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D.J. Ozer, Secretary-Parliamentarian
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION

MEETING: The Riverside Division of the Academic Senate met on Tuesday, November 30, 2010 at 2:10 p.m. in the Bourns Hall, Room A265. Chair M. Gauvain presided.

MINUTES: The Minutes of the Regular meeting of May 25, 2010 were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR: The Chancellor reported that although we received a $51.5 million cut in 2010, we saved about $17 million in cuts, more so in administrative costs than academic, as well as avoided costs of some $13 million through furloughs, temporary layoffs, travel reduction, hiring freezes, and other cuts. We also lowered reserves, and cash-managed a portion forward to this year in anticipation of the now-realized increases in student fees and state funding. This year, we received about $56 million in new funding, excluding the funding of enrollment. We received $22.6 million (net financial aid) due to the 32% student fee increase, $14 million from a partial restoration of the 09-10 cut, $11.8 million from the fees paid by unfunded students, and $7.6 million as one time funding from ARRA funding. There are associated obligatory costs of $39 million, which leaves a balance of about $17 million.

In addition, the state has started to fund previously unfunded students and we received a permanent addition of $13.2 million for 831 of our over 3000 unfunded students. In the coming years, we will have approximately $7.2 million in permanent costs including faculty merits, TA lines, library costs, start-up costs, leaving about $23 million for discretionary funds. In the spirit of shared governance and budget transparency, a budget advisory committee, with membership of senate chairs, faculty members, and administrative and academic leadership, is in the process of being formed. This committee will advise the Chancellor and EVC/Provost on financial matters.

Given the state of the California budget and the change in leadership in the Governor’s office, there may be a mid-year adjustment to the state budget allocation to UC and UCR. Also, the $7.6 million from ARRA is a onetime payment, and it is unknown if this federal funding will continue.

The Chancellor noted that he would like pursue some strategic investments based on the newly adopted UCR 2020 Strategic Plan. There are numerous possibilities in research and in structural and academic support. However, one significant element in using resources now is the financial commitment of the campus to the retirement plan. The cost to UCR this year for the retirement plan will be $6.6 million and in 2011-12 it will be $11.5 million, an amount that is equivalent to 91 FTE. When we add this expense to that of other unfunded mandates, such as merits and promotion costs, the obligation is equivalent to 174 Faculty FTE. There is no state support at this time for meeting these obligations and so some of this $23 million must be used to pay for some of these costs. The success of our research endeavor is going to require some investments, as well.

Funding for the School of Medicine is separate from these funding concerns. We have a legislative directive of $10 million dollars that comes with the expectation of annual reports of deliverables on the medical school. Two million dollars of this amount will come from the UCOP reserves and $8 million will come from the Chancellor’s Discretionary funds and not from general campus funds. The wording from the state was that we must spend $10 million on the SOM and wording from UCOP directs us “to use a portion of our restored state funding or other resources.”
Currently our student population includes approximately 86% undergraduate students and 14% graduate and professional students. We hope to change that ratio to 80%/20% by slowing the enrollment growth of undergraduates and increasing the enrollment of graduate and professional students. Two groups have been formed to investigate enrollment management and the related but separate issues of course demand.

The Enrollment Management Council has been charged by the Chancellor. The Council is chaired by Sharon Duffy, and includes as members the Academic Deans, VCSA, chairs of 3 senate committees and technical professional help from finance and admissions. The Council will make recommendations to the Provost.

The Course Demand Workgroup has been charged by the Provost, and it is chaired by Jim Sandoval. Its members come from many units of UCR, and the Workgroup is focused on assuring sufficient course availability to meet student demand on a quarterly basis.

The Chancellor noted that international undergraduate enrollment has remained at 1% since his arrival at UCR. He intends to relax the number of students admitted by exception to improve the global community of students on campus, thereby increasing the learning of multiple cultures by all students, as well as create additional revenues from enrolling more international undergraduate students. For example, maintaining a population of 200 new international students would bring a permanent increase of about $4 million for our campus. On this issue, at the last Regents meeting, a 10% cap for non-resident students was discussed. Several Regents felt there should not be a cap, however, the Chancellor noted that the public at large is concerned about international students taking up seats for eligible California students.

The Chancellor briefly touched on the need for increasing productivity in research and creative activities as well as the need for increased transparency with regards to our finances.

The floor was then opened for questions.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR AND PROVOST: There were no announcements by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SECRETARY-PARLIAMENTARIAN: Professor D. Ozer, Secretary-Parliamentarian, announced that the election report was found on page 6 of the full agenda.

Professors S. M. Helfand, B. Bishin, R. Richert, S. Hafez, and A. Smith were elected to serve on the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences Executive Committee.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR: Chair Gauvain welcomed the faculty to the new academic year. She stated the Senate office is working very hard on all the various committees, and particularly, there is a lot of effort going into dealing with problems related to course approvals and program reviews. We have also dealt with several Systemwide issues this past fall such as the post employment benefits discussion, the Gould Commission on the Future of the University, and the budget. In her effort to visit each of the departments on campus, she stated that she has visited about a third of the departments at their departmental meetings to ask what the Senate can do for the faculty and to encourage faculty to volunteer and be engaged with the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDERS:

The Consent Calendar was adopted with unanimous consent.

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ASSEMBLY: Professor M. Gauvain announced that the report of June 16, 2010 meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate can be found on page 102 of the full agenda.
REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND FACULTIES

A. Professor K. Vafai, Chair of Rules and Jurisdiction, presented and moved adoption of the proposed change in the Committee on Courses Bylaw 8.10.1 and 8.10.2 which can be found on page 104 of the full agenda. The motion was unanimously adopted.

B. Professor K. Vafai, Chair of Rules and Jurisdiction, presented and moved adoption of the proposed change to Committee on Distinguished Service Bylaw 8.27.2 which can be found on page 106 of the full agenda. The motion was unanimously adopted.

C. Professor K. Vafai, Chair of Rules and Jurisdiction, presented and moved adoption of the proposed change to College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences Bylaw N4.1, MN4.1.1, and N4.1.1.1 which can be found on page 107 of the full agenda. The motion was unanimously adopted.

D. Professor K. Vafai, Chair of Rules and Jurisdiction, presented and moved adoption of the proposed change to Regulation 6.4 which can be found on page 110 of the full agenda. The motion was unanimously adopted.

E. Professor A. Walker, Vice Chair and member of the Executive Council, presented and moved adoption of “Athletics and Dance Building” as the proposed name for the Physical Education Building, and “School of Medicine Health Sciences Research Building” as the proposed name for the Health Sciences Surge building. These items can be found on page 113 and 114 of the full agenda. The motion was unanimously adopted.

F. Professor A. Walker, Vice Chair and member of the Executive Council, presented and moved adoption of the modified proposal to establish the UCR Program for Professor of the Graduate Division (PGD) which can be found on page 115 of the full agenda. The motion was unanimously adopted.

G. Professor A. Walker, Vice Chair and member of the Executive Council, presented and moved adoption of the Writing Across the Curriculum: A Proposal to Diversify and Strengthen the Colleges’ Writing Requirements. A motion to include wording in the regulation to identify this as a pilot program was proposed and withdrawn. The motion to adopt the Writing Across the Curriculum proposal passed by majority vote.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:52 p.m.

ATTEST:

D. Ozer, Secretary-Parliamentarian
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

Marla Jo Booth
Recording Secretary
SECRETARY-PARLIAMENTARIAN
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
FEBRUARY 15, 2011

To be received and placed on file:

2010-2011 Election Report

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Chair of the Faculty (unexpired term)

One valid nomination received for:

Professor R. Smith
IN MEMORIAM

Joseph Maurice Deal
Professor of Art
UC Riverside
1947 – 2010

Joe Deal was born in Topeka Kansas in 1947. He received his bachelor’s degree in fine arts at the Kansas City Art Institute in 1970. He received his master’s degree in 1974 and his master of fine arts degree in 1978 from the University of New Mexico.

Deal began working at the George Eastman House International Museum of Photography in Rochester, NY, in 1970. Emeritus Professor Edward R. Beardsley, who was then divisional dean of Fine Arts at UCR at the time, met Deal at the Eastman House and saw in him an ideal candidate to establish a focused program in photographic practice for the Department of Art at UC Riverside.

Joe Deal came to UCR in 1977 to establish a photographic curriculum for the Department of Art and where he, along with Ed Beardsley, was the initial driving force in the establishment of the University of California, Riverside/California Museum of Photography. Deal was Associate Dean of the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences from 1987-89. During this time he was instrumental in supporting new hires in the department and facilitating its expansion in the photographic and moving-image arts. Deal had a significant impact on shaping and expanding the Art Department, which, to this day, is renowned for its emphasis in the area of photography. His impact as an educator is immeasurable and can be charted by the number of prominent photographers who studied with him, identify his work as seminal to their own practice and have gone on to careers as exhibiting artists and educators as a direct extension of his legacy.

In 1989 Deal left UCR to be closer to his daughter Meredith in Saint Louis and where he was appointed the Dean of the Art School at Washington University. In 1999 he became the provost of the Rhode Island School of Design and where he also continued to teach photography. He lived in Providence until his death.

In 1975, 18 of Joe Deals photographs were included in an exhibition curated by William Jenkins at the George Eastman House titled New Topographics: Photographs of a Man-Altered Landscape. At the time, Deal was director of exhibitions at the Eastman House and he played an important role in conceptualizing and designing the exhibition.
In subsequent years this exhibition, focusing on an objective approach that turned away from a romantic, fictive, and pictorial approach to the landscape, became identified as a significant turning point in photography. Recently the exhibition has been restaged with an international tour of major museums and with a new and extended catalog. New Topographics influenced multiple generations of image-makers, re-oriented photographic discourse in the 20th century and remains one of the most provocative and impactful bodies of work produced in contemporary art.

In Riverside Joe Deal continued this approach to landscape documenting and exploring the intersection of man and the earth. He produced several major bodies of work perhaps the most notable being The Fault Zone, which traced the landscape of the San Andreas Fault and brought a geological reference in relation to the material facts of the present and added an existential tone to the enterprise. Deal had an approach to photographing the landscape that accepted the landscape as a material fact of the present. A landscape where man’s presence is an inescapable fact of one’s experience. His work favored a more abstract and material interest, often explored from an elevated vantage point.

The New Yorker in the June 2010 issue succinctly identified that Deal, along with “Robert Adams, Stephen Shore and Lewis Baltz spent the 1970s practicing a distinct sort of landscape photography that combined a documentarian’s clear-eyed sobriety with an artist’s aesthetic discipline. In Deal’s pictures, scrubby, exuberant brushland morphs into great tracts of riven dirt, stubbled with houses and prickly with fences. The images tell an ominous and chilling story about suburban sprawl in California. But there is a sly wit to the photos. The domesticated lawns — so well tamed that they look like carpets — are pockmarked with hardy little weeds. Deal depicts the destruction of the natural landscape but recognizes its indomitability as well.”

In the last several years Deal had returned to photographing the landscape with his series West and West, Reimagining the Great Plains. The images are direct and without affectation. They are stunning meditations on the beauty and simplicity of being in a locational and specific space with its infinite horizon and patterns of grass, rolling hills, and sky. A meditation facilitated by a master’s understanding of the vocabulary of his medium and the manner in which visual experience is notated through lens and material. Deal is sorely missed and most fondly recalled. His legacy here at UCR is palpable, deep and vibrant. He is remembered as a man of grace, wisdom and inventiveness whose photographic legacy is multifaceted and far-reaching.

