April 22, 2010

TO:    Kathleen Montgomery, Vice Chair, AGSM  
       Dan Ozer, Secretary Parliamentarian, Psychology  
       Richard Arnott, Economics  
       Steve Axelrod, English  
       Jay Farrell, Electrical Engineering  
       Christine Gailey, Women's studies  
       John Ganim, English  
       George Haggerty, English  
       Dan Hare, Entomology  
       David Herzberger, Hispanic Studies  
       Carol Lovatt, Botany and Plant Sciences  
       Manuela Martins-Green, Cell Biology and Neuroscience  
       Doug Mitchell, GSOE  
       Len Mueller, Chemistry  
       Vivian-Lee Nyitray, Religious studies  
       Erik Rolland, AGSM  
       John Trumble, Entomology  
       Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences  
       Albert Wang, Electrical Engineering  
       Alan Williams, Earth Sciences  
       Jose Wudka, Physics  
       Marylynn Yates, Environmental Sciences

FR:    Tony Norman, Chair  
       Riverside Division

RE:    Executive Council Agenda, April 26, 2010

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, April 26, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 210, 2nd Floor University Office Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Information 1:10 – 1:15</strong></td>
<td>I. <strong>Approval of the</strong> April 26, 2010 Agenda and April 12, 2010 Meeting Notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information 1:15 – 1:45</strong></td>
<td>II. EVC AND PROVOST DALLAS RABENSTEIN: Strategic Plan progress, English 1C, Summer school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Information 1:45 – 2:15</strong></td>
<td>III. <strong>SUSPENSION OF SUMMER SESSIONS ENROLLMENT</strong> Brad Hyman Associate VPUE and Leonard Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Information 2:15 – 2:30</strong></td>
<td>IV. <strong>A REVISED REGISTRATION FEE POLICY:</strong> Revised fee policy to be proposed to the Regents, As well as revised guidelines for implementation of the fee program. Are there objections that the Senate should be raising?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Information 2:05 – 2:10</strong></td>
<td>V. <strong>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</strong> 2010 Admission date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
APRIL 12, 2010

PRESENT:
Anthony Norman, Chair
Dan Ozer, Psychology, Secretary Parliamentarian
Steven Axelrod, English, Preparatory Education
Jay Farrell, Electrical Engineering, BSOE Executive Committee
John Ganim, English, Physical Resource Planning
Dan Hare, Entomology, Faculty Welfare
David Herzberger, Hispanic Studies, CHASS Executive Committee
Manuela Martins-Green, Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Sr. Rep to the Assembly
Doug Mitchell, GSOE Executive Committee
Vivian-Lee Nyitray, Religious studies, Undergraduate Admissions
Erik Rolland, AGSM Executive Committee
John Trumble, Entomology, CAP
Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee
Jose Wudka, Physics, Educational Policy
Albert Wang, Electrical Engineering, Junior Rep to the Assembly
Marylynn Yates, Environmental Sciences, CNAS Executive Committee

ABSENT:
Kathleen Montgomery, AGSM, Vice Chair
Richard Arnott, Economics, Research
Christine Gailey, Women’s studies, Committees
Carol Lovatt, Botany and Plant Sciences, Planning and Budget
Len Mueller, Chemistry, Academic Computing
Alan Williams, Earth Sciences, Graduate Council

GUESTS:
LaRae Lundgren
Bracken Dailey
VC Jim Sandoval

CONSENT CALENDAR:
The agenda was approved as written. The minutes were approved with slight amendments on page 5 – corrected **UCR is one of only 12 UC campuses that offer 3 quarters of English 1A, 1B and 1C** to **UCR is one of two of the 9 UC campuses that offer 3 quarters of English 1A, 1B and 1C** and added a sentence to correct in the second paragraph on the third line to read as follows – agreed to teach a Religious Study Class that was part of the Writing Across the Curriculum.
Proposed Change in the BCOE Regulation - ENR 2.4:
Approved unanimously

iGrade Submission and dismissal process of students:
AVC Enrollment Management Larae Lundgren and Bracken Dailey the Registrar were present at the EC meeting to discuss the grading and dismissal process at UCR. The EC members were given an update on the process that took place and the final decision which was to take the iGrade submission deadline and move it from the Thursday after Finals to the Tuesday after final thus cutting short the current grading period by two days. The changes were required (1) for financial reasons – i.e. when a student is officially dismissed (usually during 3rd week of the subsequent quarter), he/she has already received the financial aid refund for the current quarter. Collecting this money from the student can be challenging once they are separated from the institution. Secondly, due to the current timeline, students are not notified of their dismissal until either right before or three weeks into the subsequent quarter. Therefore, the students subject to dismissal have already been allocated a dorm room. And finally, due to the fact that these students are not officially dismissed until the end of third week of the Spring quarter, their registered seats cannot be “given” to any other student. They indicated that there was a possibility that the move in the grading deadline will increase the volume of “GD”s on the student records. In an average quarter, about 140 students were dismissed from CHASS and 80 from CNAS. The EC members felt that the reduction in time was going to have a negative impact on the grading. There was concern that the Senate’s opinion was being sought after the fact and that it would have been better to obtain the faculty’s opinion prior to implementation. After some discussions, it was decided that the implementation would be made for spring; and the proposal will be brought back to the Senate in the fall for further discussion.

