the statewide context” – requires:

a) successfully completing a set of college-preparatory courses, described in UC policy as “a through g courses,” each of which has to be approved by UC at the student’s high school in order to count toward eligibility; b) taking UC’s full pattern of standardized tests, consisting of the SAT Reasoning exam or ACT with Writing, plus two SAT Subject exams in different a-g subject areas; and c) achieving test scores and an honors-course-weighted GPA in the a-g subjects that together exceed the threshold established by UC’s Eligibility Index. This Index specifies the minimum test scores required for a given GPA. At present, the minimum GPA required for eligibility is 3.0. The required test scores decrease as GPA increases above this minimum.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) conducts a study every few years to estimate the number of the state’s graduating seniors who are UC-eligible. Based on these periodic studies, the Eligibility Index is adjusted to maintain the proportion of UC-eligible students at one-eighth the number of graduating high school seniors.

Beginning in 2000, an additional route to establishing UC eligibility was added: Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC). Students whose honors-weighted GPA in a-g subjects places them in the top 4% of their junior class, as determined by transcript evaluations performed by UC, are deemed eligible, provided they complete their remaining a-g subject requirements and take all the tests required for eligibility in the statewide context. These students are therefore guaranteed admission somewhere in the system, as are statewide-eligible students. Although ELC students must still complete the full test pattern, the scores themselves do not affect their ELC status in any way. Near-total overlap exists in the two main eligibility pathways: over 95% of ELC students are also eligible in the statewide context. However, there is some evidence to suggest that UC’s congratulatory notification of ELC status stimulates some students who would not have done so otherwise to complete their a-g course requirements and then apply to UC.

A third, minor pathway exists, in which UC eligibility is established solely on the basis of very high scores on the required standardized tests. This pathway is maintained for the purpose of affording access by students who, for various reasons, cannot present the traditional evidence of academic achievement in the form of grades in approved a-g courses. The number of students who are eligible by this pathway alone is only a few
hundred each year.

Whereas admission to the system – i.e. eligibility – is determined solely on the basis of course-taking, GPA, test-taking, and test scores, selection by a particular campus is based on a comprehensive review (CR) of the applicant’s file. CR ideally uses all the information in the application, as well as information about the high school from which the applicant graduated. CR is governed by a single, overarching set of principles and criteria, but campuses have considerable latitude in the formulation of their specific processes and procedures. It is through CR that all facets of an applicant’s academic preparation and other accomplishments can be carefully considered, in the context of the opportunities and challenges inherent in their school and family circumstances. Campus-based CR processes range in character from numerical formulas to more holistic judgments. In all cases, CR processes are subject to extensive guidelines, rigorous norming, and continuous monitoring of the results to ensure objectivity and consistency. In conformance with California state law, race, ethnicity, gender, and national origin do not enter into the decisions made under CR in any way.

Eight of the nine general campuses currently conduct CR processes. The newest campus, UC Merced, will likely develop its own CR process in due course. Campuses vary considerably in their levels of selectivity. Two campuses, Berkeley and Los Angeles, could be called hyper-selective: they are able to admit only about one-quarter of their UC-eligible applicants. In recent years, the Santa Cruz campus has found it necessary to select from among its eligible applicants, and currently admits about three-quarters of its eligible applicants. UC Riverside has in recent years come very close to the selectivity threshold, and consequently has conducted a CR process in anticipation of becoming fully selective. UC Merced is currently able to admit all UC-eligible applicants that apply. The other four general campuses (San Diego, Irvine, Santa Barbara, and Davis) generally select for admission between 40% and 60% of their eligible applicants.

III. RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSED POLICY CHANGES

Regents’ policy directs UC to “... 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.” UC seeks to identify and admit freshman entrants who have prepared well by challenging themselves academically, and who have successfully met these challenges. Admissions criteria should directly relate to, and accurately measure, the applicant’s potential for success in college and beyond. These criteria should be applied in ways that fairly evaluate each applicant’s potential to benefit from, and contribute to, the university experience. Fixed, minimum measures on any particular criterion are inherently arbitrary, are difficult to justify educationally, and should be avoided. Admissions decisions should always be made with due regard for the challenges and opportunities inherent in each applicant’s circumstances.

UC’s present collection of admissions policies falls short of these aspirations in a number of important ways:

1) The current procedure for determining UC eligibility fails to use all the available
information about applicants. By relying entirely on the grade point average and test scores, current eligibility procedures ignore everything else in a student's application, which includes pages of information about special academic attainments, leadership and other non-academic accomplishments, and a personal statement that allows applicants to explain their achievements in the context of their school and family circumstances. In addition, an applicant's achievements can and should be compared with those of other UC applicants who have similar profiles of opportunity and disadvantage. Quantitative studies show that using additional information, including information comparing a student to others from the same school, produces a more accurate prediction of who will succeed at UC. All selective private colleges and universities use some form of comprehensive review rather than a simple index of grades and test scores. Individual UC campuses have in place procedures for whole-file review. Continued reliance on a simple index for eligibility therefore seems educationally unjustifiable.

2) Eligibility, as presently constructed, contains rigid minimums that lack sound educational justification. The current eligibility requirements consist of a set of minimums, none of which by itself can be justified on educational grounds as a requirement for UC admission. For example, failure to complete a single required course on the a-g list renders a student ineligible, even if the school does not offer enough sections of that course to permit all students to take it, or no one told the student that the course was required for UC, or the student actually did take the course but the school failed to submit the required paperwork to UC for course certification. A 2004 CPEC report\(^1\) estimated that about 1.9% of California school graduates – 6500 students – took all the required exams, and achieved a GPA and test scores that met the eligibility index, but failed eligibility because of a single a-g course deficiency. Other studies have found that only 45% of California's public high schools offer enough sections of a-g courses to permit all students to satisfy UC requirements\(^2\). The course minimums therefore exclude many students who failed to satisfy the requirement through no fault of their own. Similarly, the statewide Eligibility Index requires unvalidated minimum test scores, a practice contrary to best practices in admissions testing (see the National Academies Press' 1999 “Myths and Tradeoffs: The role of Tests in Undergraduate Admissions,” the recommendations of test producers including ACT Inc. and the College Board, and the 1999 Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA, APA, NCME)). Finally, in light of the highly varied grading practices and access to GPA-enhancing honors courses, both between and within schools, the GPA minimum for eligibility is itself suspect. Taken together, these realities indicate that many graduating high school seniors who are academically strong and would perform well at UC are denied eligibility because they fail to meet just one of the minimum requirements.

3) For all its apparent simplicity in concept, the actual determination of an individual student’s eligibility can be quite complicated. Aside from the a-g course-taking

\(^1\)California Postsecondary Education Commission, “Factors Limiting Eligibility for the University of California” (OP/04-03), December 2004.

requirement, the testing requirement, and the Eligibility Index, the policy contains extensive provisions relating to grade levels in which some of the required courses must be taken, mechanisms for "validating" missing courses either by subsequent courses in an area of "sequential knowledge," relevant standardized-test performance, or by other means; determination of grade points for repeated courses, etc. Some high schools do not maintain up-to-date lists of UC-approved courses on the "Doorways" web site, and students in those schools therefore may not get credit for some courses that should satisfy a-g requirements. Students from advantaged backgrounds who attend well-resourced schools with strong college-going cultures are likely to have access to the guidance needed to negotiate the bureaucratic complexities of UC eligibility. For example, such students are likely to receive strong advice to take UC-certified English courses beginning in the 9th grade, and thereby remain on track to complete the required four years of English by the end of the 12th grade. On the other hand, students from schools that send few students to UC, and/or whose parents and teachers cannot provide ready UC guidance, are placed at a disadvantage. It bears mention that the requirements of eligibility must be, and are, strictly enforced, because eligibility confers a valuable commodity – a freshman admission slot at UC.

4) In practice, the impact of the testing requirement for eligibility depends almost entirely on whether or not a student takes the tests, not on the performance on the tests. Test-taking by itself is not an educationally justifiable criterion for admission. In its 2003 eligibility study, CPEC found that 14.4% of the state’s graduating seniors were fully UC-eligible. However, that is only slightly less than the 14.8% who completed the a-g curriculum as well as the full UC test pattern. Less than half a percent of the state’s graduating seniors are taking all required courses and tests, but failing to achieve eligibility due to inadequate performance. And, virtually all of these 0.4% missed the Eligibility Index by a very narrow margin. CPEC further found that the single most prevalent reason for ineligibility was simple failure to take the required SAT Subject exams. CPEC also reported that, among those who completed the a-g curriculum and took the SAT Reasoning exam but not the required SAT Subject exams, fully three-quarters would have become DC eligible if they had taken the SAT Subject tests and received scores at least equal to their SAT Reasoning-exam average. The state’s UC eligibility rate would thereby have jumped from 14.4% to 20.7%. Taken together, these facts indicate that eligible status is much more a matter of mere willingness to submit to test-taking or knowledge of UC’s testing requirement, than it is a rational assessment of academic achievement. Students who successfully complete the a-g curriculum and merely take the required battery of tests are very likely to be eligible.

5) The two SAT Subject tests required by UC are taken in subjects elected by the student. In quantitative studies, BOARS has repeatedly found that, while the predictive power of all standardized admissions tests is quite modest, scores on these elective subject tests make a negligible contribution to predictions of initial academic performance at the University. In 2006, UC’s required test pattern changed in response to changes introduced in the SAT Reasoning exam. These Reasoning-test changes, in turn, were compelled by then-president Atkinson’s call on the College Board to more closely align the SAT with the curricula that college-bound students are actually expected to learn before enrolling in postsecondary institutions. The College Board’s response
consisted mainly of incorporating the old SAT Subject test in Writing into the core Reasoning exam, along with some elements of the old SAT Subject Math level 1C exam. Additionally, analogies were dropped from the old Verbal section of the core exam, as were quantitative comparisons from the old Math section. The ACT Assessment, on the other hand, did not change in response to President Atkinson's call, but an optional writing component (required for UC applicants) was introduced in order to provide a comparable alternative to the SAT Reasoning test for UC applicants. The extent to which these changes bring the SAT and the ACT into conformance with BOARS' 2001 testing principles remains under study. However, these new test configurations have, in the meantime, compelled a change in UC's required test pattern: prior to 2006, three SAT Subject tests were required along with the core exam, but two of the three were mandated to be the Writing and Math tests, with the third one in an elective subject area. With the inclusion of the Writing test and aspects of the Math Subject test in the core exam, the test pattern was changed to specify two SAT Subject tests, both in elective (but different) subject areas. Under the old test pattern, the Writing and Math Subject tests, but not the third (elective) test, showed reasonable predictive validity for freshman GPA. Thus, the only predictive elements of the old SAT Subject test requirement have been incorporated into the core exam, leaving a Subject test requirement that contributes very little to UC's ability to predict which applicants will perform well initially at UC.

6) The SAT Subject test requirement, in particular, contributes to underrepresentation of certain groups. From an analysis of 2004 CBEDS and College Board data, it is estimated that 54% of all a-g completers also took the eligibility-enabling SAT Subject exams required by UC. However, among African American students, only 35% of those completing the a-g curriculum also took the required SAT Subject exams. Among Chicano/Latino students the number was 38%. These gaps in SAT Subject test-taking behavior have a major negative impact on the size of the pool of high-achieving ethnic-minority students who are visible to UC.

7) UC's eligibility construct denies certain UC campuses the benefits of selecting their admitted classes on the basis of a comprehensive review of each applicant. For two campuses, eligibility serves as a de facto admissions process, with a third campus in nearly the same circumstances. For these campuses, the ideals of comprehensive review, whereby individual applicants are judged within the context of their own opportunities and circumstances and assessed against the campus's own goals in constructing classes, simply do not apply. Further, the admit pools for these campuses are artificially constrained by rather arbitrary requirements that bear little relation to actual academic achievement, as explained above.