Additional References


Robert Mann Gallery

Professor Charles Long, Department of Art, Chair
Professor Erika Suderburg, Department of Art
Professor John Divola, Department of Art
Internationally renowned citrus nutritionist Dr. Tom Embleton died March 10, 2010, at the age of 92. Dr. Embleton joined the University of California-Riverside in 1950 when it was the Citrus Experiment Station. At that time, citrus was fertilized annually with 300 lbs of nitrogen per acre, other nutrient requirements were largely unknown, and fruit quality problems were evident. Since California citrus growers were, and remain, competitive only in the fresh fruit market, not the juice industry, producing picture-perfect fruit of high internal quality was critical. The team of T. W. Embleton and UCR colleague W.W. “Bill” Jones pioneered the research that delineated the roles of the macronutrient elements essential to plants and their interactions in regulating citrus yield, fruit size and quality. With C.K. Labanauskas, also a UCR faculty member, the team expanded this knowledge base to include the micronutrient elements. Their comprehensive research established the fundamental guidelines for using leaf nutrient analyses as a reliable tool for determining tree nutrient status and developing fertilizer recommendations. The adoption of leaf analysis as a commercial practice by California citrus growers, and subsequently avocado growers, reduced the potentially leachable nitrogen applied to citrus by more than 50% per acre before nitrate pollution of ground water was a public concern. A significant contribution to this effort was Dr. Embleton’s identification of biuret as the phytotoxic component in commercially available urea fertilizers. This discovery lead to the development and manufacturing of a safe, low-biuret urea (less than 0.25% biuret) and adoption of foliar-applied low-biuret urea as a rapid, inexpensive way to supplement the nitrogen nutrition of citrus trees, while commensurately reducing the amount of nitrogen applied to the soil. Additional foliar fertilization practices developed by the team contributed further to solving production and fruit quality problems, while protecting the environment in California and worldwide, as the global citrus industry adopted the leaf analysis guidelines and soil and foliar fertilization practices developed by Dr. Embleton and the team at UCR.

Dr. Embleton’s work was characterized by a strong experimental design and statistical analysis of the data, thoroughness, and objective interpretation. Moreover, he was committed to and talented at translating his research results into practical recommendations for growers. He gained strong industry support for his research, which he sustained over his entire career. Dr. Embleton published nearly 300 papers and eight book chapters, including signature contributions to the *Citrus Industry* volumes. His semi-technical publications
reflected his commitment to helping growers implement the results of his research.

During his life, Dr. Embleton received many significant honors and awards: Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science-1960; *Citrograph* Research Award-1965; Fellow, American Society for Horticultural Science-1975; Wilson Popenoe Award, American Society for Horticultural Science-1985; Award of Honor and Honorary Life membership, Lemon Men’s Club-1987; California Avocado Society Award of Honor and Life membership-1987; Chancellor’s Founder’s Award, University of California-Riverside-1990; Diploma de Honor, Colegio de Ingenieros Agronomos de Chile-1991; Award of Honor, American Society of Agronomy, California Chapter-1993; Life Fellow, International Biographical Association, England-1994; and Life Fellow, American Biographical Institute, USA-1995.

As an internationally recognized expert on citrus and avocado nutrition, soil salinity, and water quality, foreign governments and international organizations frequently called upon Dr. Embleton for assistance. He provided sage advice to groups in Cyprus, Egypt, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, India, Yemen, Argentina, Chile, People’s Republic of China, and Kenya.

The teaching (I&R) component was added to Dr. Embleton’s appointment in the latter half of his career in recognition of his formal teaching contributions, guidance of graduate and undergraduate students and service on qualifying examination committees. Dr. Embleton was a respected educator and mentor. He was also a highly effective speaker, with the gift of being able to make complex topics easily understood by students and growers. Dr. Embleton was an active member of the American Society for Horticultural Science, International Society for Horticultural Science, International Society of Citruclture, serving for nearly 10 years on its Executive Board, Florida State Horticultural Society, Soil Science Society of America, California Avocado Society, Council of Soil Testing and Plant Analysis, Council for Agriculture Science and Technology, American Association for the Advancement of Science and the Lemon Men’s Club. Dr. Embleton retired in 1986 from the UCR Department of Botany and Plant Sciences.

Dr. Embleton was as a Captain in the US Army during World War II (1942-1946), serving in five campaigns in Europe and earning the Purple Heart and a Bronze Star. Following WWII, Dr. Embleton held the rank of Major in the Army Reserve. Having earned a Bachelor of Science in Horticulture from the University of Arizona before the war, Dr. Embleton resumed his academic career in 1946 and earned his Ph.D. in Pomology at Cornell University in 1949. He was an Assistant Horticulturist at Washington State University, Prosser, Washington, prior to accepting his position at UCR in 1950.

Dr. Embleton was very proud of his family - his wife Lorraine (who died in 2002) and their five sons, Harry (deceased), Gary, Wayne, Terry and Paul, and 17 grandchildren and 15 great grandchildren. Throughout his academic career, he
received loving and dedicated support from his wife. Some years thereafter, she became an invalid. Characteristic of Dr. Embleton, he served as a dedicated caretaker for the remainder of her life. Dr. Tom Embleton’s colleagues and friends remember him for his kindness, generosity, hard work and dedication to UCR and the California citrus and avocado industries.

Carol J. Lovatt (Chair), Charles W. Coggins
In Memoriam

Walter Reuther
Professor Emeritus of Horticulture
UC Riverside
21 September 1911 – 2 November 2010

One of the major contributors to UC Riverside’s international reputation in agriculture has passed away. Walter Reuther, 99, died on November 2, 2010, in San Diego, where he had made his home for a number of years.

Dr. Reuther was one of the commanding figures in the development of modern citiculture. In 1956, already well known worldwide, he joined the UCR faculty in what is now the Department of Botany and Plant Sciences. He retired as professor emeritus in 1979.

Walter Reuther was born on September 21, 1911, on a farm in Manganoui County, North Island, New Zealand, the fifth of seven children born to Arthur and Martha Reuther. His parents were German born, and during World War I the family was subjected to persecution. They immigrated to the United States in 1919, settling in Florida. Walter graduated from the University of Florida in 1933 with a B.S. in chemistry, and then went to work for the Florida Citrus Experiment Station as an assistant horticulturalist. In 1937 he entered the doctoral program in plant physiology at Cornell, receiving his Ph.D. in 1940. In 1941 he accepted a position as head of the USDA Date and Citrus Station in Indio. During his five years in Indio, Dr. Reuther was instrumental in introducing the Minneola tangelo, now the fruit’s most popular variety.

After the war Dr. Reuther returned to Florida, to the USDA Citrus Station in Orlando. There he began one of his most important research studies, elucidating the role of various minerals in citrus nutrition and describing the use of leaf analysis to pinpoint deficiencies. He and co-worker Paul Smith established the nutritional standards for citrus that are still in use today throughout the world.

In 1956 Dr. Reuther accepted a position with UCR as a full professor of horticulture, which at the time was very rare for a new hire, and chair of the Department of Horticulture. When he stepped down as chair 10 years later, Dean A. M. Boyce wrote that his “contributions to Agricultural Sciences on this campus and University-wide have been . . . outstanding and of inestimable value.” Among his contributions was his leadership of the group that in 1957 started the program now known as the California Citrus Clonal Protection Program, which provides
the industry with true-to-type propagating material free of all known graft-transmissible diseases. This program has served as a model for all other citrus-growing countries.

Beginning in 1962, Dr. Reuther began a series of consulting projects that took him all over the world and led to his significant research work showing the effects of climate on citrus maturation rate, pH of juice, and flowering behavior. Lasting from two months to two years in length, these projects included assignments in 25 separate countries over three continents. He later wrote, “I was able to see much of the world’s citrus growing problems.” He pinpointed lack of expert technological knowledge as a major handicap for many countries, and was able to persuade governments to send their brightest students for graduate education in the US, many coming to Riverside.

Dr. Reuther is perhaps best known as the editor of *The Citrus Industry*, the multivolume work first published by the University of California Press starting in 1943. The first edition was edited by H. J. Webber and L. D. Batchelor, the first and second directors, respectively, of the UC Citrus Experiment Station. After a quarter century, much of the research cited was out of date, and Dr. Reuther undertook the massive task of editing or co-editing the second edition, the five volumes of which appeared between 1967 and 1989. The work remains a staple for citrus growers and researchers throughout the world.

During the course of his life, Dr. Reuther received many awards and honors. He was named a Fellow of the American Society of Horticultural Science and a Fellow of the International Society of Citriculture, an organization that he was instrumental in founding. He received the Albert G. Salter Award from the California Citrus Quality Council, was named as one of the 2,000 Outstanding Scientists of the 20th Century by the International Biographical Centre in the UK, and appeared in Who’s Who in America in 1992-93.

In a biographical memoir written when he was 91, Dr. Reuther referred to his “lucky life,” and expressed his debt to his mentors, J. R. Magness, George Potter, and A. M. Boyce, and especially his mother, Martha; and his beloved wife, Flora, who died in 2000. They were “the most profound influences in my life,” he wrote.

Dr. Reuther is survived by his sons, David and Charles, and four grandchildren.

Michael Roose (Chair), Charles W. Coggins
To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on Committees reports the following appointments made since the last report of November 30, 2010:

Appointed Professor Emeritus Eugene N. Anderson, Professor of Anthropology; Professor Robert Rosenthal, Distinguished Professor of Psychology; and Professor Dmitri Maslov, Biology, to serve on the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

Appointed Professor Malcolm C. Baker, of History of Art to serve on the Committee on Planning and Budget

Nominated a slate of four faculty names to serve on the Joint Academic Senate/Administration Faculty Advisory Committee on Learning Outcomes

Nominated a slate of eight faculty names to serve on the five year review of the CHASS Dean.

Nominated a slate of eight faculty names to serve on the three year review of the Graduate Division Dean.

Appointed Professor Robert Clare of Physics to serve as UCORP Representative.

Appointed Prof. Ryan Julian, Chemistry to serve on the Non-Senate Faculty Excellence Review Committee for 2010-2011. The alternate member will be Prof. Christian Shelton, Computer Science.

Appointed Professor Howard S. Friedman of Psychology to Chair the In Memoriam Committee for Professor Emeritus Sally Sperling. Professor Emeritus David Warren and Professor Glenn Stanley of Psychology have agreed to serve on the committee.

Appointed Professor Charles Long of Department of Art to Chair the In Memoriam Committee for Professor Emeritus Joseph M. Deal, Art. Professors Erika Suderburg and John Divola, of Art, have agreed to serve on the committee.

Appointed Professor Susan C. Straight of Department of Creative Writing to Chair the In Memoriam Committee for Professor Emeritus Stephen Minot, Creative Writing. Professor Andrew M. Winer and Professor Emeritus Dwight Yates of Creative Writing have agreed to serve on the committee.