Namings – an update by VC Jim Sandoval:
**Charter Student Promenade** – VC Sandoval informed the EC members that the entering class consisted of transfer and freshmen students who did not come in as a class and also did not graduate as a class. Over time, the group has identified themselves as the Charter Students. With this update, the EC approved the original suggested name which was Charter Student Promenade.

**Greenock Resident Hall** – The EC members felt strongly that this name would be mispronounced and felt that there are other names that should be considered if the intent is to keep the Scottish theme. Jim Sandoval indicated that there are plans to use the name Dundee for another hall but that he will look at other names and send them to the EC for approval.

Graduate Council Update:
Chair Norman gave an update on the Graduate Council staffing issue. The Chair and Vice Chair met on April 2 with Morris Maduro (current Vice Chair, Graduate Council) and two former Chairs of the Graduate Council –Robert Russell and Chris Switzer. At that meeting, it was agreed that the Graduate Council ‘issue’ was not very complex; in reality, it was only an issue of having one staff person from the Academic Senate being responsible for all Graduate Council matters.
At the April 12 EC meeting, the committee discussed the staffing arrangement for the Graduate Council and the blueprint for staffing transition of the Graduate Council was passed around (see attached).

Since Ms. Virginia Bustamante is officially retiring from the Graduate Division at the end of December 2010, it has become important that the Academic Senate assume full responsibility for providing staff support to the Graduate Council. The EC members were informed that Sue Stracener who currently works in the Academic Senate will be responsible for staffing the Graduate Council and would start with the April 19th Graduate Council meeting. The proposal was approved by the EC members unanimously.

**Senate Response to Strategic Plan:**
The following are highlights from the various committees that reviewed the 1st draft of the Strategic Plan.

**Academic Personnel – John Trumble Chair:**
1. CAP was of the opinion that additional credit should be given towards merits/promotions to those faculty that actually publish with undergraduates. This has several substantial benefits: 1) undergraduate publication improves the undergraduate education experience (often this has an impact that carries through an entire career) and, 2) many granting agencies give extra points toward grants that include undergraduate training, particularly if under-represented groups can be included.
2. CAP was also concerned that the plan did not mention the nationally ranked departments and Colleges at UCR. The committee members felt that these departments should be acknowledged and promoted.
3. CAP believes that grants should not be made a mandatory requirement for merit advancement or promotion. They firmly believe that funding does not equal scholarship. They felt that Office of Research should be streamlined to support research.
4. CAP also was concerned over the idea of taking research inactive faculty and assigning them more teaching. They felt that there was no guarantee that this will make them better teachers and there is a risk of ending up with a multi-tier system.

**Faculty Welfare, Dan Hare Chair:**
Chair Hare commented on the following four areas:

1. **Shared Governance.** FW felt that too many administration task forces were being created and that the administration should refrain from using Administration-Faculty task forces to develop changes to the curriculum or attempt to impose a curriculum upon the faculty and ought instead to utilize the various Standing Committees of the Senate for such purposes.

2. **The Call and the APM 210.** FW cautioned that the CALL as an administrative instrument should be consistent with the APM.
3. **Training and Compliance.** FW is very concerned with the proliferation of different training programs on campus and are especially concerned about programs that are no more than obvious efforts to unload liability from the Administration onto the Faculty members, and with programs whose metric of success is the amount of time that faculty are forced to spend in training (and not the quantity of new, valuable information that might be transmitted). CFW strongly suggests that any proposed training programs be carefully evaluated in terms of their expected benefits relative to the cost and time lost by faculty who are forced to participate in such programs.

4. **Administrative support for Faculty grantsmanship.** In large part, the Strategic Plan depends upon individual faculty members funding their research through the direct costs from extramural grants, as well as a substantial portion of the rest of the University through the indirect costs from those grants. Most faculty members feel that the Office of Research Affairs has been more of a hindrance than a help in obtaining extramural support. If the Strategic Plan is to succeed then the Office of Research Affairs needs to adopt a completely new mindset and hire individuals with far different sets of skills than are currently available to faculty.

**Educational Policy – Jose Wudka, Chair:**

The recommendations on the “Ignition” seminars and the capstone research experience generated strongly mixed responses, however, and most of CEP’s discussion focused on these two items. They were also concerned that the draft document did not carefully reflect the type of discussions that took place within the subcommittees.

1. **Capstone experience:** CEP members felt that the abstract idea behind requiring a capstone experience for all undergraduates is worthy, but the implementation would likely be feasible only for smaller programs. The prospect of requiring a capstone course for every student in majors with hundreds of students graduating every year is daunting. Unlike ignition seminars, capstone experiences do indeed need to be department-specific. Generating, supervising and evaluating individual (or perhaps small-group) projects in such programs is almost impossible with the current resources.