8) The prominence of existing eligibility requirements in official UC publications and

---

3 These figures are only estimates. CBEDS (California Basic Educational Data System) contains estimates of a-g completion rates at California high schools, whereas the College Board maintains data on the number of California students who complete SAT Subject tests. CBEDS does not contain a-g data records for individual students, so it is not possible to match students between the CBEDS and College Board datasets. Accordingly, it is assumed that SAT Subject-test takers are also a-g completers. While this is an assumption, it is thought to be quite accurate, in light of the fact that any student who completes UC's distinctive required pattern of tests very likely intends to apply to UC.
presentations deters non-eligible students from applying, and therefore renders invisible to UC many graduating high school seniors who could potentially excel as UC students. The vast majority of California high school seniors who apply to UC do satisfy the formal requirements for eligibility. However, many other California seniors who have strong academic records in high school do not meet all the technical requirements for UC eligibility. Some of these currently non-eligible students would be more likely to succeed at UC than some of the students who are currently deemed eligible. But under existing procedures many of these academically talented students are not applying to UC.

IV. PROPOSAL FOR A NEW ELIGIBILITY POLICY

Following extensive study and deliberation, BOARS has concluded that UC's current eligibility construct hampers and will prevent, if unaltered, the University from achieving its admissions objectives over the long term. Accordingly, BOARS proposes that the University change its admissions policies to better honor the values inherent in its status as an elite, publicly-funded land-grant institution of higher education.

The various elements of the existing eligibility policy are defined by UC Systemwide Senate Regulations 418, 420, 424, 428, 440, 450, and 476, and also by two Regents' policies. The policy changes recommended by BOARS will require substantial amendments to the above-listed Senate Regulations. The specific changes to Senate Regulations are not detailed here; instead, the recommended policy itself is described in full detail. In order for the proposed policy to take effect, The Regents would also need to make conforming amendments to the existing Regents' policies on undergraduate admissions and admission requirements. Accordingly, the present document should be understood as: 1) a recommendation to the Academic Senate to seek, through the President, regental approval of the proposed policy; and 2) pending regental approval of the proposed policy, a request to authorize BOARS and UCRJ to work together to draft the specific amendments to Senate Regulations required to effectuate the new policy. The draft SR amendments would then be subject to Senatewide review for clarity and conformance with the previously-approved policy.

Entitled to Review: Description of the Proposed Policy

BOARS recommends that the present practice of providing a guarantee of admission to all students who meet a narrow set of criteria based on course-taking, GPA, test taking, and test scores be replaced. The new policy would guarantee not admission, but consideration for admission through a comprehensive review at each campus of application, to all students who meet certain basic criteria of academic achievement. Guaranteed admission to the UC system, albeit not necessarily to the campus of a student's choice, would continue to be extended to California-resident applicants who are found by UC to be in the top 4% of their high school graduating class, as is presently the case under the ELC program.

The details of the proposed "entitled to review" (ETR) policy are as follows:
1. All California-resident applicants who:

- complete a prescribed 11 of the 15 required a-g courses by the end of the 11\textsuperscript{th} grade,

- achieve an unweighted GPA of 2.8 or higher in all a-g courses taken in the 10\textsuperscript{th} and 11\textsuperscript{th} grades, and

- take the SAT Reasoning test or ACT with Writing,

would be entitled to a review (ETR) at each campus to which they apply. Submitted test scores do not affect ETR status, but may be used in comprehensive review. Students who are entitled to a review by this pathway are expected to complete the full set of 15 required a-g courses prior to enrolling. Failure to do so is grounds for cancellation of admission, although this is not automatic. The provisions of this paragraph are similar to the current “eligibility in the statewide context” policy, except that no SAT Subject tests are required, and test scores are immaterial in the determination of ETR.

2. The ELC program continues in essentially its present form: California-resident applicants with ETR status as described in paragraph 1 above, and who are found, by a UC transcript analysis, to be in the top 4\% of their high school class at the end of the 11\textsuperscript{th} grade, would be offered admission to at least one campus in the system, provided they complete the required 15 a-g courses prior to enrolling. The ranking used to determine the top 4\% is to be based on uncapped, honors-weighted GPA in all a-g courses completed. No guarantee is made of admission to any campus to which the applicant actually applied. Applicants who are not admitted to any campus to which they applied would be referred for admission to campus(es) that are open for referral admission. It is noted that this “ELC only” referral pool would be much smaller than the referral pool under the present policy, which usually consists of several thousand applicants. This can be inferred from the fact that under the current policy, typically only about 100 ELC applicants end up in the referral pool. In contrast to the current policy, under the proposed policy ELC status would no longer require the taking of SAT Subject tests.

3. All applicants who achieve very high scores on a prescribed battery of standardized tests are accorded ETR status, irrespective of their high school records. The battery consists of the SAT Reasoning test or the ACT with its optional Writing component, and two SAT Subject tests in different subject areas. This test pattern is identical to the one required under the current eligibility policy. This testing-only provision in the ETR policy is similar to the existing Eligibility by Exam Alone pathway, the intent of which is to provide a route into UC for those applicants whose circumstances prevent them from presenting conventional academic credentials (e.g. home-schooled students). At present, the number of students eligible by this pathway alone is very small – typically 200-300.

4. Nonresident applicants who achieve an unweighted GPA above a prescribed
threshold in all a-g subjects taken in the 10th and 11th grades are accorded ETR status. The exact GPA threshold will be determined to maintain a similar proportionality between resident and nonresident ETR students as now exists among resident/nonresident UC-eligible students.

5. Students who miss ETR status under paragraphs 1, 3, and 4 above, but who nonetheless can demonstrate substantially equivalent academic preparation as determined by campus-based comprehensive review of their applications, are still invited to apply. Though not strictly entitled to a review, such students will generally receive a comprehensive review at each campus to which application is made. This provision is intended to avoid exclusion of students who, for example, have course records that reflect minor variances from the a-g curriculum, but whose overall academic records are clearly consistent with an ETR level of preparation and achievement. Students in this category whom a campus wishes to admit will be offered admission on a “by-exception” basis, entirely consistent with the existing Admission by Exception (A by E) policy. The A by E policy is a long-standing, regentally-approved mechanism by which applicants who are not strictly UC-eligible can be admitted to a campus. It is limited to a maximum of 6% of the enrolled freshman class, although in practice the A by E mechanism is used far less extensively even than this.

The intent of paragraph 5 is to allow some flexibility in the policy, so that no student is unduly penalized for circumstances that may be beyond the student’s control, or for minor variances from the a-g requirements in an otherwise strong record of achievement. This flexibility is compelled, among other factors, by the realities of K-12 education in California: many students attend poorly-resourced schools whose administrative capacities may not allow for diligent upkeep of UC-approved a-g course lists. Some students at these schools may pursue the most rigorous college-preparatory course of study available to them, but nonetheless fall victim to the administrative failings of their school in the matter of actually achieving a-g completion. Other reasons exist that can prevent high-achieving and high-potential students from attaining the technical requirements of ETR status. In light of the fact that ETR status guarantees only a review — for which the applicant pays a $65 fee for each campus to which application is made — and not admission, it would seem inappropriate to deny this benefit on the basis of a set of criteria that only tends to suggest promise, but does not precisely partition students into those with promise and those without.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

If the ETR proposal, as defined in the above section, is approved, conforming amendments to Senate Regulations will be drafted to enact its provisions. However, in order for this substantial change in UC admissions policy to reach its full potential, or indeed even to become fully effective, other changes in the admissions-policy landscape should be made. BOARS has identified two areas where concurrent changes would be beneficial: the comprehensive review guidelines, and admissions-process management. With respect to the former, recommendations to amend are within the purview of BOARS and the Senate. Admissions-process management, on the other hand, is an administrative function, and while Senate consultation is desirable from the standpoint of
achieving the best outcome, decisions about implementation are ultimately in the hands of the administration.

The following two sections outline BOARS' current thinking with respect to desirable future policy evolution in both the CR-guidelines and admissions-process management. BOARS believes that the plans described below represent a possible way forward that could maximize the benefit of the ETR policy. These plans are tentative at this stage, and subject to ongoing and broad consultation and input. BOARS' intention in describing these plans here is simply to illustrate the nature of the changes that would be desirable or required in the event that the ETR policy is enacted.

It is noted that no concrete implementation timeline is included here, because the required discussions between the Senate and the responsible administrative units have not yet occurred. A policy change of this magnitude obviously would need to be widely and publicly disseminated. UC's past practice has been to provide sufficient advance notice of changes to eligibility policy so that students now in high school are not adversely impacted. Therefore, BOARS expects that the ETR policy, if approved, would apply to freshman entrants who first enroll in Fall 2009 or after.

A. Revision of the Comprehensive Review Guidelines

The main policy document that governs campus-based comprehensive-review practices is entitled “Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions” (the “Guidelines”). Dating from 2001, the Guidelines have governed all CR practices beginning with the Fall 2002 entering class. The main provisions of the Guidelines include a statement of eight guiding principles, and an enumeration of 14 selection criteria that may be used by campuses in formulating their CR processes. Among the eight guiding principles of Comprehensive Review, the first two merit explicit mention here:

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.

Among the 14 selection criteria are the academic GPA, scores on UC’s required pattern of standardized tests, the volume of and performance in a-g courses beyond the minimum required for eligibility, the “quality of academic performance relative to the academic opportunities available in the applicant’s secondary school,” and special talents. Also explicitly included is personal hardship or challenges that may have diminished the applicant’s ability to demonstrate their full academic potential. The Guidelines do not address the relative weights assigned to the various criteria, nor do they require that specific criteria actually be used in a campus’s CR process (beyond the stipulation that a broad variety of criteria should be used).
BOARS believes that the present Guidelines are conceptually sound and consistent with UC’s values. However, in light of the proposed ETR policy, BOARS also believes that an addition to the Guidelines is desirable in order to effectively guide the future evolution of campus-based CR processes. Specifically, BOARS proposes that a ninth principle be added:

The full course-work record, including courses taken in relation to what was available to the applicant, performance in them, and standing among the applicant’s peers along both of these dimensions, is the primary basis on which to assess academic achievement. Scores on standardized tests can be useful for enhancing subject-specific understanding of an applicant’s level of preparation, but should not be construed as providing an indispensable and independent measure of overall college readiness.

The intent of this additional CR principle is to make clear that a thorough analysis of the academic record, in all its various context-dependent aspects, is the critical element in any sound CR process. Test scores can and should be used for purposes of enhancing and confirming readers’ assessments of subject mastery, but are not to be considered indispensable measures of “overall college readiness.” Through this ninth CR principle, BOARS aims to discourage the rigid weighting of test scores in campus-based CR processes.

Also, because the proposed ETR policy does not include the SAT Subject test requirement of the existing eligibility policy, some adjustments to the language of Selection Criterion 2, which deals with test scores, is desirable. The following replacement language is proposed:

Scores on the SAT Reasoning test or ACT with its optional Writing component. Scores on other widely-administered standardized tests, such as SAT Subject tests or Advanced Placement exams, although not required, can be considered if submitted.