Lynda S. Bell
Jang-Ting Guo
Reba Page
Thomas C. Patterson
Ayala L. N. Rao
Frank Sauer
Sheldon Tan
Yinsheng Wang
Zhenbiao Yang
Barry C. Arnold, ex officio
Christine W. Gailey, Chair
Committee on Courses
Report to the Riverside Division
February 15, 2011

To be received and placed on file:
The Committee on Courses has approved the following courses.

Undergraduate Course

NEW
AST 023 Modern Japan and Personal Narrative (4)
CPLT 001 Introduction to Close Reading (4)
CPLT 001 W Introduction to Close Reading (5)
CPLT 002 Reading World Literature (4)
CPLT 023 Modern Japan and Personal Narrative (4)
CPLT 193 Capstone Research Seminar (4)
CPLT 196 Senior Research Paper (2)
ENGL 023 African American Autobiography (4)
HIST 052 S Europe from the Enlightenment to 1968 (5)
HIST 130 B History of Christianity: Modern Era (4)
HNPG 031 Q Honors Seminar in the Fine Arts (4) Theatre: Who is Hamlet, and Why Should You Care?
JPN 023 Modern Japan and Personal Narrative (4)
LGBS 105 Topics in Queer Art, Culture, or Literature (4)
MCBL 125 Experimental Microbiology (3)
MCBL 190 Special Studies (1-5)
MCBL 198 I Individual Internship in Microbiology (1-12)
MCS 010 Introduction to Cultural Studies (4)
MCS 111 History of Media Theory (4)
MCS 132 Intersections of Media and Popular Culture (4)
MCS 156 E South Asian Media and Cultures (4) Bollywood
ME 004 Energy and the Environment (3)
MUS 013 Popular Music Analysis: Text and Context (4)
MUS 018 Music of Spain (4)
MUS 177 South Asian Music Ensemble (1-2)
PHYS 132 Thermodynamics (5)
PHYS 133 Statistical Physics (4)
PSYC 149 Psychology of Happiness and Virtue (4)
RLST 135 B History of Christianity: Modern Era (4)

DELETE
ART 007 Introduction to Digital Photography (4)
ART 120 Printmaking (4)
ART 122 (E-Z) Advanced Printmaking Workshop (4)
HISE 130 History of Christianity (4)
MCS 007 Introduction to Digital Photography (4)
RLST 011 Modern Christianities and World Cultures (4)
RLST 135 History of Christianity (4)

CHANGE
ART 131 Intermediate Photography and Digital Technology (4)
ART 140 Intermediate Analog Photography (4)
ART 145 Advanced Photography Workshop (4)
ART 167 Intermediate Digital Media: Web Authoring (4)
BIOL 138 Plant Developmental Morphology (4)
BPSC 138 Plant Developmental Morphology (4)
BPSC 150 Genes, Selection, and Populations (4)
CEE 135 Chemistry of Materials (4)
CHE 114 Applied Fluid Mechanics (4)
CHE 116 Heat Transfer (4)
CHE 117 Separation Processes (4)
CHFY 010 CHASS Gateway Lecture Course (5)
CS 130 Computer Graphics (4)
EDUC 110 Learning Theory and Psychology in Education (4)
EDUC 116 The Exceptional Child (4)
EDUC 172 Reading and Language Development (4)
ENVE 171 Fundamentals of Environmental Engineering (4)
FIL 001 First-Year Filipino (4) TAG 001
FIL 002 First-Year Filipino (4) TAG 002
FIL 003 First-Year Filipino (4) TAG 003
FIL 004 Second-Year Filipino (4) TAG 004
LWSO 175 (E-Z) Topics in Law and Society (4)
LWSO 175 E Topics in Law and Society (4) Convicting the Innocent
LWSO 192 Science and Law (4)
MATH 146 A Ordinary and Partial Differential Equations (4)
MCS 131 Intermediate Photography and Digital Technology (4)
ME 003 How Things Work: The Principles Behind Technology (4)
ME 117  Combustion and Energy Systems (4)
ME 138  Transport Phenomena in Living Systems (4)
ME 174  Machine Design (4)
ME 175 A  Professional Topics in Engineering (2)
ME 175 B  Mechanical Engineering Design (3)
PHYS 111  Astrophysics and Stellar Astronomy (4)
PHYS 130 A  Classical Mechanics (4)
PHYS 130 B  Classical Mechanics (4)
PHYS 134  Thermal Physics (4)
PHYS 135 A  Electromagnetism (4)
PHYS 136  Electromagnetic Waves (4)
PHYS 139 L  Electronics for Scientists (5)
PHYS 142 L  Advanced Physics Laboratory (5)
PHYS 145 A  Biophysics (4)
PHYS 150 A  Introduction to Condensed Matter Physics (4)
PHYS 151  Topics in Modern Condensed Matter Research (4)
PHYS 152 A  Exploring Many-Body Quantum Physics with Mathematica (2)
PHYS 156 A  Quantum Mechanics (4)
PHYS 163  Atomic Physics and Spectroscopy (4)
PHYS 164  Introduction to Nuclear Physics (4)
PHYS 165  Introduction to Particle Physics (4)
PHYS 166  Cosmology (4)
PHYS 168  Environmental Physics (4)
PHYS 177  Computational Methods for Physical Sciences (4)
PSYC 12  Psychological Methods: Research Procedures (6)
THEA 102  Production Techniques for Theatre, Film, and Television (4)

Professional Course
NEW  EDUC 335 C  Seminar in Special Education (2)
CHANGE  EDUC 345 A  Supervised Student Teaching in a Special Class for Individuals with Mild/Moderate Disabilities (12)
NEW  EDUC 345 B  Supervised Student Teaching in a Special Class for Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities (12)

Graduate Course
NEW  EDUC 220 A  Sociocultural Theory and Education (4)
NEW  EDUC 220 B  Sociocultural Theory and Education (4)
DELETE  CPLT 217 A  Masterworks of World Literature (4)
DELETE  CPLT 217 B  Masterworks of World Literature (4)
DELETE  CPLT 217 C  Masterworks of World Literature (4)

Extension – Courses
EDUC X80.01  PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF TEACHING YOUNG CHILDREN (4.5)
EDUC X 81.91  INCLUSIVE PRACTICES FOR YOUNG CHILDREN: FROM CONCERN TO ACTION
EDUC X86.22  INFANT AND TODDLER SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN DIFFERENT CULTURES AND CONTEXTS: CLASSROOM, GROUP CARE AND HOME ENVIRONMENTS (5)
MGT X105  INTRODUCTION TO THE GLOBAL HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY (5)
MGT X105.01  DISNEY ADVANCED STUDIES IN HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM (4)
MGT X105.02  DISNEY CORPORATE ANALYSIS (4)
MGT X105.03  DISNEY CORPORATE COMMUNICATION (4)
MGT X105.04  DISNEY CREATIVITY AND INNOVATION (4)
MGT X105.05  DISNEY HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (4)
MGT X105.06  DISNEY MARKETING YOU (4)
MGT X105.07  DISNEY ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP (4)
MGT X105.08  DISNEY EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING (4)
MGT X105.09  DISNEY INTERNSHIP (5)

Extension – Instructors
EDUC X80.01  PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF TEACHING YOUNG CHILDREN, HERNANDEZ, G., M.A.
EDUC X81.92  TEACHING IN A DIVERSE SOCIETY, HERNANDEZ, G., M.A.
EDUC X82.86  OVERVIEW OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION: DIFFERENT APPROACHES IN DIFFERENT ENVIRONMENTS, HERNANDEZ, G., M.A.
EDUC X88.62  UNDERSTANDING CHILDREN OF CRISIS, VIOLENCE AND LOSS IN HOME AND EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS, WILD, M.
To be received and placed on file:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>LIMITS OF AUTHORIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. ROBERTS</td>
<td>ANTHROPOLOGY</td>
<td>ANTH 122 W ’11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. BANH</td>
<td>ANTHROPOLOGY</td>
<td>ANTH 163 W ’11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. BHARAT</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>ECON 124 W ’11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. DAWAY</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>ECON 105A W ’11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. MARTIN</td>
<td>POLITICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>POSC 100 W ’11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. WONG</td>
<td>POLITICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>POSC 135 W ’11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. SHULGA</td>
<td>POLITICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>POSC 147S W ’11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>COURSE TITLE/UNITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New Courses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X308.59</td>
<td>IDENTIFICATION AND INTERVENTION FOR CHILDREN WITH BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>X422.8</td>
<td>MICROSOFT EXCEL INTERMEDIATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Courses and Instructors Teaching at the Undergraduate Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X81.91</td>
<td>INCLUSIVE PRACTICES FOR YOUNG CHILDREN: FROM CONCERN TO ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X86.22</td>
<td>INFANT AND TODDLER SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN DIFFERENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NEW INSTRUCTORS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>X402</td>
<td>GREEN BUILDING DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>X405</td>
<td>DEVELOPING THE REAL NUMBER SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENSC</td>
<td>X460.7</td>
<td>LEED PROJECT MANAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Previously Approved Instructors - More Info Available By Request</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X309.01</td>
<td>EARLY ORIENTATION TO CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X372.4</td>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT FOR THE CHIEF BUSINESS OFFICIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING</td>
<td>X402</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO LINGUISTICS: STRUCTURE OF LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPN</td>
<td>X412</td>
<td>CONTENT AND METHODS FOR TEACHING ADVANCED PLACEMENT SPANISH LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>X412.4</td>
<td>ECOLOGY OF JOSHUA TREE NATIONAL MONUMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>X415.51</td>
<td>CRIME SCENE MANAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X417.8</td>
<td>CASE STUDIES IN NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>X420.A-D</td>
<td>CHEMISTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>X422.8</td>
<td>MICROSOFT EXCEL INTERMEDIATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X426.21</td>
<td>SPECIALLY DESIGNED ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION DELIVERED IN ENGLISH (SDAIE) TO ENGLISH LEARNERS FOR SB1292 STAFF DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X426.21</td>
<td>SPECIALLY DESIGNED ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION DELIVERED IN ENGLISH (SDAIE) TO ENGLISH LEARNERS FOR SB1292 STAFF DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X432.51</td>
<td>REPRESENTING AND COMPARING FRACTIONS IN ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X450.04</td>
<td>EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES FOR INCREASING SOCIAL COMPETENCE OF STUDENTS WITH AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>X461.4</td>
<td>INTERIOR DESIGN INTERNSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X465.2</td>
<td>CRIME SCENE PRESERVATION AND DEATH INVESTIGATION IN HEALTH CARE SETTINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X475.01</td>
<td>MARKETING PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X475.51</td>
<td>CONSUMER BEHAVIOR</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
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>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourns College of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BACHELOR OF SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Natural &amp; Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>BACHELOR OF ARTS</td>
<td>BACHELOR OF SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Humanities, Arts, &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>BACHELOR OF ARTS</td>
<td>BACHELOR OF SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BACHELOR OF SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. J. OZER, 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
To be adopted:

Proposed Changes to Art Department Major

PRESENT:

The Department of Art offers a B.A. degree in an interdisciplinary program that emphasizes a critical approach to artistic production. Courses are offered in the following curricular areas: Photography, digital art, video, two- and three-dimensional media (painting, drawing, sculpture, installation), and critical theory. The program is designed primarily for students preparing for graduate study and those who plan to continue professionally as artists. However, the department welcomes the participation of nonmajors and nondegree students.