2. **The drive towards AAU status:** Several members of the CEP considered, however, that this report does not present a balanced approach to achieving AAU status. There is little discussion on the implications the process described will have for undergraduate education, and for disciplines which, by their very nature, would not bring significant amounts of extramural funding to the Campus. The CEP does not consider that the drive to achieve AAU status need require UCR to make draconian choices as institutions in this category usually present a balanced profile. We therefore urge that a more harmonious approach to achieving AAU status be presented and pursued.

**CHASS Executive Committee – David Herzeberger, Chair**

1. CHASS Executive Committee members felt that the document proposed enhancing support for programs of excellence and lower levels of support and (perhaps at a maintenance level) for programs not deemed as excellent. The members were
concerned at the lack of metrics that were used to cite department/programs as excellent and wondered how can the university identify programs of excellence before establishing metrics that would identify programs of excellence? There were several programs that were named that were probably fine programs, however, the members urge that a discipline-appropriate system of metrics be developed for each program/department, that the system be implemented and actually used to determine excellence, and only then should resources be allocated to the identified programs. They endorsed the goal of sustaining (and developing) strong programs; we urge that a fair system, without the pre-judging of programs, be developed and implemented.

2. The word “Humanities” is not used in the draft of the strategic plan. Further, the arts, while mentioned, seem to be perceived largely as an “enrichment” of university life (rather than a group of disciplines with their own bodies of knowledge and scholarship/creative activities). Since UCR aspires to reach the standards of AAU universities, CHASS members strongly urge that UCR understand fully that that guidelines developed by AAU place explicit emphasis on strength in the humanities and arts.

CNAS Executive Committee – Marylynn Yates, Chair:
In general, the CNAS Executive Committee is concerned that it will not be possible to do everything that is being recommended in the Strategic Plan – from emphasizing graduate education to teaching 4-unit introductory-levels seminars to writing large-scale training grants or center proposals - without increasing the number of faculty or substantially increasing workload. For example, both the proposed 4-unit Ignition Seminars and the proposal to offer every undergraduate student a capstone experience will expend so much faculty time that Strategic Goals #1 and #2 (expanded excellence in research and graduate education) will be compromised. Disparate priorities scattered throughout the Strategic Plan would make it difficult for faculty to knowledgeably budget scarce “free” time to these various activities – regardless of their individual merits.

Undergraduate Admissions – Vivian-Lee Nyitray, Chair:
The Committee felt that the Strategic Plan lacked attention to resource. Below are some of the points they felt needed to be reviewed closely:

1. The committee was concerned about the possibly disproportionate ratio of effort expended to offer support and remedial assistance to our lowest-achieving students vs. the effort expended to encourage and stimulate higher-achieving students, some of whom may opt not to participate in the University Honors Program. They felt that top tier students get short changed. It was recommended that UCR come up with a system of tracking students who do not need extra incentives but are being challenged. The committee’s concern was that as the campus develops First Year Learning opportunities, UCR should seek as well to increase the retention of top tier students, i.e., those with entering GPAs of 3.6-3.9.
2. Although the report offers a striking vision for future strategic planning efforts, the success of this vision requires a significant buy-in from faculty; and the committee felt that that this issue must be dealt with carefully in the 2nd draft.

3. With regards to “ignition” seminars, Undergraduate committee endorsed the idea of a great start for a strong finish but felt that the present vision of ignition seminars is fiscally and pedagogically problematic.

**CODEO, Manuela Martins-Green, Chair:**
The Committee members felt that the report was lacking in details. In the report, it is commented that “UCR can make community engagement part of its ‘DNA’”. This is a very dangerous statement because it implies that the university and the community should be one. The Committee members felt that Goal No. 5 – Climate and Community – deserved great attention. It was time to invest in faculty and staff and to develop mentor programs for faculty and also seriously consider the issue of building a University Club. CODEO was also concerned with the lack of progress toward a more diverse faculty and graduate student body.

**BCOE, Jay Farrell, Chair:**
Like the other Executive Committees, the Chair of the BCOE Executive Committee indicated that BCOE members were frustrated that the actual words of the subcommittee reports were not used in the larger report. He indicated that some knowledgeable faculty should be involved in the rewriting of the 2nd draft.

**AGSM, Erik Rolland, Chair:**
The Chair of the AGSM Executive Committee indicated that other than the issues that were raised by the other College Executive Committees, some of the issues that they felt needed to be addressed includes strategies and patterns of resource allocation. The AGSM Executive Committee members would like to know what the pattern of resource allocation looked like now, and compared to what it is now, where is it that we are going to make changes.

**Physical Planning Resources, John Ganim, Chair:**
Prof. Ganim indicated that they found very little that was germane to their committee. However, they reviewed all the reports to try to identify that dealt with issues related to physical resources. PRP members were glad that the report dealt with the deferred maintenance issue, but they wanted to point out that the report was not really talking about deferred maintenance but rather was dealing with renovation of buildings.