B. Guidance to Prospective Applicants

UC’s admissions policies serve the dual purposes of: a) determining the procedures by which applicants are admitted to the University, and b) signaling to students and their parents, and to schools, what UC considers appropriate preparation for freshman enrollment at the University. The supposed simplicity of the existing eligibility construct is often cited as supporting the signaling function, and is therefore promoted as a major strength of the existing policy. However, as explained in section III above, the determination of eligibility for an individual applicant can actually be quite complicated. UC’s admissions policies and practices have always been the subject of confusion and anxiety on the part of prospective students, their parents, and their teachers and counselors. This anxiety is due in part to the existence of two separate policy concepts – eligibility and selection. Public understanding of eligibility, selection, and the difference between them is extremely limited, and is highly heterogeneous across demographic groups.
BOARS believes that the changes proposed here offer an opportunity to bring some much-needed clarity to the public message conveyed by UC admissions. This clarity can be effected through direct, narrative communication explaining the values, goals, and criteria attending UC's admissions policy. This narrative statement should be fairly short, accurate with respect to all CR processes across the system, and meaningful to students seeking specific guidance on how best to prepare themselves for UC. BOARS recognizes that the public articulation of admissions policy, including any related guidance offered to students and their parents and counselors, is within the domain of the University's administration. However, as originator of the ETR proposal, BOARS believes that a collaborative effort between the administration and the Senate is likely to result in the most effective articulation of the policy to the public. It is in this spirit that the following is offered as a candidate narrative-guidance statement.

Admission to University of California campuses is competitive. UC seeks to admit students whose records demonstrate strong academic preparation, within the context of each student’s educational opportunities. UC is also looking for evidence that applicants possess a level of maturity that will allow them to benefit from, and contribute to, the educational experience offered by the University. UC accords admission priority to applicants whose records indicate a willingness to challenge themselves academically, and an ability to rise to those challenges.

All aspects of your academic record will be taken into account, including:

- the courses you took and are now taking in high school,

- the courses available at your school,

- your course grades,

- how you did in comparison to other applicants from your school and from other schools,

- any special academic projects you undertook while in high school, and

- any improvement in your grades over your high-school years.

All standardized test scores that you submit will also be considered. These include your scores on the required SAT Reasoning test or ACT with Writing, as well as your scores on any additional standardized tests you may elect to take, such as SAT Subject tests or AP exams. UC uses test scores only to enhance our understanding of your mastery of specific subjects, and not as overall indicators of college readiness. Merely taking many tests does not, by itself, enhance your standing in UC’s admissions process. In most cases, test scores are consistent with the coursework record. In these cases, the scores have neither a positive nor a negative effect on the admissions decision. In some circumstances, however, test scores can
provide important information not otherwise available to UC. Examples of these circumstances include:

- Your school does not assign conventional grades.
- You did not have access to a UC-approved a-g curriculum.
- You are missing one or more of the 15 required a-g courses.
- You feel that your grades in one or more subject areas do not reflect your true level of mastery of the subject.

In these circumstances, scores on standardized tests in the appropriate subject areas can help UC gain the understanding of your qualifications needed to make the correct admission decision. So, take the required SAT Reasoning test (or ACT with Writing), and in addition, strongly consider taking SAT Subject tests or AP exams if any of the above apply to you.

UC is also very interested in your experiences and achievements outside the classroom. The University views all your achievements in the context of the educational opportunities available to you through your school and otherwise, as well as in the context of particular challenges you may face in your life circumstances. Extracurricular achievements of all kinds can be important factors in admissions decisions, particularly if they are substantial and sustained, demonstrate leadership qualities, or make real contributions to the school, community, or society at large.

It is of the utmost importance to recognize that there is no single qualification or attribute that means certain admission or certain denial at any UC campus. Each year, each UC campus admits many students with very high grades but few if any extracurricular achievements. And, each year, each campus admits many students with more modest coursework performance, but exceptional records of leadership outside the classroom and/or of overcoming obstacles and challenges. The great majority of successful UC applicants fall somewhere between these extremes. Only you can decide how to spend your time as you prepare for college, but make academics a priority. Above all, if you apply your best effort to all that you do, it will show in your application, and you will have the best chance of being admitted to the UC campus of your choice.

C. Admissions-Process Management: Admission and Enrollment Targets

In order to effectively manage undergraduate enrollment, any UC freshman admission system must serve two essential functions: 1) It must provide for admission, somewhere in the UC system, of approximately one-eighth of California’s graduating seniors, as called for in the Master Plan; and 2) it should facilitate achievement of an enrolled freshman class on each campus that closely matches the numeric enrollment target on
that campus. Under the present admissions system, each of these functions is effectuated by a separate policy instrument: eligibility enforces the Master Plan, and campus-based selection serves to modulate freshman enrollment levels to match campus capacity. No consideration is given to the Master Plan at the level of campus-based selection. Likewise, periodic adjustments to the Eligibility Index are made only on the basis of CPEC eligibility studies, generally without consideration for matching enrollments with projected capacity.

Ultimately, capacity should grow with the enrollment demand dictated by the Master Plan's one-eighth provision and California's population of graduating high-school seniors. The participation rate, i.e. the proportion of California's graduating seniors who enroll at UC as freshmen, has remained fairly stable at between 7.5 and 8%. In light of this observation, UC's compliance with the Master Plan can alternatively be stated in terms of freshman enrollment, as compared to the population of graduating seniors. Under the proposed policy, although the number of students entitled to review is not directly regulated, the number of admits - and therefore the size of the enrolled freshman class - of course would continue to be regulated on each campus. Accordingly, the admission and enrollment data following each annual admission cycle could be analyzed to help determine how enrollment targets should be adjusted for the next cycle, in order to meet UC's Master-Plan obligations as well as its other institutional objectives.

It is clearly the case that the volume of applications would increase under the proposed policy. In fact, a major goal of the policy is to make better admissions decisions by reviewing more applications comprehensively. The associated fiscal burden would be partially if not fully offset by the additional revenue from the application fee, which at present stands at $60 for each campus to which an application is submitted ($70 for international applicants). In an effort to understand the possible magnitude of the application-processing increase, BOARS has studied estimates of the ETR pool based on the 2003 CPEC dataset. Those analyses suggest that the ETR pool would be perhaps 50% larger than the UC-eligible pool. Specifically, the 2003 CPEC study estimated a 14.4% UC eligibility rate, while BOARS' analysis based on the same data indicates a rate of 21.6% for the ETR pool. However, not all ETR students would apply to UC. A rough idea of potential application volume can be gained by considering the number of ETR students in 2003 who enrolled at any four-year college in the Fall. This is estimated at 15.4% of California graduating seniors. The proportion of ETR students who enrolled at any postsecondary institution, including two-year colleges, was 19.5%.

It is noted that opportunities presently exist to achieve economies in the read process, through sharing of application-read information between campuses. Any increase in application volume is likely to draw further attention to this fact. BOARS believes that much might be gained, both in terms of CR process improvement as well as efficiency, through collaborative sharing of application-read information among campuses with common applicants. BOARS further believes that these gains can be achieved while simultaneously respecting campus autonomy in the freshman selection process.

D. Admissions-Process Management: Application Referral

UC's current practice is to refer eligible applicants who are denied admission at all
campuses to which they apply, to one or more referral campuses for admission. In recent years, only the Riverside and Merced campuses have remained open for referral admissions. It is through this referral-pool mechanism that UC honors its commitment to admit all UC-eligible applicants. Although the yield rate for referral admission offers is very low (6% for Fall 2006 enrollment, or in the neighborhood of 1% of the systemwide entering freshman class), the referral pool does yield a not insignificant number of enrollees for the Riverside and Merced campuses. Further, the referral pool serves the important function of conferring a systemwide character to UC admissions.

BOARS believes that the proposed ETR policy offers an opportunity to strengthen the referral-pool mechanism, making it a more robust and attractive route into the University. In broad outline, one way to accomplish this might be as follows. In the course of comprehensively reviewing applicants, campuses could refer some applications to a central “recommended pool.” Campuses could elect to do this in cases where the applicant's credentials would seem to merit admission somewhere in the UC system, but where space limitations preclude an admission offer from the reviewing campus itself. An applicant in the recommended pool would be removed from the pool if any campus to which the applicant applied makes an admission offer. The remaining recommended pool would consist of applications that one or more campuses considered sufficiently strong to merit admission somewhere in the system, but which did not receive a favorable admission decision from any campus. All campuses would then be invited to consider applications in the recommended pool using their comprehensive review processes, and to extend admission offers as appropriate. A process of this sort, particularly if executed in a timely manner, might help to distribute the enrollment demand more uniformly across the UC system. It would also tend to preserve the systemwide character of UC freshman admission.
What changes is BOARS proposing?
BOARS is proposing two main changes. First, UC would invite a larger number of graduating seniors from California public high schools to apply for freshman admission. Students who have completed the UC-approved college-preparatory curriculum (the “a-g” courses), have achieved sufficiently high grades in those courses, and have taken the SAT Reasoning test or ACT with Writing would be entitled to review of their applications, and would be invited to apply. This “entitled to review” (ETR) pool would be somewhat larger than the current UC-eligible pool mainly because it does not involve a requirement that SAT Subject (previously called “SAT II”) tests be taken. Campuses would continue to select freshmen as they do now, using comprehensive review to consider all the information in the application, and to evaluate students’ achievements in the context of their school and personal circumstances.

Second, BOARS is proposing to substantially strengthen its commitment to identify and select from the top one eighth of California high school graduates, as mandated by the Master Plan for Higher Education. Currently, the “top one eighth” is identified via UC’s eligibility construct, which hinges primarily not on actual academic achievement, but instead on merely taking each one of the required high school courses and standardized tests. The BOARS proposal would replace this practice with a simpler and fairer system in which all students who meet specified criteria of college readiness would be guaranteed a comprehensive review of their applications. Alongside this statewide guarantee of a review, the top four percent of the class in each high school would be identified by grades in a-g courses, as is currently done to determine who is “Eligible in the Local Context.” These students, if otherwise entitled to a review, would be guaranteed admission somewhere in the UC system, just as they are now. If not accepted at any of the campuses to which they apply, they would be offered admission at another UC campus. This definition of who is eligible for guaranteed admission would be more transparent and fairer than the current definition, which relies heavily on participation in UC’s unique and extensive required test pattern. The remainder of the ETR pool beyond the top 4% would not be guaranteed admission, but would be guaranteed a comprehensive review of their entire application at each campus to which they apply.

Why is BOARS proposing these changes?
BOARS’ overarching goal is to better honor its Master-Plan obligations, and to strengthen UC’s commitment to the social contract they imply. If the proposal is enacted, two main benefits are expected to result. First, enriching the applicant pool should enable campuses to select a group of students who are better prepared academically. UC’s current requirements for guaranteed admission to the system, which are presented in UC publications and web sites, deter applications from some students who are academically strong, but whose records have some technical deficiency. For example, the 2003 CPEC study estimated that about 10,000 seniors completed the required a-g courses, took the SAT I, and graduated with GPAs of 3.5 or better, but were ineligible for UC because they did not take the required SAT II exams. If campuses could receive and review
applications from such students, they would likely find students who are better qualified overall than some students who are currently deemed eligible by the present version of the eligibility construct.

While eligibility, and therefore guaranteed admission to the system, involves meeting a GPA/test-score performance index, this index is set at such a modest level that nearly all students who take all required a-g courses and complete UC's test pattern are, in fact, UC eligible. At present, guaranteed admission to UC hinges primarily on students' course- and test-taking behaviors, and, to a much lesser extent, on the grades and scores they earn. Campuses can make better and more accurate decisions by reviewing all the information in the application, and by considering applicants' accomplishments in the context of their particular schools and personal circumstances. Not surprisingly, BOARS has found that considering other information from the application, in addition to average grades and composite test scores, does result in more accurate prediction of students' performance at UC.

The second expected benefit is better representation of California's various communities. Under current procedures, nearly half of UC's admitted freshmen come from high schools that account for only one-fifth of the state's public high school graduates, and the trend is toward more stratification, not less. UC's admitted freshmen come from households that have higher incomes and education levels than the general population of California. And the percentage of California high school graduates who are Chicano, Latino, African American or Native American is about two times bigger, and growing faster, than the percentage of UC freshmen from these groups.