Non-major students who wish to declare a major in Art must electronically submit a portfolio consisting of ten (10) images of your original work and/or three (3) clips of moving images or sound work. Guidelines for the portfolio and a link to the site for submission can be found on the art department website at http://www.art.ucr.edu/. Students whose portfolios are approved will be admitted to the major. Guidelines for submission are also available from the Department of Art.

Major Requirements

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

1. Lower-division requirements (24/26 units)
   a) ART 006/MCS 006 and ART 008 (must be taken during first year of residency in the department)
   b) Three additional lower-division Art courses: ART 001, ART 002, ART 003, ART 004/MCS 004, ART 005, ART 009, ART 065, ART 066
   c) One of the following Art History courses: AHS 008, AHS 017A, AHS 017B, AHS 017C, or AHS

PROPOSED:

The Department of Art offers a B.A. degree in an interdisciplinary program that emphasizes a critical approach to artistic production. Courses are offered in the following curricular areas: Photography, digital art, video, two- and three-dimensional media (painting, drawing, sculpture, installation), and critical theory. The program is designed primarily for students preparing for graduate study and those who plan to continue professionally as artists. However, the department welcomes the participation of nonmajors and nondegree students.

Admission: Admission to the Major in Art requires electronic submission of a portfolio consisting of ten (10) images of your original work and/or three (3) clips of moving images or sound work. Guidelines for the portfolio and a link to the site for submission can be found on the art department website at http://www.art.ucr.edu/. Students whose portfolios are approved will be admitted to the major. Guidelines for submission are also available from Undergraduate Admissions and from the Department of Art.

Major Requirements

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

1. Lower-division requirements (24/26 units)
   a) ART 006/MCS 006 and ART 008 (must be taken during first year of residency in the department)
   b) Three additional lower-division Art courses: ART 001, ART 002, ART 003, ART 004/MCS 004, ART 005, ART 009, ART 065, ART 066
   c) One of the following Art History courses: AHS 008, AHS 017A, AHS 017B, AHS 017C, or AHS
021/URST 021, AHS 023

2. Upper-division requirements (48/49 units)

a) ART 160

b) One of the following Art History courses: AHS 135, AHS 136/MCS 137, AHS 176/MCS 176, AHS 175, AHS 179, AHS 180, AHS 181, AHS 182, AHS 184/URST 184, AHS 185/URST 185, AHS 186, AHS 188, AHS 189E-Z or any other upper-division Art History course that covers the period 1945 to present

c) ART 180

d) A minimum of 32 additional units of upper-division Art course work

e) ART 195 (Senior Thesis) or ART 185 (Senior Thesis Seminar)

To fulfill ART 195 or ART 185, students must complete a preliminary review of work with a formal presentation of a thesis project to a faculty committee two quarters prior to actual enrollment in ART 195 or ART 185. Students graduating in Spring must take ART 185. Students graduating in Fall or Winter must take ART 195 to fulfill their senior thesis requirement. Students will be assigned a faculty thesis advisor by week three of the term in which their preliminary review takes place. Students enroll in ART 195 or ART 185 during their final term before graduating.

Note A maximum of 12 upper-division transfer units of established equivalency in Art courses is accepted for credit. Equivalent transfer units in lower-division studio art course work and lower- and upper-division Art History course work is also accepted for credit toward the major in the respective lower- or upper-division category.

A minimum of 36 units of Art must be taken in residence (UCR Department of Art) to fulfill this major.

JUSTIFICATION:
The Art Department is a small department with only 8.5 FTE’s. With the growth of the campus, our number of majors has been steadily climbing. We have reached the limit of our resources. Our curriculum requires close supervision of our students’ artistic progress culminating in the Senior Thesis review. Each faculty member mentors students through this review process of the final presentation of the students’ Senior Thesis via our course entitled Art 185. This system has benefitted our majors significantly, but we will be unable to provide this kind of one on one education with the continued uncontrolled growth of majors.

We are also encountering another problem. We have found that many students transfer from other majors within UCR into our major because of various reasons. Many of them have no real interest in the arts and are often under the mistaken impression that an art major will be an easy way to complete graduation. Many of these students do not pass their Preliminary Thesis review their first chance. This means that the faculty must put enormous energy into reviewing them again the following quarter. The Preliminary Review must be passed before the Senior Thesis course can be taken.

Many of the Fine Arts departments on other UC campuses have instituted review processes for artistic aptitude for students entering the major. UCLA requires a portfolio review. The Art Department had a portfolio requirement up to three years ago and now must return to this system for our applicant process. The portfolio requirements; at this time is for students submitting Change of Major Forms. By requiring portfolio submissions the department will be able to better track the amount of incoming majors, thus limited the size of graduating classes to accommodate both course section offerings and thesis reviews held within the department.

We intend, with this change, to set a minimal standard for acceptance into the Art Department major. The Art Department would like this to be effective, Fall 2011.

**APPROVALS:**

Approved by the Faculty of the Department of Art: September 21, 2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of the College of Humanities: September 29, 2010

Per Director of Admissions, Effective date for Freshmen - the soonest it can be implemented is for the Fall 2012 term (the application filing period ends November 30, 2011) and 2) Transfers - the soonest it can be implemented is for the Fall 2013 term due to catalog rights (November 30, 2012 filing period ends).

Approved by Undergraduate Admissions: 1/12/11
Approved by Committee on Educational Policy: 10/12/10
Assembly Location: Teleconference

Minutes for the 6-16-2010 meeting were approved.

From Assembly Chair, Daniel Simmons

Final report of Commission on Future will be on Regents’ agenda of their December meeting.

UC to streamline major pre-requisites to ease transfer students: Provost Pitts plans to host faculty meetings in five disciplines across the system. Meetings of math and biology faculty occurred. Other meetings will occur soon. The legislature considers Transfer to be difficult and the major prerequisites are different across campuses. But the real problem is capacity. UC already enrolls more transfer students than by the Master Plan.

Study shows non-competitive for all employee including faculty at UC.

Post-Employment Benefits (PEB): the Regents will vote in December on the proposed contribution rates to pension fund, 3.5% for employees and 7% for employer in July 2011; 5% and 10% in July 2012.

Commission on the Future decisions: continue to explore the creation of online courses through a pilot program; develop plans to increase revenue from indirect cost recovery; ask the Senate to develop a plan for easy transfer process; rename “fees” to “tuition.”

Faculty Salaries: Provost Pitts said that 11-12 Budget had $87 million for salary increases. The campuses were asked for modeling to see if the increases could occur earlier. There is a political concern that on salary increases at the time of an 8% fee. The options are: an across-the-board increase, to raise the salary scales, or allow the Chancellors and EVCs to use the funds for recruitment and retention. Provost Pitts wants to hear from the Senates. The Council resolution is a hybrid of the first two options. It recommends a 2% across-the-board increase (“range adjustment”) in 2010-11 and a subsequent (2011-12) 3% range adjustment, and 2% market adjustment to raise the salary scales. There were discussions.

Strategic Planning for the University: Chair Simmons said that the Special Committee report and the systemwide review response to the Academic Council recommendation to the UC Commission on the Future and the UCLA Statement of UC Values were discussed at Council meeting in November. The Council asked Special Committee to include all of the systemwide responses into its final report. The Council further set a small task force to evaluate the financial impact of the Special Committee’s recommendations. Its report will be ready in late spring for systemwide review.
From Provost

State budget: Incoming governor might cut mid-year budget due to a $6 billion budget gap (latest news: $1.5B cut to education?). UC needs a multi-year strategy.

Re-benching: The President asked the Provost to start the re-benching process to mitigate historic inequities in funding among campuses. Currently, campuses are reimbursed per student according to a baseline amount established in early 1990s, including many factors. Provost will start a committee in January 2011 to discuss principles for state general funds allocation and develop financial models.

Submitted by: Albert Wang, Representative to the Assembly


## Proposed Changes to Regulations of the Riverside Division R.1 Grading System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1.1.1.1 The grade GD (Grade Delay) shall be entered on the student's record: a) when administratively the faculty member is not able to assign a grade or b) when disciplinary proceedings are in progress. The GD shall not itself be calculated in any way in the student's grade-point average. The GD shall be changed to a grade, or an incomplete, only when the Registrar receives a written request from the instructor, or if unavailable, the program chair, to indicate that the student situation has been resolved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once an instructor has decided to proceed with disciplinary proceedings, he or she will refrain from assigning a course grade for the student. If the course concludes before the charge has been resolved, the instructor will assign a grade GD and indicate as a note that this GD is for a &quot;Pending Charge of Academic Integrity&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.1.5.1 A student who has been referred for a pending academic integrity violation may not drop or withdraw from the course to escape the consequences of the misconduct. If a student drops or withdraws from the course prior to the resolution of the case brought to Student Conduct, they will be re-enrolled in the course. Students are encouraged to attend and engage fully in the course during the academic integrity review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:** The purpose of this proposal is to suggest for consideration two additions to the UCR Grading Policies, so that the grade policies are in line with current practices and policies on campus. 1) The grade GD currently is utilized administratively and during academic integrity reviews; however, the GD grade is not defined as an official grade in the UCR Grading Policy and 2) The Committee on Educational Policy requested and approved in 2005 the Academic Integrity at the University of California, Riverside policy which includes language that a student officially notified of alleged academic misconduct may not withdraw from the course until the determination of
responsibility is made and any sanctions are imposed. This policy and the Grade Policy for withdrawal do not appropriately match and therefore, the proposal requests the addition of a regulation to address withdrawals in the case of academic integrity.

Approvals:

Approved by the Executive Committee of CHASS: 11/17/2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of CNAS: 10/13/2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of COE: 10/27/2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of AGSM: 10/11/2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of the GSOE: 10/05/2010
Approved by Graduate Council: 10/18/2010

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: 11/5/2010
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: 10/29/2010, 12/2/2010
Reviewed by the Executive Council: January 10, 2011
To Be Adopted