Secondly, the committee was concerned with the type of buildings UCR is currently getting. Some buildings were actually dysfunctional before they were outfitted. The PRP committee concurred with the general principles enunciated in the “Climate” subcommittee report, especially its emphasis on sustainable design and socially interactive and welcoming spaces and places. They did not think that creating a new office was the way to go. What UCR should do is rewrite all the charges of all the committees to include those issues so that everyone becomes responsible from bottom up.
They also pointed that the process called value engineering was often counterproductive and that going for the cheapest thing is not always the most efficient way to do thing and at times ends up being much more expensive.

**Any other Business:**
Legislative Assembly – Chair Norman and Vice Chair Montgomery have been working on the document as an effort to improve the ways that the Academic senate does its business so as to be more inclusive. The proposal was to write it up and amplify it a little bit more including details about the number of departments we have on campus and send it on to key committee members. He indicated that the departments will gain if we move to a legislative assembly format because the proposal ensures that there is a representative at every meeting. He proposed visiting large departments and if they agreed with the proposal, then bring it back to the Executive Council to make a final decision on whether it should be sent to the Division or not.

Next, the EC reminded the EC of the next Chili cook-off scheduled to May 7th at 5:00 PM.

Third, the Chair reminded the EC members of the upcoming Post-Benefits Employment forums that were scheduled for April 13 and 14. He also mentioned that on May 5, 2010, Chair Harry Powell and Vice Chair Dan Simmons were planning to visit UCR and would like to have a town hall meeting designed to allow the faculty to bring up their concerns over the benefits issue. Finally, he mentioned that the Systemwide Committee on Planning and Budget had put together a new Report titled “Choices” and encouraged the members to read it.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

*Selwyn Ehlers*
*Executive Director*
*Academic Senate*
April 18, 2010

TO: Executive Council

FROM: Tony Norman

RE: A Revised Registration Fee Policy

Below is a message/request that I received from Dan Simmons our System wide Vice Chair. I would like the Executive council members to give this a quick read and see whether you encounter any issues or red flags. We can discuss it at our next Executive Council.

There are two documents here, merged into one PDF file. (a) a modified Fee Policy and (b) modified Guidelines for Student Services Fee Portion of the UC Student Fee Policy.

Thank you.

Colleagues:

As I indicated at the last Council meeting, I have been serving on an OP task force formed to report a revised registration fee policy to the Regents. The task force deliberations were completed this morning to meet a deadline to report to the Regents at the May meeting.

I told the task force that the Senate normally expects a period for consultation before a budget item such as this is considered by the Regents. However, as I stated at the last Council meeting, I don’t believe that the Senate will have a great concern with this item. The generally student driven process is designed to highlight the use of the registration fee or student centered activities with a name change to Student Services Fee, suggested uses and mis-uses of fee revenue, and clarification of the advisory role of student fee advisory committees on the campuses. One major revision is incorporation of a provision for a return-to-aid element in the fee structure.

The attachments include a revised fee policy to be proposed to the Regents, and revised guidelines for implementation of the fee program. There is also a reporting spreadsheet that is proposed as a template for the campuses.

Given the quick turn around being imposed for consultation, I suggest that your review ask whether there are objections that the Senate should be raising. In the case of serious objection Harry and I can ask the Regents to postpone any action to give the Senate time to undertake a more thorough review. Absent serious objection I recommend that we take on position on the matter.

I will put this matter on the agenda for the April Council meeting at which time you all can instruct Harry and me on your response.

Dan

Daniel L. Simmons
Professor of Law, UC Davis
Vice-Chair, Academic Senate
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Tel: 510 987-9303
Fax: 510 763-0309
Deletions are shown by strikeout; additions by underscore

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA STUDENT FEE POLICY*

A Student Fee Policy affecting the Educational Fee and the University Registration Fee Student Services Fee is established with the following provisions.

A. The Educational Fee

The Educational Fee is a Universitywide mandatory charge assessed against each resident and nonresident registered student. The Educational Fee is assessed uniformly across all campuses of the University.

In addition to funding programs and services supported by the Educational Fee (such as student financial aid and related programs, admissions, registration, administration, libraries, and operation and maintenance of plant), income generated by the Educational Fee may be used for general support of the University's operating budget. Revenue from the Educational Fee may be used to fund all costs related to instruction, including faculty salaries.

In recommending to the Board the annual Educational Fee level, the President shall take into consideration the following factors:

1. the resources necessary to maintain access under the Master Plan, to sustain academic quality, and to achieve the University's overall mission;

2. the full cost of attending the University, including the cost of housing, food, healthcare, books and supplies, transportation, and other academic and personal expenses;

3. the amount of support available from various sources to assist needy students in funding the full cost of their education;

4. overall State General Fund support for the University; and

5. the full cost of attendance at comparable public institutions.

The President annually shall solicit faculty and student views on the level of the Educational Fee, through the appropriate consultation processes.