The admission guarantee to the UC system, with its attendant rigidly-applied eligibility rules, has failed to attract high-achieving students from less-advantaged backgrounds. The current requirements for guaranteed admission instead favor students from high schools where curricula, counseling, and administrative procedures are geared toward maximizing the number of students who meet UC's requirements. These high schools tend to be affluent, enrolling relatively large proportions of white and Asian students. Enacting the BOARS proposal should increase the number of applications from the rest of the high schools. As the applicant pool draws from more high schools, it should also become more representative in terms of income, education, race, and ethnicity. A more representative pool should result in a more representative group of admitted freshmen. From this larger and more inclusive pool of applicants, campuses should be able to select students who are more qualified academically and who better represent California.

**Why propose these reforms now?**

During the past five years, all UC campuses have developed procedures for comprehensive review of freshman applications. These procedures take account of the whole array of information in the application, including various measures of academic achievement as well as leadership and other non-academic accomplishments, while considering, to varying degrees, each applicant's achievements in context.
Actual offers of admission have always been made by individual campuses. Most UC campuses now have more applicants than they can admit. The requirements for guaranteed admission to the UC system were developed in a previous era, before most campuses became selective, and before all the campuses had developed procedures for comprehensive review. Those earlier requirements, using only high school grades and test scores, no longer reflect the way UC campuses select students. But they are still publicized by UC as criteria for “eligibility,” and they deter some highly qualified students from applying. No other elite university, including those against which UC competes for students, guarantees admission to its admits based on such narrow criteria.

In short, the systemwide eligibility requirements have become obsolete. They now hinder UC’s effort to recruit and select the most qualified students.

What about the Master Plan? Doesn't it require a 12.5% eligibility rate for UC?
California's 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education calls for UC to “draw from the top one-eighth” of the state's high school graduates for its freshman classes. Subsequent revisions clarify that UC should in fact guarantee admission to all California applicants in the top 12.5% of their graduating class. The Master Plan and its amendments explicitly leave it to the University to decide how to determine the top one-eighth. Accordingly, UC developed the present eligibility construct, which requires periodic recalibration so that about one out of eight graduating seniors are deemed eligible.

The BOARS proposal would continue this adherence to the Master Plan by limiting the total number of freshman admission offers to about one out of eight graduating seniors. It would also strengthen UC's commitment to the principles underlying the Master Plan by basing the determination of the top one eighth not on mere coursework and test participation, but on a thorough and complete review of each college-ready applicant's qualifications.

Does the BOARS proposal remove the guarantee of admission to UC for some students?
Students who are in the top four percent of their high school class would continue to hold an admissions guarantee, as is presently the case. However, those students who are not in the top four percent of their high school class, even if eligible under the current policy, would no longer be guaranteed admission to the UC system. Instead, they would be guaranteed an admission review at every campus to which they apply.

The existing guarantee does not seem to be highly valued by most of its intended beneficiaries. The guarantee means that students who are not admitted by any of the campuses to which they apply are placed in a referral pool, which gives them the option of attending a UC campus where spaces are available — in recent years, Riverside and Merced. For Fall 2006, fewer than six percent of the students who were given this option accepted it. Those who accepted these referral offers amounted to less than one percent of new UC freshmen that year.
Admission to a particular campus seems to matter more to students than admission to the UC system. The BOARS proposal would guarantee admission via the referral pool to fewer students, but would guarantee more students that their applications are thoroughly reviewed by the campuses to which they apply.

**Does the BOARS proposal mean that campus-based selection procedures will have to change?**

No, except possibly at Merced. Other campuses have already been using comprehensive review to select freshmen. Some campuses rely more on numerical formulas, others rely more on the judgment of trained readers. The BOARS proposal would not change these existing procedures. It would only increase the numbers of applicants subject to them. Campuses, via their divisional senates and ultimately their faculty admissions committees, would remain free to use the methods they think best to admit students, consistent with BOARS' systemwide comprehensive review guidelines.

**The BOARS proposal would not require applicants to take SAT Subject examinations. Does that mean UC would be lowering its academic standards?**

No, because the SAT Reasoning examination – the successor to the old “SAT I” exam – now includes a writing component. In fact the SAT Reasoning test incorporates the content of the old SAT II Writing test essentially in its entirety. The previous SAT I examination did not include writing. Statistical studies found that the previous SAT II Writing examination had a strong correlation with the academic performance of students at UC. However, among UC freshmen entering in fall 2006 — the first class that took the new SAT Reasoning test — statistical studies now find that the new SAT Subject examinations, which are taken in subjects elected by the student, do not add significantly to the accuracy of predictions of academic performance at UC, once scores on the Reasoning test are taken into account. It is also worth noting that the SAT Reasoning exam now includes substantial material from the old SAT II Math 1C exam, which was previously required of all UC applicants. Under UC's old test pattern, SAT I and SAT II math scores were highly correlated, and given the inclusion of much of the SAT II math material in the new SAT Reasoning test, it seems likely that this correlation will only increase. Taken together, these facts indicate that there is no longer a good reason for UC to keep requiring the Subject exams.

However, there may be circumstances under which specific SAT Subject exams, as well as other tests, may be useful to a campus in arriving at an admission decision. For example, although no campus or major can require specific SAT Subject exams as a condition of admission, many UC engineering programs recommend that their applicants submit a score on the SAT Math 2C Subject test. The BOARS proposal would in no way alter how campuses use scores on non-required examinations, such as SAT Subject and Advanced Placement tests. Campus-based majors are free to recommend particular exams, students are free to take the exams and submit the scores, and campuses are free to take them into account in making decisions. But students would be entitled to have
their applications reviewed if they meet the basic conditions — a-g courses, grades, and taking the SAT Reasoning or ACT with Writing — and do not take SAT Subject examinations.

Finally – and importantly – it is noted that very few students are currently rendered ineligible because of low SAT Subject test scores. In effect, what matters in the current eligibility construct is whether students simply take the tests, not how well they score. This is not an effective way to maintain high standards.

What will happen to Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC)?
The BOARS proposal provides for continuation of the ELC program in essentially its present form, except that taking SAT Subject exams will no longer be required to retain ELC status. Test scores have never played a role in determining eligibility under the program, by design.

 Aren't there other ways of achieving the same goals without restructuring eligibility? What about Admission by Exception?
“Admission by Exception” (A by E) is a longstanding policy construct whereby campuses are permitted to admit ineligible applicants, not to exceed six percent of the enrolled freshman class. The original purposes of A by E were to allow campuses and the system to experiment with alternative admissions processes, to admit academically promising students whose profiles of disadvantage prevented them from achieving UC eligibility, and to attract students with extraordinary talent who failed eligibility for one reason or another. Some campuses use A by E primarily to admit sponsored athletes for intercollegiate sports, while others use the policy more broadly.

In the last decade or so, no campus has come close to the six percent limit — most have only one or two percent A by E enrollees. A main reason is that A by E admits must, by definition, be ineligible, but the great majority of applicants do meet eligibility requirements, because UC publications present these as minimum requirements for even applying to UC. The A by E pathway is an unadvertised pathway that is underutilized because of broad misperceptions that “eligibility” defines the pool of meritorious students. Advertising A by E more aggressively would be confusing, given the current eligibility policy.

With more applicants, won't the costs of admissions processing increase?
Yes, but applicants pay a $60 fee for each campus to which they apply. The marginal cost of reading a single application is considerably less than this, even in the most elaborate and intensive campus-based processes.

Will the BOARS proposal impact the University's general-fund appropriation from the state?
Each year, the University negotiates with the state's Department of Finance to arrive at an enrollment target for both freshman and transfer students, as well as a marginal funding rate ("per head" allocation). This negotiation process is driven by a variety of factors, including demographic projections, state and UC educational policy aims, and the fiscal circumstances of the state. While it is true that budgetary scenarios that prevent admission of all applicants guaranteed admission under the current eligibility policy—which occurred in 2004—are politically painful, it is highly unlikely that the current guarantee structure represents a significant element in the negotiation process. After all, it is widely known that, the eligibility index notwithstanding, UC routinely admits considerably more than 12.5% of California's high school graduates. Yet, neither the legislature nor the Department of Finance has put pressure on UC to adjust the eligibility index. This implies that other considerations, and not simply the number of students declared eligible by the eligibility index in force at any given time, drive the budget negotiations with the state.

Where can I go to get more information and supporting data?

The full BOARS proposal is available at:
www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/sw.rev.eligibility.reform.0807.pdf

CPEC report which synopsizes the main reasons why students fail to be UC eligible: "Factors limiting eligibility for the University of California" (CPEC report OP/04-03, December 2004), available at:
www.cpec.ca.gov/completereports/2004reports/OP04-03.pdf

Information relating to the stratification of access to UC: "BOARS Inclusiveness Indicators," available at:
www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/boars/boars.indicators.pdf

Study of the relevance of various factors known at the time of application in predicting freshman GPA at UC: "A comparison of measures included in the UC eligibility construct in the prediction of first year UC GPA – focus on the predictive value of SAT II," available at:
(URL pending Senate approval for posting)

Study to estimate the size and composition of the ETR pool: available at:
(URL pending Senate approval for posting)
A Comparison of Measures Included in the UC Eligibility Construct in the Prediction of First Year UC GPA – Focus on the Predictive Value of SAT II

Prepared by Sam Agronow, Tongshan Chang, and Kyra Caspary
Admissions Research and Evaluation
University of California, Office of the President, and
Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair UC Davis

Purpose:
The analyses in this report, requested by Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), are part of an effort to determine which factors available to UC admission offices, beyond those currently used in determining eligibility, improve the prediction of student success at the University of California. This report examines the contribution of a number of variables of different types, but also focuses on the relative value of the new SAT test pattern (as simulated from old SAT I and SAT II measures), most especially the value of the new SAT Subject test requirement, in the prediction.

Data Set:
Data from the cohort of freshman entrants to the University of California, 2004, were used in the analyses in this report. In addition to the grades and test scores used in determining UC eligibility, percentile ranks within high school (statistics akin to “class ranks”) were calculated for SAT scores, high school GPA, and number of college preparatory and honors courses taken. The percentile ranks were calculated based on three years of applicants to UC from the same school. Percentile ranks within school were not calculated for schools with fewer than 20 applicants to UC over the three-year period. Instead, the percentile ranks for three years of UC applicants (“pool” percentile ranks) were used in the cases where the school percentile ranks were not available. A dummy variable was included in the analyses to represent this replacement of pool percentile rank for school percentile rank. Additionally, a series of variables captured by the on-line application system, “Pathways,” was employed in the analyses. These variables include change in GPA from 9th to 10th grade and from 10th to 11th grade, number of academic and non-academic awards, number of AP exams taken or planned, percent of scores of 3 or 4 or 5 on the AP exams, total hours spent in activities outside of high school, and the percent of time spent in volunteer activities, employment, or academic preparation programs sponsored by the University of California or others. Finally, a school’s Academic Performance Index (API) was obtained from the California Department of Education. Schools with no API score, such as private and out-of-state schools, were assigned an API score equivalent to the mean score of schools in the 9th decile for that year, and a dummy variable indicating this replacement was included.

In order to simulate the effect of the new SAT composite scores on UC GPA, the older SAT I and SAT II measures available for the class of 2004 freshman entrants needed to be recombined. The new SAT reasoning exam, effective for the freshman class entering in 2006, includes three components: SAT Math, SAT Critical Reading, and SAT Writing. The complete battery of SATs in 2006 consist of these three SAT Reasoning exams plus two SAT Subject exams of the student's choice (the highest two SAT Subject scores are used). The simulation of this new SAT pattern was accomplished by combining the older SAT I and SAT II measures as follows:

1) Approximation of composite of new “SAT Reasoning” exam plus two SAT Subject exams =
   average(SAT I Math, SAT II Math) + SAT II Writing + SAT I Verbal + 2(SAT II Other)

2) Approximation of new “SAT Reasoning” exam only =
   average(SAT I Math, SAT II Math) + SAT II Writing + SAT I Verbal
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The outcome variable analyzed was UC GPA after one year of matriculation.