Proposed Changes to School of Business Administration Bylaws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M1 Membership</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOBA1 Membership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M1.1</strong> The Faculty of the Graduate School of Management, Riverside consists of (a) the President of the University; (b) the Chancellor; (c) the Executive Vice Chancellor; (d) the Dean of the Graduate School of Management; (e) all members of the Academic Senate who are members of the department(s) assigned to the Graduate School of Management; (f) designated Senate members from other colleges and schools, the number and departmental affiliation of such members to be specified by the Faculty of the school at a regular meeting in each case; (g) such other Senate members as may be specified by the bylaws of the Division.</td>
<td><strong>SOBA1.1</strong> The Faculty of the School of Business Administration consists of (a) the president of the University; (b) the Chancellor; (c) the Executive Vice Chancellor; (d) the Dean of the School of Business Administration; (e) all members of the Academic Senate who are assigned to the School of Business Administration; (f) designated Senate members from other colleges and schools, the number and departmental affiliation of such members to be specified by the Faculty of the School at a regular meeting in each case; and (g) such other Senate members as may be specified by the bylaws of the Riverside Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M1.2</strong> Only voting members of the Academic Senate are eligible to vote in the Faculty of the Graduate School of Management.</td>
<td><strong>SOBA1.2</strong> Only voting members of the Academic Senate are eligible to vote in the Faculty of the School of Business Administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2 Officers</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOBA2 Officers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2.1</strong> The Officers of the Faculty consist of a Chair and a secretary.</td>
<td><strong>SOBA2.1</strong> The Officers of the Faculty consist of a Chair, a vice chair and a secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2.1.1</strong> 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, 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 the vacated term is less than six months, the secretary of the Faculty will serve as Chair.</td>
<td><strong>SOBA2.1.1</strong> The Chair of the Faculty is elected for a two-year term and is not eligible to succeed himself/herself immediately. To assure orderly transition, the Chair of the Faculty shall remain in office until the successor assumes office. 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 one month, 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2.1.2</strong></td>
<td>The Secretary of the Faculty is chosen by the Executive Committee from among its membership. The term of office is two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOBA2.1.2</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOBA2.1.3</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2.1.3</strong></td>
<td>The election of the Chair of the Faculty shall be conducted as provided in chapter 7 of the bylaws of the Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOBA2.1.4</strong></td>
<td>The election of the Chair of the Faculty is conducted as provided in Chapter 7 of the bylaws of the Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOBA2.1.5</strong></td>
<td>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 vice chair and secretary take office immediately upon appointment. (Am 20 Nov 07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M3</strong></td>
<td>Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M3.1</strong></td>
<td>Meetings may be called by the Chair of the Faculty or by the Executive Committee. At the written request of four voting members of the faculty, the Chair must call a meeting. He must call at least one meeting each regular term in each year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOBA3.1</strong></td>
<td>Meetings may be called by the Chair of the Faculty or by the Executive Committee. At the written request of five voting members of the Faculty, the Chair must call a meeting. Regular Meetings of the faculty are scheduled on the Friday of the second week of class in the fall term, the first Friday in February in the winter term, and on the Friday of the tenth week of class in the spring term. At least two weeks prior to each scheduled Regular Meeting, the Chair shall issue a solicitation of requests for agenda items to the faculty, which items, at the discretion of the chair, may be included in the meeting agenda. At least one week prior to a scheduled Regular Meeting, the Chair shall distribute the agenda for the meeting. The Dean of the School of Business Administration may schedule a Special Meeting. Special Meetings are intended for the purpose of addressing a limited agenda (normally one item) and require at least one week prior notice to the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M3.1.1</strong></td>
<td>A quorum consists of one-half the members of the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOBA3.1.1</strong></td>
<td>A quorum consists of one-half of the members of the Faculty of the School of Business Administration who are members of the Academic Senate and not emeritus faculty. A quorum is necessary to conduct any official business at such meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M3.1.2</strong></td>
<td>A motion to submit a measure to mail ballot has precedence over a motion for a vote in a meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOBA3.1.2</strong></td>
<td>A motion to submit a measure to mail ballot has precedence over a motion for a vote in a meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M3.1.3 The Chair must send, at least five days before each meeting, copies of the call for the meeting together with all pertinent documents to each member of the faculty.

SOBA3.1.3 The Chair must send, at least five business days before each meeting, copies of the call for a meeting together with all pertinent documents to each member of the Faculty. The Faculty shall not change curricular requirements or regulations of the school or its departments or change these bylaws at the meetings at which such proposals for change are first made or make any other main motion, unless notice is previously given to all members of the Faculty in a call to the meeting. Any main motion introduced by a member of the faculty at a meeting and not previously announced in the meeting agenda shall be either tabled until the next meeting or vote on the motion by mail ballot with balloting to close no sooner than one week after the meeting when the motion was introduced.

M3.1.4 These bylaws constitute primary rules of order for meetings of the Faculty and of the committees of the faculty. The order of business is that prescribed in chapter 4 of the bylaws of the Division. Questions of order not covered by these bylaws or those of the Division are covered by *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*.

SOBA3.1.4 These bylaws constitute primary rules of order for meetings of the Faculty and of the Standing Committees of the School of Business Administration. The order of business is that prescribed in Chapter 4 of the bylaws of the Division. Questions of order not covered by these bylaws or those of the Division are covered by *The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure (4th Edition)*.

M3.1.5 The minutes of every meeting of the Faculty shall be sent within ten days by the secretary to every member of the faculty.

SOBA3.1.5 The minutes of every meeting of the Faculty, the Executive Committee and every School of Business Administration Standing Committee shall be sent to every member of the Faculty within ten business days after the meeting.

M4 Committees

M4.1 There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of five voting members and up to two non-voting members. The voting members shall be the elected Chair of the Faculty, the Dean of the school, and three elected members of the Faculty to be distributed as follows: one member elected from each of the departments. The Chairs of the undergraduate Business Administration and Master of Business Administration programs shall be non-voting members of the Executive Committee unless, in either or both cases, he/she is an elected member. (Am 25 Jan 79)(Am 27 May 93)(Am 30 May 06)

SOBA4 Committees

SOBA4.1 There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of the Chair of the Faculty, the Dean of the School, and the elected members of the Faculty as provided in SOBA4.1.1, as voting members, and the associate Dean(s) of the School as ex officio members unless he/she is an elected member. 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, and Secretary of the Faculty occupy corresponding offices in the Executive Committee. The Vice Chair and Secretary are elected by the Executive Committee from the existing elected Faculty members of the
<p>| M4.1.1 | The election is held as provided in Chapter 7 of the bylaws of the Division. For purposes of these elections, members of the Executive Committee are considered Officers of the Faculty of the School. Members of the Executive Committee take office on the first day of September following their election, or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election. (Am 30 May 06) | Executive Committee whenever a vacancy arises. |
| SOBA4.1.1 | The elected membership of the committee shall include one member chosen from each designated academic area in the School. The five currently designated academic areas are Accounting and Information Systems, Finance, Management Science, Marketing, and Management. 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. |
| M4.1.1.1 | The term of office of members of the Executive Committee is two years. | SOBA4.1.1.1 The term of office of members of the Executive Committee is two years. |
| M4.1.2 | The Executive Committee has the following functions: | SOBA4.1.2 The Executive Committee has the following functions: |
| SOBA4.1.2.1 | The Executive Committee has general oversight of the academic welfare and discipline of students in the school and has the power to bring before the Faculty any matters that the committee deems advisable. | The Executive Committee has general oversight of the academic welfare and discipline of students in the school and has the power to bring before the Faculty any matters that the committee deems advisable. |
| M4.1.2.2 | The Executive Committee appoints all other standing committees and all special committees of the Faculty unless otherwise directed at a meeting of the Faculty. | The Executive Committee appoints all other standing committees and all special committees of the Faculty unless otherwise directed at a meeting of the Faculty. |
| M4.1.2.3 | The Executive Committee acts finally for the Faculty (a) in the awarding of all degrees to students of the school in all cases which do not involve the suspension of regulations or that involve only minor adjustments in the curricula and (b) in the awarding of honors at graduation. The committee is likewise empowered to act on petitions of students for graduation under suspension of the regulations. The committee will report all degrees approved to the Division. | The Executive Committee acts finally for the Faculty (a) in the awarding of all degrees to students of the school, and (b) in the awarding of honors at graduation. The committee is likewise empowered to act on petitions of students for graduation under suspension of the regulations. The committee will report all degrees approved to the Division. |
| M4.1.2.4 | The Executive Committee makes recommendations to the Faculty regarding the establishment, modification, and discontinuation of curricula, fields of interest, majors and minors within the school. | The Executive Committee acts for the Faculty in the establishment, modification, and discontinuation of majors and minors within the school. |
| M4.1.2.5 | The Executive Committee acts for the Faculty in making recommendations to the Division regarding courses. | The Executive Committee acts for the Faculty in making recommendations to the Division regarding courses. |
| M4.1.2.6 | The Executive Committee reviews and makes recommendations to the Dean of the Graduate | The Executive Committee reviews and makes recommendations to the |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Management regarding proposals for the establishment of new departments or modifications of existing departments.</td>
<td>Dean of the School of Business Administration on proposals for the establishment of new departments or modifications of existing departments and reviews the status of all interdisciplinary programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M4.1.2.7</strong> The Executive Committee establishes and maintains liaison with the Executive Committees of the other colleges and schools in the Division.</td>
<td><strong>SOBA4.1.2.7</strong> The Executive Committee establishes and maintains liaison with the Executive Committees of the other schools and schools in the Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M4.1.2.8</strong> The Executive Committee assists the Dean on his/her request in matters relating to the administration of the Graduate School of Management.</td>
<td><strong>SOBA4.1.2.8</strong> The Executive Committee assists the Dean on his/her request in matters relating to the administration of the School of Business Administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M4.2</strong> The Business Administration/Administrative Studies Program will be guided by a committee consisting of the program Chair selected from the Faculty of the Graduate School of Management and five Faculty members, of whom at least one each shall have appointment in the Departments of Economics, Political Science, and Sociology, and at least one shall have appointment in the Graduate School of Management. The Deans of the Graduate School of Management and of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences will be ex officio members of the committee. (En 5 May 77)</td>
<td><strong>SOBA4.2</strong> The School of Business Administration academic programs shall be guided by two Standing Committees, one for masters’ level graduate programs and one for the undergraduate programs. The master’s level Programs Chair will be selected from the Faculty of the School of Business Administration. The undergraduate Academic Programs Chair will be selected from the Faculty of the School of Business Administration. The Dean of the School of Business Administration will be an ex officio member of the committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M4.2.1</strong> The members of the Business Administration/Administrative Studies Program Committee will be appointed by both Executive Committees. (En 5 May 77)</td>
<td><strong>SOBA4.2.1</strong> The members of the School of Business Administration academic programs committees will be appointed by the Executive Committee and shall have representation in all academic areas as defined in 4.1.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M4.2.2</strong> The Chair of the Business Administration/Administrative Studies Program Committee will be appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School of Management after consultation with the Business Administration/Administrative Studies Program Committee and approved by the two Executive Committees. (Am 8 Jun 78)</td>
<td><strong>SOBA4.2.2</strong> The chairs of the master’s level Academic Programs Committee and the Chair of the undergraduate Administration Academic Programs Committee will be appointed by the Dean of the School of Business Administration and approved by the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M4.2.2.1</strong> The term of office of the Chair of Business Administration/Administrative Studies is two years. (En 5 May 77)</td>
<td><strong>SOBA4.2.2.1</strong> The term of office of the master’s level Academic Programs Committee is two years. The term of office undergraduate Academic Programs Committee is two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOBA4.2.2.2</strong> Changes or revisions in the masters level graduate programs curriculum, including proposals for new courses or deletion of existing courses, must be approved by the Executive Committee. Changes or revisions in the undergraduate programs curriculum, including proposals for new courses or deletion of existing courses, must be approved by the Executive Committee.</td>
<td><strong>SOBA4.2.2.2</strong> Changes or revisions in the masters level graduate programs curriculum, including proposals for new courses or deletion of existing courses, must be approved by the Executive Committee. Changes or revisions in the undergraduate programs curriculum, including proposals for new courses or deletion of existing courses, must be approved by the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4.2.3</td>
<td>Changes or revisions in the Business Administration/Administrative Studies curriculum, including proposals for new courses or deletion of existing courses, must be approved by the Executive Committees of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences and the Graduate School of Management. (En 5 May 77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4.2.4</td>
<td>Changes in the bylaws or regulations of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, which affect general degree requirements within the college, will automatically apply to degree requirements within the Business Administration/Administrative Studies Program. (Am 8 Jun 78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA4.3</td>
<td>The Executive Committee may appoint additional committees as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA5.1</td>
<td>These bylaws and regulations can be amended or suspended only as provided in chapter 6 of the bylaws of the Division.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JUSTIFICATION:**

These proposed bylaws have been in revision by the school’s faculty for the past two academic years, and are now being proposed to be compatible with the school’s needs as well as with the numerous changes in organizational structure that have taken place over the past 3 years.