B. The University Registration Student Services Fee
The University of California is committed to providing a supportive and enriched learning environment for all undergraduate, graduate and professional students. To facilitate this intent, all registered resident and nonresident students are assessed the Student Services Fee which is a Universitywide mandatory charge.

The University Registration Fee is a Universitywide mandatory charge assessed against each registered resident and nonresident student.

Income generated by the Student Services Fee (formerly referred to as the University Registration Fee) should may be used to support services and programs which that directly benefit the students and which that are complementary to, but not a part of, the core instructional program. These services and programs include, but are not limited to, operating and capital expenses for services related to the physical and psychological health and well-being of students; social, recreational, and cultural activities and programs; services related to campus life and campus community; technology expenses directly related to the service; and educational and career support. These services and programs create a supportive and enriched learning environment for University of California undergraduate, graduate and professional students and provide general student enrichment.

Increases in the Student Services Fee should have a return-to-aid component that is the same percentage as the return-to-aid component of increases in the Educational Fee.

Given the campus-specific programs and services funded by this Fee, the University Registration Fee need not be uniform across campuses. The Board of Regents shall establish annually a range within which campuses are to establish a specific fee level for the next academic year.

Annually the Regents should review the Student Services Fee and determine the appropriate fee level after considering a variety of factors, including but not limited to: needs and priorities of undergraduate, graduate and professional students; inflation and other budgetary cost increases; creation of new programs or services; and overall budget priorities of the University.

At each campus, the Chancellors or his/her designee annually shall should solicit and actively consider student recommendations, with the intent of honoring as much as possible student recommendations on the following: the use of Student Services Fee revenue; and the annual Student Services Fee to be set student views on the level of the campus Registration Fee, for their respective campuses, for the next academic year through the campus Registration Fee Advisory Committees, consistent with the range established by the Regents Board. Student recommendations shall be provided by each campus’ student fee advisory group recognized by the systemwide Council on Student Fees.

Chancellors annually shall submit to the President, for final review and approval, the level of the University Registration Fee for their respective campuses. The President shall
inform the Board of Regents what the University Registration Fee level will be, by campus, for the coming year.

Each campus will maintain a website that provides details on how the Student Services Fee has been allocated relative to the recommendation of the student fee advisory group.

Each campus should refer to administrative guidelines issued by the President that provide additional guidance around the use of Student Services Fee revenue, student fee advisory committees, Student Services Fee reports, and student fee websites.

C. Notification to Students

To assist students and their parents in planning for future educational expenses, the President shall report annually to the Board the proposed fee levels for the Educational Fee and the range of the University Registration Student Services Fee for the next academic year, and the anticipated fee levels (in the case of the Educational Fee) or ranges (in the case of the University Registration Fee) for the following three years.

*Nothing in this policy constitutes a contract, an offer of a contract, or a promise that any fees ultimately authorized by The Regents will be limited by any term or provision of this policy. The Regents expressly reserves the right and option, in its absolute discretion, to establish fees at any level it deems appropriate based on a full consideration of the circumstances, and nothing in this policy shall be a basis for any party to rely on fees of a specified level or based on a specified formula.
ATTACHMENT 2

Guidelines for Implementing the Student Services Fee Portion of

The University of California Student Fee Policy

The intent of these Guidelines is to ensure the effective and appropriate use of the Student Services Fee (formerly referred to as the University Registration Fee) to support co-curricular student services and to ensure appropriate student input and oversight. The Guidelines provide interpretation to help translate the Student Services Fee portion of The University of California Student Fee Policy into appropriate campus practices that will achieve the Policy's goals. These Guidelines are intended to be sufficiently flexible and allow for exceptions at the campus level, based on recommendations made by the local Student Fee Advisory Committee and approved by the Chancellor. Changes in these Guidelines should be made in consultation with the Council on Student Fees and the Office of the President.

I. Use of Student Services Fee Revenue

As stated in The University of California Student Fee Policy, Student Services Fee revenue should be “used to support services and programs that directly benefit students and that are complementary to, but not a part of, the core instructional program. These services and programs include, but are not limited to, operating and capital expenses for services related to the physical and psychological health and well-being of students; social, recreational, and cultural activities and programs; services related to campus life and campus community; technology expenses directly related to the service; and career support.”¹ Services and programs funded by the Student Services Fee should be broadly available to all students.

The Student Services Fee is subject to the University’s return-to-aid practice. Beginning in 2011-12, any new return-to-aid associated with the Student Services Fee will be funded from Student Services Fee revenue. The return-to-aid revenue

¹ The University of California Student Fee Policy is available at http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/policies/3101.html.
will be used for student financial aid according to the guidelines for the University Student Aid Program.\(^2\)

Because the intent of the Student Services Fee is to provide stable and adequate funding for student services that complement the instructional program, as endorsed by campus Student Fee Advisory Committees, the primary use of Student Services Fee revenue should be for student services programs and activities that are not traditionally supported by State funds. Student Services Fee funding should be prioritized for the direct costs of Student Services Fee-funded programs. Student Services Fee revenue can be used for the indirect costs associated with operating the student services programs and activities the Fee supports.