**Models/Analyses:**
Linear multiple regression was employed to predict the first-year GPA. The predictor variables described above are identified as follows:

1. Weighted, capped high school GPA
2. New simulated SAT Composite (simulated SAT Reasoning + simulated new SAT Subject) as defined above
3. New simulated SAT Reasoning (as defined above)
4. Rank: capped GPA (i.e., an approximation of the percentile rank of variable 1)
5. Rank SAT Composite (i.e., an approximation of the percentile rank of variable 2)
6. Rank: SAT Reasoning (i.e., an approximation of the percentile rank of variable 3)
7. Ranks: Percentile ranks on A-G courses, junior and sophomore honors, senior honors, plus a dummy variable identifying number missing one or more rank variables
8. Number of semesters of A-G courses, reported individually, plus total semesters of honors courses taken
9. "Pathways" variables described above
10. Academic Performance Index (API), as described above

The Models tested combine the variables or sets of variables numbered above as follows:

Model 1: 1 (i.e., Weighted, capped high school GPA only)
Model 2: 1 + 2 (i.e., Weighted, capped high school GPA + new simulated SAT Composite)
Model 3: 1 + 3 (i.e., Weighted capped high school GPA + new simulated SAT Reasoning)
Model 4: 1 + 2 + 5
Model 5: 1 + 3 + 4 + 6
Model 6: 1 + 3 + 4 + 6 + 7
Model 7: 1 + 3 + 4 + 6 + 7 + 8
Model 8: 1 + 3 + 4 + 6 + 7 + 8 + 9
Model 9: 1 + 3 + 4 + 6 + 7 + 8 + 9 + 10

**Results:**
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The nine tables that follow show the results of these regression analyses, first for the UC system and then broken down by the eight undergraduate campuses that accepted freshmen in 2004 (UC Merced was not yet enrolling students).

The multiple-R-squares shown in the top rows of each table allow the comparison of the nine Models in terms of the amount of variance explained in UC GPA.

**Predictive Value of “Simulated” SAT Subject scores:**
The comparison of Model 1 (Weighted-capped GPA only) with Model 2 (Weighted-capped GPA + simulated SAT Composite) and Model 3 (Weighted-capped GPA + simulated SAT Reasoning) in the systemwide data (first table) shows that the SATs add approximately 0.06 – 0.07 to the prediction of UC GPA. However, a comparison of Model 2 vs. Model 3 shows that the prediction of the simulated SAT Reasoning exam actually contributes slightly more variance (0.2542) to the prediction of UC GPA than the simulated SAT Composite which contains the SAT Subject scores (0.2413). This finding appears in the separate campus analyses, shown on subsequent pages, that compare Models 2 and 3 for all campuses except Berkeley. For Berkeley, see second table, the model including SAT Subject tests (Model 2) is only slightly higher (0.1775) than the model without the simulated SAT Subject scores (Model 3, 0.1766).

A comparison of Model 4 and Model 5 shows a similar pattern of results. Model 5 which contains no SAT Subject variables has slightly more explained variance than Model 4 which contains the SAT Subject variables.\(^1\)

Models 6 through 9 build on Model 5 by adding the additional variable groups. Each of these models exclude the SAT Subject variables. The systemwide results show that there are only small gains in predictive validity, beyond Model 5 (weighted-capped GPA, simulated SAT Reasoning, plus percentile ranks on GPA and SAT Reasoning) when these additional variable groups are included. I.e., the gain in predictive validity between Model 5 (0.2806) and Model 9 (0.2958) is about 0.015. However, the gains between Model 5 and Model 9 in some of the campus models is a little larger, e.g., about 0.036 at UCLA and 0.025 at UC Davis.

---

\(^1\) The variance explained by Model 5 may also be higher than Model 4 because of the inclusion of the percentile rank on weighted capped GPA in Model 5 but not Model 4.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT composite</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Preparatory Electives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change in GPA: 9th to 10th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change in GPA: 10th to 11th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of AP exams planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of APs exams taken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% taken scored 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% taken scored 4 or 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total activity hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Volunteers work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Outreach (non-UC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% UC Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Pathways data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reported by applicants on the UC online application.

1 Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal
2 Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal

Source: UC undergraduate admissions file (UAD) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data

Prepared by Admissions Research & Evaluation, 04-10-07
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## UC Berkeley: No exclusions
2004 fall freshman entrants

### University of California, Office of the President

#### A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

3494 cases used

Outcome: First-year GPA

### Missing at least 1 rank variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted, capped GPA</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT composite</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT reasoning</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: capped GPA</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT1 verbal</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT1 math</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 writing</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 math</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 other</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT1 math</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 writing</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 math</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 other</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: A-G courses</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: junior &amp; soph. honors</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: senior honors</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing at least 1 rank variable</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal

### Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal

Source: UC undergraduate admissions file (UAD) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data

Prepared by Admissions Research & Evaluation, 6-04-10-07
### Table 1: Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj R²</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1761</td>
<td>0.1759</td>
<td>0.2597</td>
<td>0.2594</td>
<td>0.2518</td>
<td>0.2822</td>
<td>0.2917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3211</td>
<td>0.3213</td>
<td>0.3211</td>
<td>0.3213</td>
<td>0.3211</td>
<td>0.3213</td>
<td>0.3211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome:** First-year GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted, capped GPA</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT composite</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT reasoning</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. The table above presents regression coefficients for various measures from the UC application in predicting UC GPA. The measures include the SAT composite, SAT reasoning, and various high school GPA components.
2. Models 1 to 9 represent different combinations of these measures, with Model 1 being the simplest and Model 9 the most complex.
3. The R² values indicate the proportion of variance in UC GPA explained by the respective models.
4. The p-values indicate the statistical significance of the coefficients, with values less than 0.05 typically considered significant.

**Source:** UC undergraduate admissions file (UAR) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data

---

*Reported by applicants on the UC online application.

1 Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal + SAT1 Writing + SAT2 Math

2 Approximation of SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal

Prepared by Admissions Research & Evaluation, 04-10-07
### A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

**Outcome: First-year GPA**

3626 cases used

#### UC Los Angeles: No exclusions

2004 fall freshman entrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Req</th>
<th>AdjReq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1538</td>
<td>0.1538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### R-squared and Adjusted R-squared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Rsq</th>
<th>AdjRsq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1538</td>
<td>0.1536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>~0.2078</td>
<td>0.2074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2112</td>
<td>0.2108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2464</td>
<td>0.2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2723</td>
<td>0.2719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2848</td>
<td>0.2810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3094</td>
<td>0.3031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3110</td>
<td>0.3042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAT Composite Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT composite</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT composite</td>
<td>384.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Beta Coefficients and P-values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted, capped GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: capped GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT1 verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT1 math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: A-G courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: Senior honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Preparatory Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: Change in GPA: 9th to 10th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: Change in GPA: 10th to 11th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: Academic Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: Other Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: # of AP exams planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: # of AP exams taken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: % taken scored 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: % taken scored 4 or 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: Total activity hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: % Volunteer work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: % Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: % Outreach (non-UC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: % UC Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways: Missing Pathways data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal
2. Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal

### Source:

UC undergraduate admissions data (UADS) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data

Prepared by Admissions Research & Evaluation, 04-10-07
## A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

### UC Riverside; No exclusions
- 2004 fall freshman entrants
- 3211 cases used
- Outcome: First-year GPA

### Measures
- **SAT composite**
  - Math
  - Reading
  - Writing
- **Rank**
  - Capped GPA
  - SAT1 Math
  - SAT1 Verbal
- **Total Honors**
  - History/Social Science
  - English
  - Mathematics
  - Lab Science
  - Other Language
  - Visual and Performing Arts
  - College Preparatory Elective
- **Total activity hours**
- **Change in GPA**: 9th to 10th
- **Change in GPA**: 10th to 11th
- **% Volunteer work
  - % Employment
  - % Outreach (non-UC)
  - % UC Outreach
- **Missing Pathways data**
- **API (2003)**

### Beta Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>+.486</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>+.463</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>+.746</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted capped GPA</td>
<td>+.620</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>+.914</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>+.988</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>+.877</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT composite</td>
<td>+.321</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>+.000</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>+.001</td>
<td>+.490</td>
<td>+.000</td>
<td>+.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank, capped GPA</td>
<td>+.005</td>
<td>+.202</td>
<td>+.005</td>
<td>+.287</td>
<td>+.008</td>
<td>+.264</td>
<td>+.003</td>
<td>+.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank, SAT1 Math</td>
<td>+.002</td>
<td>+.064</td>
<td>+.002</td>
<td>+.017</td>
<td>+.003</td>
<td>+.107</td>
<td>+.003</td>
<td>+.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank, SAT2 Math</td>
<td>+.000</td>
<td>+.008</td>
<td>+.002</td>
<td>+.021</td>
<td>+.002</td>
<td>+.056</td>
<td>+.002</td>
<td>+.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank, SAT2 Writing</td>
<td>+.001</td>
<td>+.038</td>
<td>+.002</td>
<td>+.017</td>
<td>+.002</td>
<td>+.074</td>
<td>+.002</td>
<td>+.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank, SAT2 Other</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.197</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank, A-G Courses</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank, junior &amp; soph. honors</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-.328</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-.503</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-.922</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank, senior honors</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-.422</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-.603</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-.717</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted, capped GPA</td>
<td>+.001</td>
<td>+.366</td>
<td>+.001</td>
<td>+.388</td>
<td>+.001</td>
<td>+.365</td>
<td>+.001</td>
<td>+.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Social Science</td>
<td>+.177</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>+.148</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>+.109</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>+.090</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>+.017</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>+.014</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>+.013</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>+.015</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>+.016</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>+.013</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>+.013</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>+.015</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Science</td>
<td>+.033</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>+.005</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>+.005</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>+.005</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Language</td>
<td>+.013</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>+.013</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>+.013</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>+.015</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>+.003</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>+.003</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>+.003</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>+.005</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Preparatory Elective</td>
<td>+.002</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>+.000</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>+.001</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>+.000</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Honors</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-.597</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-.126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
1. Approximation of new SAT composite: \(\text{average}(\text{SAT1 Math}, \text{SAT2 Math}) + \text{SAT2 Writing} + \text{SAT1 Verbal} \times 2\)
2. Approximation of new SAT composite: \(\text{average}(\text{SAT1 Math}, \text{SAT2 Math}) + \text{SAT2 Writing} + \text{SAT1 Verbal}\)

Source: UC undergraduate admissions file (VAD) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data.

Prepared by Admissions Research & Evaluation: 04-10-07
### A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

#### UC San Diego: No exclusions
2004 fall freshman entrants

3802 cases used
Outcome: First-year GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Rsq</th>
<th>AdjRsq</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>T 'SAT reasoning'</th>
<th>Rsq</th>
<th>AdjRsq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>0.1058</td>
<td>0.0966</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>0.1222</td>
<td>0.1117</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>0.2174</td>
<td>0.2062</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>0.2462</td>
<td>0.2348</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5</td>
<td>0.2467</td>
<td>0.2346</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 6</td>
<td>0.2517</td>
<td>0.2394</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 7</td>
<td>0.2819</td>
<td>0.2594</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 8</td>
<td>0.2962</td>
<td>0.2594</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pathways Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathways Variables</th>
<th>B Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in GPA: 9th to 10th</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in GPA: 10th to 11th</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Awards</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Awards</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of AP exams planned</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of AP exams taken</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% taken scored 3</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% taken scored 4 or 5</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total activity hours</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Volunteer work</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employment</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Outreach (non-UC)</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% UC Outreach</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Pathways data</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table: UC San Diego: No exclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC San Diego: No exclusions</th>
<th>2004 fall freshman entrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3802 cases used</td>
<td>Outcome: First-year GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: UC undergraduate admissions file (UAD) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data</td>
<td>Prepd by Admissions Research &amp; Evaluation, 04-10-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

2866 cases used

Outcome: First-year GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Raq</th>
<th>AdjRaq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raq</td>
<td>0.1006</td>
<td>0.1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdjRaq</td>
<td>0.1370</td>
<td>0.1373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raq</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdjRaq</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raq</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdjRaq</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raq</td>
<td>0.1005</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdjRaq</td>
<td>0.1042</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raq</td>
<td>0.1097</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdjRaq</td>
<td>0.1048</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reported by applicants on the UC online application.