Approved by the Faculty of SoBA: **10/8/2010**

Approved by the Executive Committee of SoBA: **10/21/2010**

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: **11/29/2010**

Reviewed by the Executive Council: **1/10/2011**
PROPOSAL TO MODIFY THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW FOR FRESHMAN ADMISSIONS FOR THE FALL 2012 ADMISSIONS CYCLE

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee has proposed to modify the Comprehensive Review of admissions criteria for freshman admissions, to be implemented for the fall 2012 admissions cycle. The proposed changes described in this memo are transitional and incremental in nature, and represent a first step in an ongoing process of change and evolution of freshman admissions procedures at UCR. (See Part III of this memo for a more detailed time line for changes to the freshman admissions process, for fall 2012, and for fall 2013.)

This memo is organized as follows: Part I briefly summarizes the current Comprehensive Review admissions process at UCR and the proposed changes in that process. Part II provides a detailed rationale for the proposed changes. Part III provides an outline and general time line for continued revision of the Comprehensive Review process.

I. CURRENT ADMISSIONS PROCESS AND PROPOSED CHANGES

UCR currently admits freshmen students through a Comprehensive Review process that weighs five factors in an additive model to calculate an Academic Index Score (AIS). These five factors are a subset of the 14 factors that were recommended by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and approved by the Regents in 2001. The full list of the 14 factors that currently may be considered is given in Appendix A of this memo.

The current admissions process, referred to as Comprehensive Review, Phase I, was implemented in 2005. The proposed revision described here is referred to as Comprehensive Review, Phase II. The current weighting distribution, and the proposed weighting distribution, are both outlined in Table 1 (on the next page). The Table lists the factors and their current and proposed weights. These proposed weights were determined through extensive analyses performed by Student Affairs Research and Evaluation (SARE) in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, using graduation, dismissal, and UCR GPA data, and admissions criteria available through an electronic read of student applications.
Table 1.
Factors and Weights for Current and Proposed Calculation of Academic Index Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>.4578</td>
<td>.5020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Reasoning / ACT plus writing</td>
<td>.1962</td>
<td>.4119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Subject Exam</td>
<td>.0654</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Subject Exam</td>
<td>.0654</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility in Local Context</td>
<td>.1308</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of A-G courses beyond minimum</td>
<td>.0409</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation Status</td>
<td>.0218</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Family Income</td>
<td>.0218</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of AP/IB courses</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note – High School GPA is weighted and capped; AP/IB denotes Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses.

The criteria that enter into the Academic Index Score have very different scales. For example, the SAT score has a maximum score of 2400, whereas High School GPA has a maximum score of 4.5. Also, First Generation Status and Low Family Income are binary variables that are assigned values of 0 and 1. Thus, in order to calculate the AIS, the variables are re-scaled. Each variable is then scored as a proportion of the maximum (re-scaled) score possible, and these proportions are weighted and summed, and multiplied by a scalar which is the total possible AIS value. The calculation of the Academic Index Score is illustrated in Appendix B of this proposal.

It is clear from the Table that the largest changes in the calculation of the AIS are: (1) the increase in the weight given to SAT scores, (2) the removal of the SAT Subject Exams, and (3) the removal of Eligibility in Local Context (ELC).

The calculation of the Academic Index Score will be the same for all colleges – the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (CHASS), the School of Business (SoBA), the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS), and the Bourns College of Engineering (BCoE) – based on the weights shown in the right-hand column of Table 1.

For CHASS and SoBA, admissions decisions will be based on the calculation of the AIS. For BCoE and CNAS, admissions decisions will be based primarily on the calculation of the AIS, but some admissions decisions will be made on the basis of exam scores that reflect mastery of mathematics, chemistry, and physics. These decisions are described as follows:

It is proposed that the following information be provided to prospective applicants to majors within the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences: “Applicants to the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences are strongly encouraged to take the SAT Math Subject Exam, and either the Physics or Chemistry SAT Subject Exam. Applicants are also strongly encouraged to take the ACT Science Reasoning Test and an AP Calculus Exam.”
It is proposed that the following information be provided to prospective applicants to majors within the Bourns College of Engineering: “Applicants to the Bourns College of Engineering should ensure strong preparation in Physics, Chemistry, and Mathematics. Their mastery of Mathematics should cover at least Pre-Calculus, but an advanced Placement course in Calculus is recommended. Applicants are strongly encouraged to provide evidence of adequate preparation by taking the SAT Math Subject exam, and either the Physics or Chemistry SAT Subject Exam, or the ACT Science Reasoning Test.”

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee proposes a plan that would empower CNAS and BCoE to form committees within their colleges to review a subset of freshman applications that have AIS scores below the AIS cut-off for the 2012 admissions cycle, and to make admissions decisions based on the criteria listed above. For this subset of applications the CNAS and BCoE committees may also, in making admissions decisions, consider the Math portion of the SAT reasoning Test.

II. RATIONALE FOR PROPOSED CHANGES

The development of Phase II of Comprehensive Review was guided by four goals: (1) To effectively respond to the UC systemwide changes in the UC eligibility construct that will be implemented for the Fall 2012 admissions cycle, (2) To raise the academic profile of undergraduate students admitted to UCR, (3) To maintain the diversity of the student body, and (4) To maintain the transparency and integrity of the admissions process at UCR.

Goal 1:
To Effectively Respond to the UC Systemwide Changes in the UC Eligibility Construct

In February 2009, the Regents approved several changes in the UC eligibility construct. These changes, originally proposed by BOARS are as follows:

1. Entitled to Review. High school seniors who meet all of the criteria described below will be entitled to a full review of their applications for admission:
   
   (a) Complete the SAT Reasoning or ACT plus writing examination.
   
   (b) Successfully complete the list of courses known as the “a through g curriculum” consisting of 15 year-long, college preparatory courses certified by UC at each high school.
   
   (c) Achieve a minimum GPA of 3.0, weighted with up to 8 semesters of honors.

2. Statewide Context. Students determined to be in the top 9% of the state based on an index of their honors-weighted GPA and test scores will be guaranteed admission to UC. The 9% figure represents a change from the current eligibility construct of 12.5% for statewide context.
3. Local Context (ELC). Students determined to be in the top 9% of their public high school graduating class based on an index of their honors-weighted GPA and test scores will be guaranteed admission to UC. This 9% figure represents a substantial change from the current 4% figure.

Implications of the Changes in UC the Eligibility Construct
The full scope of the implications of these changes is not completely clear. However, two aspects of the proposed changes are particularly salient. (1) The change in ELC from 4% to 9% will likely expand the pool of eligible students and may increase the number of applicants who are less well-prepared and who have weaker academic preparation for college. (2) The removal of the requirement for SAT subject tests should remove a barrier to gaining access to UC. College Board data show that in 2007, 195,406 California seniors took the SAT Reasoning test, but only about half of those students (51%) took one or more of the SAT Subject Exams. These numbers are even more striking for low income students; less than half (47%) of low-income students who took the SAT-R took one or more of the SAT subject tests. The comparable percentages are even lower for African American students (34%), Native American students (37%), and Chicano/Latino students (42%).

Changes in the Eligibility construct are reflected in the weights for Comprehensive Review, Phase II. Note that the SAT Subject exams and ELC are removed from the calculation of AIS. The elimination of SAT subject exams is a simple implementation of the new UC eligibility construct. The zero weight assignment for ELC was based on careful consideration and discussion by the admissions committee. The Undergraduate Admissions Committee agrees with the principle behind the 4% to 9% change in the ELC construct. However, the change in ELC creates a new, unknown, and undefined variable, and thus it is impossible to know what weight to give to this variable, and it is impossible to know how it will affect the composition of our applicant pool, how it will be related to academic success, or how it will affect the composition of our student body. Before we can assign it a weight, we need to have a clearer picture of the cohort of students that will be defined by the new ELC variable.

Goal 2:
To Raise the Academic Profile of the Undergraduate Student Body at UCR

The committee examined factors currently utilized in Comprehensive Review (Phase I) to determine the extent to which they were associated with academic success at UCR. Academic success was defined in three ways: in terms of graduation rates, dismissal rates, and current UCR GPA.

The relationship between admissions criteria and graduation rates is based on the Fall 2002, 2003, and 2004 cohorts. (One has to go back several years in order to obtain useful graduation rate data.) These analyses revealed that graduation rates were only weakly predicted by the factors that are currently used to make admissions decisions. The correlations from these analyses ranged from -.048 to .098, and are shown in Table 2. Why should these correlations be so weak? Our tentative explanation is that retention and graduation rates are determined in large part by factors that have little to do with admissions criteria. Specifically, students may withdraw from the University or transfer to other academic institutions for a variety of personal reasons.
and financial reasons that have little or nothing to do with their aptitude or preparation for college.

**Table 2.**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GRAD GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT 1 Total</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT-verbal</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT-Math</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A to G courses beyond minimum</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP / IB courses</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Courses</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Family Income</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation Status</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because graduation rates for the campus are weakly correlated with the current admissions criteria, we considered a different measure of academic success, UCR GPA. The correlations between admissions criteria and UCR GPA, using the same cohort, were much stronger and are shown in Table 2. The strongest predictor of UCR GPA was high school GPA, followed quite closely by the total SAT reasoning score.

The committee also examined the relationships between admissions criteria and measures of success in a more recent incoming class, from fall 2008. Of course, graduation rate data are not available for this group of students who came to UCR only two years ago. Thus, rather than graduation rates, we examined dismissals, in addition to UCR GPA. The correlations are given in Table 3. For this cohort the strongest predictor of UCR GPA is the total SAT reasoning score.

**Table 3.**

Correlations between Admissions Criteria, Dismissal, and UCR GPA, Fall 2008 Cohort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DISMISSAL GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td>-.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Total</td>
<td>-.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-G Courses</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Courses</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP/IB Hours</td>
<td>-.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation Status</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36
Optimization of Admissions Criteria

Student Affairs Research and Evaluation (SARE) conducted an analysis that adjusted the weights on the current Comprehensive Review factors to identify the set of weights that would optimize the dependent variable of UCR GPA. Those weights are listed in the left-hand column (labeled OPT) of Table 4. If our goal were simply to weight admissions factors in such a way as to admit students who would demonstrate academic success as measured by their UCR GPA, this would be accomplished through the weighting of factors shown in Table 4. These factors, taken together, predict UCR GPA with a correlation of $r = .43$. This correlation can be compared to the predictive power of the current set of weights, $r = .32$. The increase from .32 to .43 represents a substantial increase in the power of admissions criteria to predict student success.