The primary focus of Student Services Fee revenue should not be on programs in the following areas; however, this does not preclude some Student Services Fee revenue from being used for these areas, consistent with The University of California Student Fee Policy:

- Enrollment/Registrar/Admissions Services
- Financial Aid Administration
- University Library
- Alumni Affairs and Alumni Student Services
- Planning and Budget Administrative Units
- Instructionally-related capital improvements
- Immediate office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
- Auxiliary Units, such as Housing, Parking Services
- Office for Students with Disabilities
- Intercollegiate Athletic Programs
- New Student/Transfer Student Orientation Programs
- Learning Skills Center
- Educational Opportunity Programs
- International Student Programs

While in general, campuses should not meet their budgetary priorities by shifting additional expenses onto the Student Services Fee, in years of fiscal shortfall, cuts to student services functions, perhaps achieved with funding shifts of programs to the Student Services Fee, may be unavoidable. Such cuts and/or funding shifts should only be made in consultation with the campus Student Fee Advisory Committee, as described below. Also, such cuts and/or funding shifts should maintain consistency with The University of California Student Fee Policy and these Guidelines.

\(^2\) The guidelines for the University Student Aid Program are available at [insert weblink here].
II. Recommended Structure and Responsibilities for Student Fee Advisory Committees (SFACs)

As stated in The University of California Student Fee Policy, “At each campus, the Chancellor or his/her designee annually shall solicit and actively consider student recommendations, with the intent of honoring as much as possible, student recommendations on the following: the use of Student Services Fee revenue; and the annual Student Services Fee level to be set by the Regents.” Each campus should have in place a Student Fee Advisory Committee, comprising matriculated students, to advise on the use of revenue generated from the Student Services Fee. Each Chancellor should solicit annually and consider recommendations of the Student Fee Advisory Committee.

The following are recommended guidelines for the Committee:

1. The Committee is advisory to the Chancellor or his/her designee. The Chancellor or his/her designee will seek, to the extent feasible and within the context of campus priorities and strategic goals, to honor the recommendations of the Committee.
2. The Committee should be comprised of a majority of students who represent graduate, professional, and undergraduate students, and to the extent feasible, should reflect the relative populations of these students on each campus.
3. The Committee should maintain an official working relationship with undergraduate and graduate/professional student governments.
4. The Committee should designate a representative on the Council on Student Fees.
5. The Committee should be provided with appropriate staff support, including a representative from the campus budget office.
6. The Committee should have access to appropriate office space with phone and computer.
7. Campuses should consider offering stipends to the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee.
8. Operation of the Committee may be funded by Student Services Fee revenue.
9. The first Committee meeting of each academic year should occur not later than the fourth week of the fall quarter or semester. Unless otherwise recommended by the local Student Fee Advisory Committee, it is expected that the Committee should meet a minimum of three times each term.
10. The Committee should have purview over fees as specified in the Committee’s bylaws.
11. The Committee should opine on or offer/decline endorsement of campus-based fee referenda.
12. The Committee should review student fee-funded and non-student-fee-funded non-instructional/curricular student services within the Committee’s purview.

13. The Committee should maintain a regularly updated website accessible to all students containing:
   a. Information about the committee, such as:
      i. Agendas;
      ii. Meeting minutes, posted within one month after each meeting;
      iii. Governing documents, including bylaws with membership selection policies and procedures;
      iv. Membership roster;
      v. Committee recommendations from previous years;
      vi. As stated in *The University of California Student Fee Policy*, “...details on how the Student Services Fee has been allocated relative to the recommendation of the student fee advisory group”;
      vii. A summary of how Student Services Fee revenue has been expended;
   b. *The University of California Student Fee Policy*;
   c. Relevant student fee policies; and
   d. *Guidelines for Implementing the Student Services Fee Portion of the University of California Student Fee Policy*.

### III. Recommended Process for Soliciting Budget Recommendations from Student Fee Advisory Committees

At a minimum, the following should be practiced in support of Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) budget deliberations:

1. At the beginning of each academic year, the Committee should be briefed on the campus’s budget and budget climate.
2. Each committee should be presented with the entire Student Services Fee base budget for the current academic year during the fall quarter or semester. Budget information provided to the Committee should include clearly understandable data on direct and any indirect costs funded by the Student Services Fee.
3. The Committee should work directly with the campus budget office to determine the level of budget information and detail needed to fulfill their responsibilities. Student Services Fee-funded units should make their full budgets available to the Committee in time to allow the SFAC to have the information necessary to make budget recommendations. As needed to ensure an appropriate analysis, the Committee should be provided the ability to review Student Services Fee-supported programs within the context of all funds supporting those programs.
4. Each Committee should have the ability to visit, review and request budget clarification from Student Services Fee-funded units.
5. Additional documentation requested by the Committee should be produced in a timely manner.
6. Each Committee should have the ability to review and make short- and long-term allocation recommendations on all Student Services Fee funds.