1 Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math,SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT 1 Verbal

2 Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math,SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT 1 Verbal
## University of California, Office of the President

**A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA**

2004 fall freshman entrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rsq</td>
<td>0.1854</td>
<td>0.2355</td>
<td>0.2961</td>
<td>0.2993</td>
<td>0.3203</td>
<td>0.3211</td>
<td>0.3259</td>
<td>0.3466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdjRsq</td>
<td>0.1852</td>
<td>0.2354</td>
<td>0.2966</td>
<td>0.2996</td>
<td>0.3208</td>
<td>0.3219</td>
<td>0.3266</td>
<td>0.3474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome: First-year GPA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>-0.375</th>
<th>-1.522</th>
<th>-1.453</th>
<th>-2.130</th>
<th>-1.720</th>
<th>-1.117</th>
<th>-1.941</th>
<th>-0.964</th>
<th>-1.136</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weighted, capped GPA</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### High School School

- **SAT composite**
  - Model 1: 0.001
  - Model 2: 0.001
  - Model 3: 0.001
  - Model 4: 0.001
  - Model 5: 0.001
  - Model 6: 0.001
  - Model 7: 0.001
  - Model 8: 0.001
  - Model 9: 0.001

### College Preparatory Elective

- **Total honors**
  - Change in GPA: 9th to 10th: -0.199
  - Change in GPA: 10th to 11th: -0.189
  - Academic Awards: -0.189
  - Other Awards: -0.189
  - # of AP exams planned: -0.189
  - # of AP exams taken: -0.189
  - % taken scored 3: -0.189
  - % taken scored 4 or 5: -0.189
  - Total activity hours: -0.189
  - % Volunteer work: -0.189
  - % Employment: -0.189
  - % Outreach (non-UC): -0.189
  - % UC Outreach: -0.189

- **Missing Pathways data**
  - API (2003): -0.189

---

*Reported by applicants on the UC on-line application.

1 Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT 1 Verbal + 2(SAT2 Other)

2 Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT 1 Verbal

**Reported by applicants on the UC on-line application.**

**Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT 1 Verbal + 2(SAT2 Other)**

**Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT 1 Verbal**

---

*Prepared by Admissions Research & Evaluation*
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**Source:** UC undergraduate admissions file (UAD) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data
## University of California, Office of the President

### A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

2004 fall freshman entrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raq</td>
<td>0.1067</td>
<td>0.1727</td>
<td>0.1835</td>
<td>0.2008</td>
<td>0.2085</td>
<td>0.2075</td>
<td>0.2121</td>
<td>0.2326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdjRsq</td>
<td>0.1064</td>
<td>0.1722</td>
<td>0.1830</td>
<td>0.2092</td>
<td>0.2050</td>
<td>0.2050</td>
<td>0.2079</td>
<td>0.2254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B (Beta)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B (Beta)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B (Beta)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B (Beta)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B (Beta)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B (Beta)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B (Beta)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B (Beta)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT compositi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: capped GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT1 verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT1 math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: A-G courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: junior &amp; soph. honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: senior honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Preparatory Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in GPA: 9th to 10th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in GPA: 10th to 11th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of AP exams planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of APs exams taken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% taken scored 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% taken scored 4 or 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Volunteer work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Outreach (non-UC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% UC Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Pathways data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>API</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reported by applicants on the UC on-line application.

1 Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal + 2(SAT2 Other)

2 Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal

**Model 9**

3575 cases used

Outcome: First-year GPA

*Change in GPA: 9th to 10th

**Change in GPA: 10th to 11th

Source: UC undergraduate admissions file (UAD) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data

Prepared by Admissions Research & Evaluations, UC Irvine, 04-10-07
MEMORANDUM

April 4, 2007

TO: Mark Rashid, Chair, BOARS Subcommittee, UC Academic Senate
FROM: Roger Studley, Assistant Director, Admissions Research & Evaluation, UCOP
SUBJECT: Entitled to Review – Third set of data simulations

Data Requested

The attached data (4pp.) contain follow-up analyses related to “Tasks 1 & 2” of your December memo requesting analyses related to BOARS’ development of the concept of “Entitled to Review” (ETR). These data update the data presented at the March BOARS meeting by (i) adding matriculation data to the ETR scenarios and (ii) adding a scenario, described in your March 29 email, that reflects BOARS’ current thinking on an ETR proposal.

Description of Data Provided

Each page of the attached data corresponds to one of the following scenarios:

- **Page 1**: Students who, at the end of their junior year, had (i) completed, with a grade of C or better, the 11 a-g courses required for ELC eligibility, (ii) achieved a 2.8 minimum unweighted a-g GPA, and (iii) taken the SAT I or ACT examination. (Note that students were not required to take a writing examination because it was not part of the SAT I or ACT examinations for the cohort of students graduating high school in 2003, the year from which the data sample was drawn.) *This scenario reflects BOARS’ current thinking on an ETR proposal.*

- **Page 2**: Students who, at the end of their junior year, had completed, with a grade of C or better, the 11 a-g courses required for ELC eligibility. In contrast to the previous scenario, no minimum GPA or test-taking requirements are imposed in this scenario.

- **Page 3**: Students who, by the end of their senior year, fulfilled the 15 unit a-g course requirement with a grade of C or better in each course. No minimum GPA or test-taking requirements are imposed.

- **Page 4**: Students meeting CSU’s 2003 eligibility requirements.

Each page/table has 9 columns of data:

- **Column 1**: Contains estimated characteristics for the entire cohort of California public high school graduates in 2003 (the year from which the sample was drawn).
Entitled to Review – Third set of data simulations

Note that these characteristics are not the actual characteristics of the 2003 cohort. They are the characteristics of the 54-school sample on which the simulations (and the 2003 CPEC Eligibility Study) were based. As such, they provide a consistent basis of comparison for the scenarios. Sample stratification was based on four strata, created by dividing public high schools into (i) those with and without a large proportion of African American students and (ii) those with API scores above or below the median. On these dimensions, therefore, the weighted sample estimates are likely to closely reflect the underlying population; on other dimensions, the correspondence between the sample and the population will be weaker. For example, while the population estimate for API deciles 1-5 is 48% (which is close to the expected 50%), the estimate for deciles 1-3 is only 20% (relatively far from the expected 30%).

- **Column 2:** Contains the ETR estimate for the given scenario. The “College Aspirations” rows at the bottom of the page have been added to suggest likely number of applicants from the ETR population. The “Stimulated Applicants (Projected)” row uses a rough estimate of the stimulation effect of the ELC program (12% additional applicants) to produce an estimate of the number of students who might apply to UC under an ETR policy.

- **Columns 3-5:** These columns partition the simulated ETR populations into three (mutually exclusive and exhaustive) groups:
  - Students currently eligible for UC either in the Local Context or by Examination Alone. (These students might retain their guarantee of admission to the UC system if an ETR-type admissions/eligibility model were adopted.)
  - Students currently eligible for UC but only in the Statewide Context. (These students would no longer have guarantee of admission to the UC system, but they would remain eligible for review if and ETR-type model were adopted.)
  - Students not previously eligible for UC but who meet the ETR definition under consideration in the present scenario.

- **Columns 6-9:** These columns attempt to suggest the number of ETR students who might apply to UC. Column 6, a “lower bound” estimate, comprises ETR-designated students who did apply to UC in 2003. Column 7 comprises the subset of these students who ultimately enrolled at UC. Column 8 comprises ETR-designated students who show up in the National Student Clearinghouse as having matriculated at any 4-year college (not just at UC). Column 9, which might be considered an “upper bound” estimate, adds students who matriculated at any 2-year college to the column 8 total.
Simulations of "Entitled to Review"

Scenario: (i) "ELC 11" A-G Requirement, (ii) 2.8 Minimum Unweighted GPA, and (iii) Must Take ACT or SAT Reasoning Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Graduates (Estimated from Sample)</th>
<th>EFR Students: All</th>
<th>EFR Students: with Guarantee (ELC or EEA)</th>
<th>EFR Students: without Guarantee (ESE Only)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Previously Ineligible</th>
<th>EFR Students: Applied to UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at a 4-Yr College (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled Anywhere (Historical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in Sample (of 18,660)</td>
<td>18,660</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>1,701</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>3,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Estimate (weighted)</td>
<td>335,658</td>
<td>72,404</td>
<td>15,217</td>
<td>26,501</td>
<td>28,680</td>
<td>41,707</td>
<td>21,879</td>
<td>51,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of High School Grads</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

- Female: 52%
- Male: 48%

**Ethnicity**

- African American: 10%
- Latino: 31%
- Native American: 1%
- Asian American: 2%
- White: 50%
- Unknown: 1%

**High School GPA**

- Students Completing A-G: 27%
- Mean GPA (unweighted): 3.33
- Mean GPA (weighted, capped): 3.45
- All Students: 2.63
- Mean GPA (weighted, capped): 2.88
- Below 2.80 (weighted, capped): 55%
- 2.80 - 3.19: 17%
- 3.20 - 3.59: 14%
- 3.60 - 3.99: 9%
- 4.00 and above: 4%

**Academic Performance**

- Deciles 1, 2, and 3 (bottom): 20%
- Deciles 4 and 5: 26%
- Deciles 6 and 7: 27%
- Deciles 8, 9, and 10 (top): 24%

**College Aspirations**

- Applied to UC: 16%
- Stipulated Applicants (Projected): 18%
- Enrolled at UC: 8%
- Enrolled at Any 4-Year College: 25%
- Enrolled at Any 2- or 4-Year College: 69%
**Simulations of "Entitled to Review"**

**Scenario: "ELC 11" A-G Requirement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Graduates</th>
<th>EFR Students:</th>
<th>EFR Students with Guarantee</th>
<th>EFR Students without Guarantee</th>
<th>EFR Students: Applied to UC</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at a 4-Yr College</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled Anywhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Estimated from Sample)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>(ELC or EEA)</td>
<td>(ESC Only)</td>
<td>(Historical)</td>
<td>(Historical)</td>
<td>(Historical)</td>
<td>(Historical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in Sample (of 18,660)</td>
<td>18,660</td>
<td>5,785</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>2,818</td>
<td>2,958</td>
<td>1,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Estimate (weighted)</td>
<td>335,658</td>
<td>91,228</td>
<td>15,731</td>
<td>29,744</td>
<td>45,701</td>
<td>43,966</td>
<td>22,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of High School Grads</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

- Female: 52% 57% 56% 58% 57% 57% 58% 59% 58%
- Male: 48% 43% 41% 42% 43% 43% 42% 41% 42%

**Ethnicity**

- African American: 10% 6% 2% 5% 8% 5% 4% 7% 6%
- Latino: 31% 12% 14% 19% 14% 11% 14% 15%
- Native American: 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1%
- Asian American: 17% 26% 30% 20% 37% 44% 30% 27%
- White: 40% 49% 44% 52% 42% 40% 45% 50%
- Unknown: 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1%

**High School GPA**

- Students Completing A-G: 27% 78% 89% 100% 60% 87% 89% 85% 80%
- Mean GPA (weighted, capped): 3.45 3.50 3.93 3.52 3.26 3.65 3.68 3.58 3.51