Careful inspection of the analyses revealed some peculiarities and undesirable consequences with regard to the diversity of the student body. First, regarding the peculiarity: Although honors courses are positively correlated with UCR GPA ($r = .164$), their coefficient in the optimization was negative (note that this negative coefficient is not shown in the tables). Further analysis revealed that the negative relationship was due to the double contribution of honors courses in the calculation of AIS. Specifically, because the weighted High School GPA also reflects the contribution of honors courses, entering them into the AIS equation twice over-represents their contribution. In order to factor the double-contribution out of the AIS calculation, honors courses were removed as a separate component in calculating AIS. As for the undesirable consequences, the optimized weights appear to produce potentially undesirable shifts in the ethnic distribution of the student body (see Goal 3 in the section to follow).

The Academic Index Score will be the primary factor in determining admissions decisions for the fall 2012 admissions cycle. However, based on consultation with faculty within CNAS and BCoE, the Admissions Committee believes that it is crucial that students who are admitted to majors in CNAS and BCoE have additional preparation and mastery in math, physics, and chemistry, in order to succeed. For that reason, the Admissions Committee has consulted with both CNAS and BCoE faculty to propose the plan described above that would empower CNAS and BCoE to form committees within their colleges to review a subset of Freshman applications (that have AIS scores below the AIS cut-off), and to make admissions decisions based on scores for the Math portion of the SAT, the Math, Physics, and Chemistry Subject Exams, and the ACT Science Reasoning Test (as described on page 3 of this proposal).

Table 4.
Weights on Admissions Criteria, Optimized and Adjusted Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Optimized ($r = .43$)</th>
<th>Adjusted ($r = .41$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td>.4334</td>
<td>.5020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>.3598</td>
<td>.4119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-G Courses</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>.0334</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP/IB</td>
<td>.1552</td>
<td>.0667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>.0180</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Family Income</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 3:
To Maintain the Diversity of the Undergraduate Student Body at UCR

On May 20, 1988, the Regents adopted UC Policy on undergraduate admissions, which stated in part, “Mindful of its mission as a public institution, the University of California ..., seeks to enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that, beyond meeting the University’s eligibility requirements, demonstrates a high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic, and socio-economic backgrounds characteristic of California.” (Emphasis added.)

UCR is in a strong position with respect to diversity. Unlike other UC campuses, UCR has been successful in enrolling a diverse student body that is representative of the state of California. UCR has received considerable praise and national attention for the diversity of its student body. Moreover, UCR qualifies as a Hispanic Serving Institution, making the university eligible for grants it would otherwise be ineligible for. To qualify as a Hispanic-Serving Institution, the student body must include a minimum 25% Hispanic student body.

Regarding the consequences of optimizing for UCR GPA for the diversity of the student body, Table 3 shows that first generation status and low income are both negatively associated with academic success. The negative weight, however, cannot be justified in any reasonable admissions policy, as it penalizes students whose admission to UC is a core component of our mission as educators in a public, state-funded institution. The committee speculated that the negative correlation with GPA may reveal a post-enrollment vulnerability of first generation and low income students that should be addressed not through the admissions process, but through post-enrollment support.

The committee also examined the ethnic distribution of the student body based on these optimized weights. SARE analyzed the distributions for ethnicity of the undergraduate student body, for fall 2010, based on the current AIS calculation and the optimized AIS calculation, as a function of various admissions cutoffs. Of course, if UCR admitted 100% of the fall 2010 incoming class, the distributions would look exactly as they do currently, irrespective of how the AIS is calculated. The data in Table 5 are based on an assumption of increased selectivity as a 70% cutoff, i.e., they are based on the top 70% that would be selected in each model. (This assumption of increased selectivity is reasonable in light of the increased yield in recent admissions cycles.)

Table 5.
Distribution of Ethnicity of UCR Student Body Based on Current, Optimized, and Adjusted Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Optimized</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>24.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>44.45</td>
<td>46.71</td>
<td>44.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note – Columns do not sum to 100.00. “Other” and “Not specified” responses are not included in the table.

The data in Table 5 suggest that the optimization of weights would increase the proportion of all ethnic groups except for Mexican-American and Latino students. The proportion of Mexican American students shows the largest decrease, from 26.32 percent to 21.92 percent. The combined percentage for Mexican American and Latino students decreases from 32.96 percent to 27.31 percent.

With the goal of maintaining the diversity of the UCR student body, and to extend access as broadly as possible to UC qualified students, the Undergraduate Admissions Committee considered an Adjusted Model that re-coded low income and first generation status in order to favor (rather than disfavor) their admission to UCR. The ethnic distribution based on this Adjusted Model is shown in the right-most column of Table 5. The table shows a proportional increase in all ethnic groups, with the exception of a small decrease in the proportions of Mexican-American and Latino students, compared to the current model. As the table shows, these decreases in Mexican-American and Latino students are much smaller in the adjusted model than in the optimized model.

The weights derived from this Adjusted model are shown in the right-hand column of Table 4, next to those of the optimized model, for comparison. The predictive power of the adjusted model is \( r = .41 \), which represents only a very small decrease relative to the optimized model (\( r = .43 \)).

The adjusted model is a much stronger predictor of academic success, measured by UCR GPA, compared to the current model. It deviates only very slightly from the optimized model (\( r = .41 \) versus .43 in the optimized model). This is accomplished with very little change in the ethnic distribution of students.

Goal 4: Maintaining the Transparency and Integrity of the Admissions Process

The proposed changes to the Comprehensive Review process maintain the transparency and integrity of the admissions process. Admissions decisions are determined by a structured decision process based on objective criteria. Admissions decisions are not based, in any way, on subjective judgments. The criteria and the relative importance of the criteria are clearly specified.

III. TIME LINE FOR ADDITIONAL REVISION OF COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

The proposed changes in the Comprehensive Review model represent an important, necessary, but incremental change in the admissions procedures. Because of the very short time frame and the necessity of responding to the changes in the UC eligibility construct for fall 2012, the committee restricted itself to consideration of factors that were currently available through the electronic read of admissions applications.

We were unable to consider factors that would require a human-review of the applications to identify factors such as leadership, significant community service, special talents
(i.e., Factor 11 as they are numbered in the list of BOARS recommendations). The committee recognizes that such factors may provide valuable information, but did not have adequate time to code those factors in the current applications, in order to run the simulations that would provide the empirically justified basis for incorporating such factors into the admissions equation. (One of the key factors in the time line is that changes in admissions must be made public and must be distributed to high schools prior to the start of the fall 2012 admissions cycle. Although Fall, 2012 may seem to be a long way off, the pathway from approval to public distribution is also a long process.)

Although the Admissions Committee has proposed small variations across the colleges, specifically to allow CNAS and BCoE to more carefully examine applications for evidence of mastery in mathematics, physics, and chemistry, the Committee has not yet given full attention to the consideration of college-specific, or major-specific, admissions criteria. The Undergraduate Admissions Committee will take up the consideration of these additional admissions criteria in March 2011 (after the divisional meeting for the UCR academic senate in February).

The Committee also plans to revisit the consideration of ELC after the fall 2012 admissions cycle. The fall 2012 admissions cycle will provide us with the first cohort of applicants for whom ELC data (based on the top 9% ELC) will be available.
APPENDIX A

CURRENT COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW CRITERIA

1. Academic grade point average in all completed “a-g” courses, including additional points for completed University-certified honors courses.

2. Scores on the ACT Assessment plus Writing or SAT Reasoning Test, and two SAT Subject tests.

3. Number of, content of, and performance in academic courses beyond the minimum “a-g” requirements.

4. Number of, and performance in University-approved honors courses and Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and transferable college courses.

5. Identification by UC as being ranked in the top 4 percent of the student’s high school class at the end of his or her junior year (“eligible in the local context” or ELC).

6. Quality of the student’s senior-year program, as measured by the type and number of academic courses in progress or planned.

7. Quality of the student’s academic performance relative to the educational opportunities available in his or her high school.

8. Outstanding performance in one of more academic subject areas.

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

10. Recent, marked improvement in academic performance, as demonstrated by academic GPA and the quality of coursework completed or in progress.

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

12. Completion of special projects undertaken in the context of the student’s high school curriculum, or in conjunction with special school events, projects, or programs.

13. Academic accomplishments in light of the student’s life experiences and special circumstances.

14. Location of the student’s secondary school and residence.
The Academic Index Score calculation is illustrated below, based on the weights on GPA, SAT, Advanced Placement / International Baccalaureate courses, First Generation Status, and Low Income, as proposed by the Undergraduate Admissions Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weights</th>
<th>Max Values</th>
<th>Max Values Scaled to SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>.5020</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>.4119</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP/IB</td>
<td>.0673</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST GEN</td>
<td>.0094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW INCOME</td>
<td>.0094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 1. Scale variables to SAT.
GPA is weighted more heavily than SAT, by a ratio of .5020/.4119 = 1.2187. Thus, the maximum GPA, scaled to SAT, and reflecting the higher weighting of GPA relative to SAT, is:

\[ \frac{.5020}{.4119} \times 2400 = 2924.98 \]

Advanced Placement Courses are weighted less heavily than SAT, by a ratio of .0673/.4119 = .1634. Thus, the maximum score for Advanced Placement Courses is:

\[ \frac{.0673}{.4119} \times 2400 = 392.13 \]

Step 2. Divide each score \( S_i \) by its maximum score \( S_i(\text{max}) \) to obtain the proportion of maximum, and sum over the scores. Multiply this sum by the total number of points (5827) to obtain the AIS Score.

\[ AIS = 5827 \sum \left[ \frac{S_i}{S_i(\text{max})} \right] w_i \]

where \( s_i \) denotes the student’s scores on GPA, SAT, AP/IB, First Generation Status, and Low Income, \( S_i(\text{max}) \) are the maximum possible for GPA, SAT, AP/IB, First Generation Status, and Low Income, and \( w_i \) are the weights.
Professor David R. Parker, Chair  
Executive Committee,  
College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences  
University of California, Riverside  
Riverside, CA  92521  

January 19, 2011  

Dear David,  

I am writing to you in my capacity as the Chair of the Academic Senate Undergraduate Admissions Committee.  

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee voted to approve the following amendment to the admissions criteria (in addition to the calculation of the Academic Index Score) to be used for freshman admissions for the 2012 admissions cycle:  

“Applicants to the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences are strongly encouraged to take the SAT Math Subject exam, and either the Physics or Chemistry SAT Subject Exam. Applicants are also strongly encouraged to take the ACT Science Reasoning Test and an AP Calculus exam.”  

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee also voted to approve a plan that would empower the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences to form a committee to review a subset of freshman applications that have AIS scores below the AIS cut-off for the 2012 admissions cycle, and to make admissions decisions based on the criteria listed above. For this subset of applications, the committee may also, in making admissions decisions, consider the Math portion of the SAT Reasoning Test.  

These additions append the Undergraduate Admissions Committee’s November 9, 2010 Proposal to Modify the Comprehensive Review of Admissions Criteria. The November 9, 2010 proposal is also attached.  

In order for the Proposal, with the additions noted above, to go forward to the Academic Senate Divisional meeting, I ask that the CNAS Executive Committee vote on the proposal, as amended, at your earliest convenience.  