IV. Annual Student Services Fee Reports

At a minimum, the Committee should have access to the budget, including historical information, for each program, service, or activity supported by the Student Services Fee. Attachment A summarizes the key budget and data elements to be included in an annual report on expenditures for Student Services Fee-funded programs. Each campus has the flexibility to develop its own budget template format; however, the template should be developed in consultation with the local Student Fee Advisory Committee. The report will be due to the Office of the President (the office of Budget and Capital Resources) by December 1 each year. This report should be made widely accessible through each campus’s website; in addition, the office of Budget and Capital Resources at the Office of the President will be responsible for ensuring easy access to all campus reports on an Office of the President website which will provide updated reports each year.

V. Student Fee Websites

Campuses should have fee information on their websites that is as complete as possible. For instance, campus fee websites should include levels and definitions of all mandatory systemwide fees, i.e., the Educational Fee and Student Services Fee; campus-based fees; Course Materials and Services Fees; user fees; and miscellaneous fees. Fees should be clearly listed by student level (e.g., resident and nonresident undergraduate; resident and nonresident graduate academic; resident and nonresident graduate professional in business; etc.). In addition, term fee levels (including summer) and annual fee levels should be clearly identified.

Students and their families should be able to access campus fee websites easily from campus home pages, as well as by using major search engines.

Campuses are encouraged to seek the input of students regarding the content, layout, and accessibility of campus fee websites.
2010 Freshman Admissions to the University of California
Overview

The admissions outcomes reported in the summary below and the accompanying tables are preliminary and focus entirely on admission of freshman applicants. Transfer admissions data will be available mid-May. These data reflect admissions offers as of April 1, 2010, and except as noted, are for California resident students.

This year the University of California is implementing a waitlist process to help participating campuses enroll the maximum number of new freshmen consistent with their enrollment targets for state-supported students. Individual campus admission numbers in this report are subject to change if campuses admit students from their waiting lists. New totals that incorporate waitlist admits will be distributed with preliminary reports of Statements of Intent to Register in June.

Unless otherwise noted, the universitywide totals in this summary and the tables are “unduplicated,” meaning that each student is counted only once. Data provided for individual campuses typically reflect multiple admissions offers; on average, fall 2010 freshman applicants applied to 3.5 UC campuses.

Summary

The fall 2010 University of California freshman admissions cycle took place in a challenging context that included the largest number of applicants in the University’s history (100,428, compared to 98,119 for fall 2009 and 95,444 for all 2008), budgetary constraints, and unfunded over-enrollments on most campuses. For the second consecutive year, the University is seeking to reduce the enrollment of new students from high school, although the 1,500 student planned reduction is less than the 2,300 enrollment reduction implemented for the fall 2009 term. At the same time, the University has increased the enrollment target for California community college transfer students by 500 students overall and all campuses are committed to increasing transfer enrollments for the fall 2010 term. Transfer admissions outcomes will be reported later this spring.

Even under these difficult circumstances, the University remained steadfast in its commitment to access and has offered, or will offer, a place to every UC-eligible freshman applicant. However, most campuses reduced their number of freshman admissions offers and many applicants received fewer offers of admission than they might have received in previous years. This action is intended to result in the modest reduction in freshman enrollments for the fall term.

While this was a very competitive year for freshman admission, the preliminary outcomes show that the University has been able to preserve and expand access for students who come from low-income families and those who will be the first in their families to graduate from college. Although many campuses made fewer admissions offers, the University was able to maintain or enhance proportional representation in admissions offers to African American, American Indian, Asian and Latino students on nearly all campuses; the representation of Whites dropped, however, due to the decline in the projected number of White high schools graduates and their representation in UC’s applicant pool. Serving all of California’s diverse communities is a very high priority for the University. While this report focuses exclusively on the preliminary freshman admissions outcomes, the University also plans to expand opportunity for California community college transfer students...
and is committed to increasing the enrollment of transfer students on all campuses by 500 to 13,500 students for the fall 2010 term.

The University of California has offered admission to 68,329 applicants for the fall 2010 term, including 58,777 California resident freshman applicants. The number of admissions offers represents an increase of 2,064 offers compared to the fall 2009 outcomes with most of this increase occurring among out-of-state and international applicants. This year 71.6 percent of fall 2010 California freshman applicants have been offered admission to the University, compared to 72.5 percent for fall 2009 and 75.4 percent for fall 2008.

The University will offer a space to every UC-eligible California resident applicant. Several campuses, including Irvine, Los Angeles, Merced and Santa Cruz, were able to offer admission to a greater number of California applicants. The remaining campuses, including Berkeley, Davis, Riverside, San Diego, and Santa Barbara, reduced their number of admissions offers for the fall term. The fall admissions numbers include 2,146 applicants who have been offered admission to the spring term at Berkeley. In addition to the numbers reported here, another 10,960 UC-eligible applicants who were not offered admission to a campus to which they originally applied will be offered admission to Merced and/or Riverside through a process known as referral. This year, 10,712 applicants, all with a firm admissions offer at one or more UC campuses, have also received an invitation to participate on at least one campus waitlist.