**All Students**

- Mean GPA (unweighted): 2.63 3.30 3.78 3.37 3.10 3.47 3.53 3.41 3.32
- Mean GPA (weighted, capped): 2.68 3.42 3.92 3.52 3.18 3.62 3.69 3.55 3.44
- Below 2.60 (weighted, capped): 55% 9% 0% 1% 17% 2% 0% 3% 8%
- 2.60 - 3.19: 17% 22% 3% 16% 32% 13% 9% 17% 21%
- 3.20 - 3.59: 14% 32% 9% 40% 34% 30% 30% 32% 32%
- 3.60 - 3.99: 9% 25% 37% 36% 14% 34% 36% 31% 26%
- 4.00 and above: 4% 12% 51% 6% 2% 21% 24% 17% 13%

**Academic Performance**

- Deciles 1, 2, and 3 (bottom): 20% 14% 17% 11% 16% 15% 15% 15% 14%
- Deciles 4 and 5: 28% 24% 21% 16% 29% 16% 16% 18% 24%
- Deciles 6 and 7: 27% 26% 24% 20% 25% 25% 25% 24% 24%
- Deciles 8, 9, and 10 (top): 24% 36% 38% 47% 29% 44% 45% 39% 37%

**College Aspirations**

- Applied to UC: 16% 48% 82% 85% 13% 100% 100% 65% 52%
- Stimulated Applicants (Projected): 18% 54% 88% 85% 13% 100% 100% 65% 52%
- Enrolled at UC: 5% 25% 50% 42% 4% 100% 100% 40% 26%
- Enrolled at Any 4-Year College: 25% 62% 85% 80% 42% 83% 100% 100% 70%
- Enrolled at Any 2- or 4-Year College: 69% 88% 93% 93% 82% 94% 100% 100% 100%
Simulations of "Entitled to Review"
Scenario: "Freshman 15" A-G Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Graduates (Estimated from Sample)</th>
<th>EFR Students: All</th>
<th>EFR Students with Guarantee (ELC or EEA)</th>
<th>EFR Students w/out Guarantee (ESC Only)</th>
<th>EFR Students Previously Ineligible</th>
<th>EFR Students: Applied to UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at a 4-Yr College (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled Anywhere (Historical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in Sample (of 18,660)</td>
<td>18,660</td>
<td>5,198</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>3,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Estimate (weighted)</td>
<td>335,658</td>
<td>82,991</td>
<td>14,094</td>
<td>32,131</td>
<td>36,766</td>
<td>40,820</td>
<td>20,772</td>
<td>54,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of High School Grads</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Completing A-G</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (unweighted)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (weighted, capped)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (unweighted)</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (weighted, capped)</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 2.50 (weighted, capped)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.60 - 3.10</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20 - 3.59</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.60 - 3.89</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 and above</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 1, 2, and 3 (bottom)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 4 and 5</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 6 and 7</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 8, 9, and 10 (top)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Aspirations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied to UC</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated Applicants (Projected)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at UC</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at Any 4-Year College</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at Any 2- or 4-Year College</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Simulations of "Entitled to Review"

#### Scenario: CSU Eligible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Graduates (Estimated from Sample)</th>
<th>EFR Students: All</th>
<th>EFR Students with Guarantee (ELC or EEA)</th>
<th>EFR Students without Guarantee (ESC Only)</th>
<th>EFR Students Previously Ineligible</th>
<th>EFR Students: Applied to UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at a 4-Yr College (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled Anywhere (Historical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in Sample (of 18,660)</td>
<td>18,660</td>
<td>6,057</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>2,997</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>3,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Estimate (weighted)</td>
<td>335,858</td>
<td>98,376</td>
<td>15,191</td>
<td>31,843</td>
<td>40,342</td>
<td>44,469</td>
<td>22,388</td>
<td>61,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of High School Grads</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### High School GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Completing A-G</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (unweighted)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (weighted, capped)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (unweighted)</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (weighted, capped)</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 2.80 (weighted, capped)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.80 - 3.19</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20 - 3.59</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.60 - 3.99</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 and above</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Academic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deciles 1, 2, and 3 (bottom)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 4 and 5</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 6 and 7</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 8, 9, and 10 (top)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### College Aspirations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied to UC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated Applicants (Projected)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at UC</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at Any 4-Year College</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at Any 2- or 4-Year College</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Changes in Bylaw M2

To be adopted:

Present: M2 Officers

M.2.1.4 The Chair assumes office on the first day of the academic year following his/her election at a regular election or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election. The secretary takes office immediately upon appointment.

Proposed: M2 Officers

M.2.1.4 The Chair assumes office on the first day of September following his/her election at a regular election or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election. The secretary takes office immediately upon appointment.

Justification:

The change in the start date will enable the Chair of the Executive Committee and the Executive Committee members to start at the same time which would be consistent with the other colleges/schools thus making the transition period smoother and more effective.

Effective: Immediately upon approval

Reviewed and Approved by AGSM Executive Committee: June 15, 2006
Reviewed and Approved by AGSM Faculty: June 1, 2007
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: September 7, 2007
Endorsed by the Advisory Committee: September 24, 2007
To be adopted:

Proposed Change in the Bourns College of Engineering Bylaw EN2

Present:
EN2.1.1 The Chair of the Faculty is elected for a two-year term and is not eligible to succeed himself/herself immediately. The election is conducted in accordance with the procedure prescribed in these bylaws. If the Chair is unable to complete the term of office for which he/she has been elected, the Secretary-Parliamentarian of the Division shall, within two months, conduct an election in accordance with the procedure prescribed in these bylaws for the unexpired term, provided that the unexpired term is longer than six months. In the interim, or in the event that the vacated term is less than six months, the Vice Chair of the Faculty will serve as Chair.

EN2.1.2 The Vice Chair of the Faculty is chosen by the Executive Committee from among its membership. The term of office is two years.

EN2.1.3 The secretary of the Faculty is chosen by the Executive Committee from among its membership. The term of office is one year.

EN2.1.4 The parliamentarian of the faculty is chosen by the Executive Committee from among its membership. The term of office is one year.

Proposed:
EN2.1.1 The Chair of the Faculty is elected for a three-year term and is not eligible to succeed himself/herself immediately. The election is conducted in accordance with the procedure prescribed in these bylaws. If the Chair is unable to complete the term of office for which he/she has been elected, the Secretary-Parliamentarian of the Division shall, within two months, conduct an election in accordance with the procedure prescribed in these bylaws for the unexpired term, provided that the unexpired term is longer than six months. In the interim, or in the event that the vacated term is less than six months, the Vice Chair of the Faculty will serve as Chair.

EN2.1.2 The Vice Chair of the Faculty is chosen by the Executive Committee from among its membership. The term of office expires at the end of committee membership.

EN2.1.3 The secretary of the Faculty is chosen by the Executive Committee from among its membership. The term of office expires at the end of committee membership.

EN2.1.4 The parliamentarian of the faculty is chosen by the Executive Committee from among its membership. The term of office expires at the end of committee membership.
Justification:

Re EN2.1.1: The terms of office of all the elected members of the Executive Committee, except for the Chair, have been recently increased from two to three years. The proposed change applies the same rule to the Committee Chair.

EN2.1.2 - EN2.1.4. Since the Vice Chair, Secretary and Parliamentarian are chosen by the Committee from among its members whenever a vacancy arises, their terms of office are deemed to expire at the end of their committee membership rather than after a fixed period of one year.

Effective: Fall 2007

Approved by College of Engineering Executive Committee- January 8, 2007
Approved by College of Engineering Faculty- June 4, 2007
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: June 20, 2007
Endorsed by the Advisory Committee: July 9, 2007
To be adopted:

**Proposed Change in the Bourns College of Engineering Bylaw EN4**

Present:

EN4.1 There is an Executive Committee consisting of the Chair of the Faculty, ex officio; the Dean of the college, ex officio; the associate Dean(s) of the college, ex officio; and seven members of the Faculty as provided in EN4.01.01 below; and a student representative as provided in EN4.1.1.4 below. An elected member is not eligible for immediate reelection unless he/she has completed a term of fewer than 18 months. Eligibility is reestablished after one year of non-service. The Chair, Vice Chair, secretary, and parliamentarian of the Faculty occupy corresponding offices in the Executive Committee. The Vice Chair, Secretary, and Parliamentarian are elected by the Executive Committee from the existing elected Faculty members of the Executive Committee whenever a vacancy arises.

EN4.1.1 The elected membership of the committee shall include seven members elected from the Faculty, to be distributed as follows: one member chosen from each of the programs in Bioengineering, Chemical Engineering, Computer Science and Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Environmental Engineering, and Mechanical Engineering; and one member elected from the Faculty at large of the College. The election is conducted as provided in Chapter 7 of the bylaws of the Division. The first order of business of the Executive Committee, after the election of the Chair of the Faculty, will be to determine whether the representation formula needs change and to recommend appropriately to the Faculty.

Proposed:

EN4.1 There is an Executive Committee consisting of the Chair of the Faculty, ex officio; the Dean of the college, ex officio; the associate Dean(s) of the college, ex officio; the elected members of the Faculty as provided in EN4.01.01 below; and a student representative as provided in EN4.1.1.4 below. An elected member is not eligible for immediate reelection unless he/she has completed a term of fewer than 18 months. Eligibility is reestablished after one year of non-service. The Chair, Vice Chair, secretary, and parliamentarian of the Faculty occupy corresponding offices in the Executive Committee. The Vice Chair, Secretary, and Parliamentarian are elected by the Executive Committee from the existing elected Faculty members of the Executive Committee whenever a vacancy arises.

EN4.1.1 The elected membership of the committee shall include one member chosen from each of the departments in the College and one member elected from the Faculty at large of the College. The election is conducted as provided in Chapter 7 of the bylaws of the Division. The first order of business of the Executive Committee, after the election of the Chair of the Faculty, will be to determine whether the representation formula needs change and to recommend appropriately to the Faculty.

EN4.1.1a (Transition rule) The two representatives from the Department of Chemical and Environmental Engineering currently serving their respective terms will remain members of the Committee until their terms expire.
A quorum consists of no less than fifty percent of the elected faculty members of the Executive Committee.

Justification:
The current membership formula stipulating that the Department of Chemical and Environmental Engineering is represented by two members while all the other departments have only one representative has been replaced by the more equitable formula stipulating that all departments are represented by one member. The transition rule ensures however that the two currently elected representatives from the Department of Chemical and Environmental Engineering will remain members of the Committee until their terms expire.

Effective: Fall 2007
Approved by College of Engineering Executive Committee – January 8, 2007
Approved by College of Engineering Faculty – June 4, 2007
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: June 20, 2007
Endorsed by the Advisory Committee: July 9, 2007
To be adopted:

Proposed Change in the Bourns College of Engineering Bylaw EN4.2

Present:

EN4.2 There is a standing Library Committee consisting of three Faculty members appointed annually by the Chair of the Executive Committee and the University Librarian, ex officio. The duty of this committee is to advise on the engineering collections in the appropriate University Libraries. The Executive Committee Chair will appoint a Chair of the Library Committee, who will call and oversee all meetings. The Chair of the Library Committee must call a meeting, if requested, by (1) the Executive Committee of the College; (2) any member of the Library Committee or (3) the University Librarian. The Chair of The Library Committee will issue an annual report to the Faculty of the College describing the activities of the committee and the policy decisions of the Library which affect the faculty.

EN4.3 There is a standing committee on honors and scholarships consisting of three members of the Faculty appointed by the Executive Committee. The duties of the committee are judging of the awarding of honors at graduation and evaluation of applications for fellowships and scholarships judged and/or awarded through this college.