Sincerely,  

Steven E. Clark, Chair  
Academic Senate  
Undergraduate Admissions Committee
To: Mary Gauvain, Chair  
Academic Senate  
University of California, Riverside

From: Undergraduate Admissions Committee:  
Steven Clark, Committee Chair (Department of Psychology)  
J. William Gary (Department of Physics and Astronomy)  
John Heraty (Department of Entomology, BOARS Representative)  
Ray Kea (Department of History)  
Mindy Marks (Department of Economics)  
Heejung Jung (Department of Mechanical Engineering)  
Adam Lukaszewski (Department of Botany and Plant Sciences)  
James Sandoval (Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs)

Re: Proposal to modify Comprehensive Review of admissions criteria and calculation of Academic Index Score (AIS) for freshman admissions, to be implemented for fall 2012.

January 21, 2011

The Academic Senate Undergraduate Admissions Committee proposes to modify the Comprehensive Review process for Freshman Admissions for the fall 2012 Admissions Cycle. The proposal and supporting documents are attached.

The original proposal (of November 9, 2010) has been revised to reflect the Admissions Committee’s consultation with faculty in the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences and the Bourns College of Engineering. Memoranda reflecting those consultations are attached.

Sincerely,

Steven E. Clark, Chair  
Academic Senate  
Undergraduate Admissions Committee
Steve:

I think Mike and I can bless this on behalf of the Committee; it is 100% consistent with their intent when they voted to endorse the Larsen report from December.

If you would like, I can obtain a confirming vote next week, but I would like to make sure this gets on the agenda for the Division meeting (deadline is today I believe).

Let me know.

Dave

On 1/20/2011 5:30 PM, Steven Clark wrote:

    Hi David.
    The last eVote just came in that pushed the revised CNAS proposal over the top. It's a done deal.

    Can the CNAS executive committee approve the undergraduate admissions proposal for Comprehensive Review, amended as indicated in the my Jan 19th letter (which I've attached).

    -steve

David R. Parker

Chair of the Faculty, College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

Professor, Department of Environmental Sciences

University of California

Riverside, CA 92521

voice: 951-827-5126

fax: 951-827-3993
Date: January 21, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain  
Chair of the Academic Senate  
University of California, Riverside

From: Jay A. Farrell  
Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee  
Bourns College of Engineering  
University of California, Riverside

RE: BCOE Amended Admissions Criteria

Dear Mary:

At our meeting today, the BCOE Executive Committee discussed and voted to approve the following amendment to the admissions criteria (in addition to the calculation of the Academic Index Score) to be used for Freshman admissions for the 2012 admissions cycle:

“Applicants to the Bourns College of Engineering should ensure strong preparation in Physics, Chemistry, and Mathematics. Their mastery of Mathematics should cover at least Pre-Calculus, but an Advanced Placement course in Calculus is recommended. Applicants are strongly encouraged to provide evidence of adequate preparation by taking the SAT Math Subject exam, and either the Physics or Chemistry SAT Subject Exam, or the ACT Science Reasoning Test.”

Please route this to the Undergraduate Admissions Committee for their approval as soon as possible, as BCOE would like to have it on the agenda of the next Division meeting. The request to the Undergraduate Admissions Committee is twofold:

1. To approve the above amendment;
2. To approve a plan that would empower BCOE to form a committee to review a subset of Freshman applications that have AIS scores below the AIS cut-off for the 2012 admissions cycle, and to make admissions decisions based on the criteria listed above and the Math portion of the SAT Reasoning Test.
TO: Mary Gauvain, Chair  
Academic Senate

FROM: David Herzberger, Chair  
CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Proposal to Modify Comprehensive Review of Admissions Criteria and Calculation of Academic Index Score (AIS) for Freshman Admissions, to be Implemented for Fall 2012.

On January 5, 2011, the CHASS Executive Committee approved by majority vote the Comprehensive Review of Admissions Criteria and Calculation of Academic Index Scores for Freshman Admissions. All members of our committee appreciated the work undertaken by the Undergraduate Admissions Committee chaired by Steven Clarke; we also understand that the Admissions Committee had access to more data and more analyses than CHASS Exec, and that the Committee devoted a great deal of time to their deliberations. However, there were concerns raised both by those who voted in favor of the proposal and those who voted against it.

For those voting in favor of the proposal, the following reservations were voiced: UCR should maintain diversity in a broad sense, including cultural, racial, geographic, and socioeconomic backgrounds, as stated in the 1988 Regents' policy on admissions. To this end, we recommend that changes to the weighted criteria applied to admissions be changed incrementally. We note that academic success is only partially indicated by GPA. The goal of "raising the profile of UCR students" should not come at the expense of UCR's ethnic and economic diversity and access for low-income and first generation students. Finally, we strongly urge the Undergraduate Admissions Committee to integrate a firm timetable for implementation of a holistic approach to admissions, one that incorporates the 14 comprehensive review factors approved by BOARS.

For those voting against the proposal, the following reservations were raised (to a large degree these echo the concerns of the majority): UCR should take a more gradual approach to changing the weights used to determine the academic index score so that diversity will not be negatively affected. The minority felt that the concerns raised by several members of CHASS Exec were serious enough to require additional adjustments to the proposed weights. This group would like to see a proposed set of weights that seeks to improve academic performance--although perhaps by a little less--without reducing the share of minority students at UCR. This group was also concerned that impacts on other dimensions of diversity were not discussed in the proposal. Given these limitations, the minority favored a more cautious approach to increasing the weight on SAT scores and to reducing the weights on first generation status and low family income.
November 29, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: GERHARD GIERZ, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

RE: UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS PROPOSAL

At the November 22 Committee on Preparatory Education meeting, Professor Steve Clark, chair of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee, visited us to discuss the proposal to Modify Comprehensive Review of Admissions Criteria and Calculation of Academic Index Score for Freshman Admissions. We appreciate the detailed analyses and hard work done by the Undergraduate Admissions Committee.

We understand that this proposal represents a first step in a continuing process of refining admissions criteria.

We support the proposal. (10 Yes votes, 0 No votes, 1 Abstention).

In the future, the top 9% of graduating high school seniors will be “eligible in the local context” (ELC) to enroll at a UC campus, compared to the current top 4%. At the present time, we do not know how the Office of the President plans to deal with the additional ELC students, and this uncertainty raised serious concerns for members of the committee.

We have therefore requested Professor Clark report the following information to the Committee:
1) Does the Office of the President have a plan to allocate students who rank between the top four and nine percent of their high school classes? 2) If so, what are the primary features of this plan? 3) What proportion of these newly-eligible students will each campus be expected to admit? and 4) What will happen if these newly-eligible students are not admitted by any of the campuses as part of regular admissions practices?

The committee feels that it is essential that the new admissions policy to be embraced by all campuses and that all campuses, accordingly, admit a proportion of these newly-eligible students. This proportion might correspond, for example, to each campus’s state-funded undergraduate FTE count. Members of the Committee expressed a concern that our campus may otherwise carry a disproportionate share of the responsibility for admitting these newly-eligible students. Many of these students will be less well prepared for UC than students admitted under the previous admissions policy. If these less well-prepared students do not perform well at a
university level, it will be far more difficult for our campus to improve the academic profile of its undergraduate student population, an expressed goal of the campus strategic plan and one that members of the committee endorse.

In addition, the Committee feels that UC Riverside should have a plan to monitor the academic performance of these newly-eligible students once they are on campus. These studies should focus on comparisons of these newly-eligible students admitted from the top 4 percent of high school classes in terms of grades, academic probation, time to degree, and retention.

Future refinements of the undergraduate admissions policy may allow different Colleges or even different programs to develop admissions criteria linked to College or Department specific correlates of success. For instance, the Art Department might request that the students submit a portfolio, while CNAS and BCOE might require that students take the SAT II Mathematics test and achieve a minimum score on that test. Our committee supports continued work of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee to refine admissions criteria along these lines and in other ways that will improve the academic profile and success of the campus’s undergraduate student body.

In addition, we understand that the Admissions Office is planning to employ wait lists this year. We support the use of wait lists to eliminate the costly over-enrollments we have seen in the last two years.
November 27, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR, RIVERSIDE DIVISION
CC: RISE AXELROD, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

FM: ERIK ROLLAND, CHAIR, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION/AGSM

RE: New Undergraduate Admission Criteria

During its November 16 (2010) meeting, the Executive Committee of SoBA discussed in depth the UGA proposal to modify the criteria for freshman admissions. While the report seems to reflect the four stated goals, the committee felt that the report needs much improvement, particularly in its explanation of how the results were obtained (statistics, BOARS references, methods, results, etc.). The statistics/econometrics need to be explained fully, so that the reader can understand what was tested and how. On the content side, the committee felt that there is need for an audit of the implications of this report. The SoBA EC agrees with moving towards a more holistic admissions criteria, as the variables and regression in the report show a clear lack of correlation between the measures currently used. It is apparent that the admissions criteria should be studied in depth, using more advanced statistical and econometric methods – this could (and should) be a full research project for the right individual or group on campus.

In summary, we feel that the report sheds very little light on the implications of the new criteria, and that this must be considered an experiment until the implications are better understood. The report also needs clarifications and improvements – both in write-up and methodology.

[Signature]

Erik Rolland
November 24, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS PROPOSAL TO MODIFY THE
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF ADMISSIONS CRITERIA AND
CALCULATION OF ACADEMIC INDEX SCORE FOR FRESHMAN
ADMISSIONS

During its November 18 meeting, the Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the aforementioned proposal from the Undergraduate Admissions. We appreciated the visit from Professor Mindy Marks of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee, who outlined the background and justification for the proposal. We also appreciated the detailed analyses that the UAC has done to come this far. The proposal seemed appropriate for the time and therefore, we voted to approve the proposed AIS weights (12 Yes votes, 0 No votes, 0 Abstentions).

As a separate issue, the CEP requests that the AIS scale (that is, the maximum value for this quantity) be standardized in order to simplify longitudinal studies of admission trends.

The Committee understands that the admissions process will use waiting lists this year and requests to be kept informed on the details of their implementation (including the targets proposed by the colleges and any department or program) and, eventually, of the effectiveness of the new admissions process (including the extent to which targets were met and statistics on the consequences of the new AIS weights), and plans for improvement.
To be adopted:
Proposed Changes to College Board Advanced Placement Examination Credit - Changes in the
Articulation of Statistics AP Exams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present:</th>
<th>Proposed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP Score</td>
<td>AP Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Credit</td>
<td>Unit Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Natural and Agricultural Science</td>
<td>College of Natural and Agricultural Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics 3, 4, 5 4 Credit for STAT040</td>
<td>Statistics 3 4 Credit for STAT040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4, 5 4 Credit for STAT048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:

The addition of allowing a score of 4 or 5 to give a student credit for STAT 48 has been proposed for the following reason:
STAT 48 directly (and STAT 100A indirectly, due to it being an upper division equivalent course) services many more students than does STAT 40; therefore, many more students have the opportunity to receive credit for their AP Statistics coursework as long as these students score a 4 or better on the AP Statistics Exam. Because credit for STAT 48 could place a student directly into STAT 100B, it is believed that only scores of 4 or better on the AP Statistics Exam ensure that any student receiving this sort of credit will not be at a disadvantage compared to those students who must first take STAT 48 (or STAT 100A) in order to get into STAT 100B.

Approved by Statistics Faculty: November 3, 2010
Approved by the Executive Committee College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences: November 16, 2010
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: December 2, 2010
Approved by the Undergraduate Admissions: January 12, 2011