A brief summary of the admissions data follows:

**The University of California awards highest priority in freshman admissions to California resident applicants:** 86 percent of students offered admission are California residents (58,777). Admissions offers to out-of-state and international students numbered 9,552.

**Universitywide, the rate of admission (admits/applicants), declined slightly for the fall 2010 term, and most campuses also experienced a drop in their admissions rate.** Illustrating the intense level of competition for admission this year, seven of nine campuses – all but Merced and Riverside – report the lowest admission rate in campus history.

**Underrepresented students increased as a proportion of UC admits.** African Americans, American Indians and Chicano/Latinos comprise 28.3 percent of the University admits, up from 26.9 percent for fall 2009 and 25.1 percent for fall 2008. Despite the reductions in admissions offers – which affected all groups – most campuses registered gains in the proportion of underrepresented students in their admitted class. Led by a strong increase in applications, the admission of American Indian students increased by nearly 20 percent, or 80 admitted students compared to fall 2009; the two-year increase is 45 percent, or 151 students. The University also is experiencing a 5.3 percent increase (+691) in the admission of Chicano/Latino applicants and a 3.5 percent increase (+84) in admissions offers to African American students. Admissions offers for Asian students remained relatively unchanged (up 1.7 percent, 355 students), while offers to white students decreased by 7.2 percent (-1,412), mirroring their decline among projected California public high graduates and within UC’s applicant pool. The percentage of students admitted who declined to state their ethnicity increased by 51 percent (+345) compared to the previous year. This increase is attributed to federal changes in ethnic reporting requirements.

**Representation by gender remained stable.** The admitted class is 56 percent female and nearly 44 percent male.
Geographic representation through California continues to improve. The University of California is committed to attracting, admitting and enrolling students from throughout all of California. The majority (73.7 percent) of admitted students call Los Angeles, the San Francisco Bay Area, Orange and San Diego/Imperial counties home, but the Riverside/San Bernardino (+72 students), Santa Barbara/ Ventura/ San Luis Obispo (+34 students), and Fresno/Inyo/Kings/Kern/Tulare (+29 students) regions made small gains in numbers this year in spite of the overall decline in admissions offers in most areas of the state.

Universitywide, UC continues to excel at offering opportunity and access to students from families that have traditionally not enjoyed the benefits of higher education. Over 38 percent of freshman admits come from families where neither parent has a 4-year degree, 39.4 percent come from low income families, and one out of five admitted students is enrolled in a high school that is in the lower 40 percent of California public high schools, as ranked by the Academic Performance Index (API) score.

Applicants offered admission have exceptionally strong academic records. UC admits complete on average 23 year-long college preparatory courses, earn a high school grade point average of 3.84, and on average score 26 on the ACT and 1794 on the SAT. Nearly 23 percent of admitted students have been ranked by the University as in the top 4 percent of their graduating senior year class.

A complete set of tables is available at www.ucop.edu/news/factsheets/fall2010adm.html.

Information on UC’s new freshman admissions policy, effective for the class entering the University in 2012, is now available at: http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/admissions/undergrad_adm/paths_to_adm/freshman2012/
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Note: Data reported excludes missing values.

A-G Courses\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean A-G Courses</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High School GPA\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean HSGPA</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC)\(^3\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of CA Admits</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Course data reported in semester units.

\(^2\)High school GPA based on 10th and 11th grades, with a maximum of 8 honors bonus points. Based on self-reported information from the application.

\(^3\)Represents the proportion of ELC applicants in the total admit pool.
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ACT Composite

Mean Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAT Reasoning: Critical Reading + Mathematics

Mean Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>1199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAT Reasoning: Writing

Mean Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAT Reasoning Total: Critical Reading + Mathematics + Writing

Mean Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>1777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>1794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4As reported by ACT or self-reported by applicant. Does not include writing subscore or combined English/writing score used for UC eligibility.
Neither parent has a 4-year college degree.

Applicants reporting household income (weighted) at or below the 30th percentile based on the March 2009 supplement of the Current Population Survey (CPS) for Californians aged 30-65, or $46,000 or less in Fall 2008 and $45,000 or less in Fall 2009 and Fall 2010.
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Underrepresented Ethnic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rural California Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urban California Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suburban California Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\)Includes domestic African American, American Indian, Chicano, and Latino.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>% w/o Oth &amp; Decl State</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>% w/o Oth &amp; Decl State</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>% w/o Oth &amp; Decl State</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>% w/o Oth &amp; Decl State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2,366</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Latino</td>
<td>12,449</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>13,008</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>13,699</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total of Underrepresented Student Groups</strong></td>
<td>15,098</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>15,780</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>16,635</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>20,210</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>20,451</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>20,806</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>20,651</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>19,415</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>18,003</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total of Other Student Groups Above</strong></td>
<td>41,075</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>40,007</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>38,958</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total of Underrepresented and Other Student Groups</td>
<td>56,173</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>55,787</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>55,593</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to State</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3,184</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>60,104</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>58,631</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>58,777</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>