EN4.4 There is a standing undergraduate education committee consisting of the undergraduate advisors from each of the programs in the college and chaired by the associate dean. The duty of this committee is to provide an on-going review of college undergraduate programs and policies. Its advice and recommendations are to be presented to the dean and the departmental chairs, and reported quarterly to the executive committee. (EN 31 May 01)

Proposed:

EN4.2 There is a standing undergraduate education committee consisting of the undergraduate advisors from each of the programs in the college and chaired by the associate dean. The duties of the committee are the judging of the awarding of honors at graduation and evaluation of applications for fellowships and scholarships judged and/or awarded through this college. The committee is also charged with the duty to provide an on-going review of college undergraduate programs and policies. Its advice and recommendations are to be presented to the dean and the departmental chairs, and reported quarterly to the executive committee. (EN 31 May 01)
Justification:
The responsibilities of the seldom used committee on honors and scholarship have been incorporated into the standing committee on undergraduate education. The Library Committee is no longer needed since its responsibilities are handled by the departmental library representatives.

Effective: Fall 2007
Approved by College of Engineering Executive Committee – January 8, 2007
Approved by College of Engineering Faculty – June 4, 2007
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: June 20, 2007
Endorsed by the Advisory Committee: July 9, 2007
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
COLLEGE OF NATURAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
NOVEMBER 20, 2007

To be adopted:

Proposed Change in Bylaw N4.1.1 and N4.1.1.1

PRESENT:

N4.1.1 The elected membership of the committee shall include one member elected from each of the following departments: Biochemistry, Biology, Botany and Plant Sciences, Chemistry, Earth Sciences, Entomology, Mathematics, Nematology, Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Physics, Plant Pathology, Environmental Sciences, and Statistics. One member shall be elected from the undergraduate program in Biological Sciences and one member from the Division of Biomedical Sciences. The first order of business of the Executive Committee after the biennial election of the Chair of the Faculty will be to determine whether the representation formula needs change and to recommend appropriately to the faculty.

PROPOSED:

N4.1.1 The elected membership of the committee shall include one member elected from each of the following departments: Biochemistry, Biology, Botany and Plant Sciences, Chemistry, Earth Sciences, Entomology, Mathematics, Nematology, Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Physics, Plant Pathology, Environmental Sciences, and Statistics. One member shall be elected from the undergraduate program in Biological Sciences. The first order of business of the Executive Committee after the biennial election of the Chair of the Faculty will be to determine whether the representation formula needs change and to recommend appropriately to the faculty.

N4.1.1.1 The term of office of the Chair of the Faculty is two years, elected in even years. The term of office of members of the Executive Committee is three years. The five members of the Executive Committee from the departments of Biology, Chemistry, Nematology, Cell Biology and Neuroscience and Environmental Sciences are elected in the same year; the five members of the Executive Committee from the Division of Biomedical Sciences, and the five members of the departments of Earth Sciences, Physics, Plant Pathology and Statistics are elected in the same year; the four members of the Executive Committee from the departments of Biology, Chemistry, Nematology, Cell Biology and Neuroscience and Environmental Sciences are elected in the same year; the four members of the Executive Committee from the departments of Earth Sciences, Physics, Plant Pathology and Statistics are elected in the same year; the five members of the
Plant Pathology and Statistics are elected in the same year; the five members of the Executive Committee from the undergraduate program in Biological Sciences and the departments of Biochemistry, Botany and Plant Sciences, Entomology, and Mathematics are elected in the same year.

JUSTIFICATIONS:
Biomedical Sciences has created separate Bylaws that were approved at the Academic Senate Division Meeting May 22, 2007. Biomedical Sciences will create their own Executive Committee and will no longer be joined with the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences.

APPROVALS:
Approved by the Executive Committee of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences: May 30, 2007
Approved by the CNAS Faculty: May 30, 2007
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: June 22, 2007
Endorsed by Advisory Committee: July 9, 2007
To be adopted: Proposed Change in Regulation NR2.4.5.1

PRESENT:
NR 2.4.5.1 A declaration of a second major, which includes a list of courses used to satisfy the requirements for each major must be signed by both academic major advisors and the Dean. The declaration must be filed at the Dean's office at least two quarters before graduation. At the time of filing, a student must have completed 120 units, with at least 18 upper division units in the primary major and 8 upper division units in the secondary major. A student must also be in good academic standing and be able to complete both majors without exceeding the 216 unit college maximum.

PROPOSED:
NR 2.4.5.1 A declaration of a second major, which includes a list of courses used to satisfy the requirements for each major must be signed by both academic major advisors and the Dean. The declaration must be filed at the Dean's office at least two quarters before graduation. At the time of filing, a student must have completed 120 units, with at least 18 upper division units in the primary major and 8 upper division units in the secondary major. To declare a second major, a student must have a cumulative GPA of 2.7 or higher and a major GPA of 2.7 or higher.

JUSTIFICATIONS:
This proposal will ensure that students declare a second major only after academic success has been established for the primary major.

APPROVALS:
Approved by the Executive Committee of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences: April 18, 2007
Approved by the CNAS Faculty: May 30, 2007
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: June 28, 2007
Endorsed by Advisory Committee: July 9, 2007
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
NOVEMBER 20, 2007

PROPOSED CHANGE IN COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
BYLAW 8.15.1

To be adopted:

Present:  Proposed:

8.15.1 This committee consists of at least five members, and (ex officio) the campus director of the Education Abroad Program, who may not serve as the Chair of the Divisional committee. The Vice Chancellor of International Programs, the director of the International Services Center, the director of University Extension's International Education Programs, an undergraduate student, and a graduate student will serve as non-voting representatives on the Divisional committee. The representative on the Universitywide committee is normally the Chair of this committee. (Am 26 May 88) (Am 27 May 99) (Am 11 Nov 04) (Am__________)

8.15.1 This committee consists of at least five members, and (ex officio) the campus director of the Education Abroad Program, who may not serve as the Chair of the Divisional committee. The Dean of University Extension, the director of the International Education Center, the director of University Extension's International Education Programs, an undergraduate student, and a graduate student will serve as non-voting representatives on the Divisional committee. The representative on the Universitywide committee is normally the Chair of this committee. (Am 26 May 88) (Am 27 May 99) (Am 11 Nov 04) (Am__________)

Justification:
There is no longer a position for the Vice Chancellor of International Programs. The replacement for this position will be the Dean of University Extension. International Services Center has changed its name to International Education Center.

Effective:   Fall 2007
Approved by Committee on International Education – October 9, 2007
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: – October 10, 2007
Endorsed by the Advisory Committee: – October 22, 2007
Proposed Bylaw 8.27
Committee on Distinguished Campus Service Award

To be adopted:

8.27 DISTINGUISHED CAMPUS SERVICE AWARD – (En 2007)

8.27.1 This committee consists of five members of the Division and will be composed of previous recipients of the award selected by the Academic Senate Committee on Committees with due diligence to maintaining diversity of membership. Each year, the newly selected recipients of the award become eligible to serve on the committee. For the first five years of the committee’s existence, the membership can include non-recipients of the award.

8.27.2 This committee nominates annually for election by the Division at its spring meeting two members of the ladder rank faculty at UCR to receive this award, which is designed to recognize exceptional effort and achievement in service to the UCR Campus. These awards are presented by the Chancellor each year during the Commencement ceremonies.

Justification:

The Committee on Distinguished Campus Service Award was appointed on January 24, 2006. The primary purpose of the award was to recognize exceptional effort and achievement in Campus service by a UCR faculty member. The approval of this bylaw will establish an official bylaw for the committee based on its charges, and secondly add it to the Standing Committees of the Senate. The Bylaw has been rewritten based on the previous charges to the committee.

Approved by the Committee on Distinguished Campus Service: 10/18/2007
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate: 10/19/07
Endorsed by the Advisory Committee: 11/05/2007
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
November 20, 2006

Proposed change to bylaw 2.6 – Executive Office

To be adopted:

PRESENT:

2.6 Executive Office. The Executive Office of the Division is under the general supervision of the Chair and the administrative direction of the Secretary-Parliamentarian. It includes such analytical, administrative, and clerical employees as are made available to the Division and its committees. (Am 22 Oct 73) (Am 24 May 2005)

PROPOSED:

2.6 Executive Office. The Executive Office of the Division is under the general supervision of the Chair. It includes such analytical, administrative, and clerical employees as are made available to the Division and its committees. (Am 22 Oct 73) (Am 24 May 2005) (Am Nov ____)

Justification: The change in this bylaw is necessary to make it consistent with the change to bylaw 2.5.1 which was amended May 2007 to clarify the role of the Secretary Parliamentarian which clearly state that the Secretary-Parliamentarian does not direct the activities of the Executive Office.

Approved by the Advisory Committee: October 22, 2007
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: October 24, 2007
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
NOVEMBER 20, 2007

Proposed change in bylaw 3.3, 8.2.5, 8.5, 8.5.2, 8.5.3, and 8.8.3

To be adopted:

Proposed name Change

PRESENT:

3.3 Emergency Meeting. An emergency meeting may be called by the Chair of the Division and two members of the Advisory Committee. The call to an emergency meeting must be communicated to the members of the Division at least two days of instruction prior to the meeting and shall contain the time, place, and purpose of the meeting. Materials, if any, relevant to the purpose of the meeting must be distributed at least two hours prior to the meeting. In the event of the absence or disability of the Chair, the Vice Chair and two members of the Advisory Committee may act to call an emergency meeting. The order of business shall be that for a special meeting. Legislation cannot be enacted nor modified at an emergency meeting. (Am 23 Apr 74) (Am 24 May 2005)

PROPOSED:

3.3 Emergency Meeting. An emergency meeting may be called by the Chair of the Division and two members of the Executive Council. The call to an emergency meeting must be communicated to the members of the Division at least two days of instruction prior to the meeting and shall contain the time, place, and purpose of the meeting. Materials, if any, relevant to the purpose of the meeting must be distributed at least two hours prior to the meeting. In the event of the absence or disability of the Chair, the Vice Chair and two members of the Executive Council may act to call an emergency meeting. The order of business shall be that for a special meeting. Legislation cannot be enacted nor modified at an emergency meeting. (Am 23 Apr 74) (Am 24 May 2005)

8.2.5 Each standing or ad hoc committee of the Academic Senate shall annually consider the impact of conflict of interest considerations on the ability of that committee to conduct its business with the highest possible degree of credibility. To this end, each Academic Senate committee shall place on file each year as the first item of business of that committee procedures by which conflict of interest concerns will be

8.2.5 Each standing or ad hoc committee of the Academic Senate shall annually consider the impact of conflict of interest considerations on the ability of that committee to conduct its business with the highest possible degree of credibility. To this end, each Academic Senate committee shall place on file each year as the first item of business of that committee procedures by which conflict of interest concerns will be
mitigated. These procedures will be submitted to the Advisory Committee within 30 days of their adoption. For these purposes, "conflict of interest" is taken to refer to those situations in which personal affiliations of individual committee members with departments or programs or with individuals bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. (En 22 May 86)

8.5 Advisory

8.5.2 The Advisory Committee has only the powers enumerated in these bylaws. It advises the Chancellor of the Riverside campus, and it advises the Chair of the Division in his/her exercise of responsibility to coordinate the work of all standing and special committees of the Division, to submit the budget for the work of the Division, and to prepare the annual report of the work of the Division office. It further advises the Division's representatives to the Assembly and to Senate committees.

8.5.3 At the request of the Faculty of a school or college and with the advice of the appropriate Divisional committees, this committee may act upon courses, curricula, and legislation. However, it shall not act if the matter can be included in the agenda of a regular Divisional meeting to be held within thirty calendar days from the time of the request. Each such Advisory Committee action must be reported to the Division at the next regular meeting.

8.8.3 During his tenure on the Committee on Committees, a member shall not...
hold membership on any other standing committee of the Division except the Advisory Committee, the Committee on Distinguished Teaching, the Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer, or the Faculty of a college, school, or division at Riverside. This restriction shall not apply to temporary appointments under 8.8.2.4. (Am 21 Feb 80)