

**LAUC-I Senate Committee/Council Reports
2008-2009 Academic Senate Reports**

Cathy Palmer	cpalmer@uci.edu	Educational Policy (CEP)
--------------	--	--

1. Office/Committee Name: Council on Educational Policy (CEP)
<http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CEP/index.asp>

2. Membership and Terms: Elected to a two year term ending 2010

3. Key Accomplishments

2008-09 Council on Education Policy Activity Summary

- CEP reviews and approves the Consent Calendar each month. The Consent calendar consists of all changes to undergraduate academic program requirements, course requirements, approval for fulfillment of general education requirements, etc.
- Reviewed and approved Learning Outcomes for the General Education requirement categories I-IX. Approved language for use in the General Catalog to incorporate learning outcomes into GE requirement descriptions.
- Provide oversight of the CEP Review of Lower- and Upper-Division Writing. The review will include questions about how to better integrate information literacy instruction into the lower and upper-division writing courses.
- Met with EVC Gottfredson for discussion of academic freedom issues related to faculty.
- Responded to the report of the external Academic Program Review of the School of Biological Sciences.
- Prepare for Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Accreditation review of UC Irvine.
- Review, approve, and comment on School-wide reviews. This year the following schools participated in the mid-review cycle reporting:
 - School of Engineering

General Education Learning Outcomes University of California, Irvine (approved 1/8/09)
Practical abilities (Categories I, V, and VI) -- what students should be able to do
Category 1: Writing
Because of the importance of visual, oral, electronic, and written communication in every academic discipline, in the professions, and in public life, the University is committed to developing a variety of communication abilities in students at all levels and in all areas. The Writing Requirement expresses this broad commitment, but the concern for and attention to rhetorically effective, accurate writing is expected in all courses. The Writing Requirement consists of two courses at the lower-division level beyond the UC Entry-Level Writing Requirement and one upper-division course in a discipline.
After completing this general education requirement, successful students should be able to do the

following:

Lower-division writing:

- demonstrate rhetorically effective, accurate writing and communication ability across a variety of contexts, purposes, audiences, and media using appropriate stance, genre, style, and organization
- develop flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proof-reading texts
- develop abilities in critical reading across a variety of genres and media
- demonstrate information literacy skills by locating, evaluating and integrating information gathered from multiple sources into a research project**

Upper-division writing:

- demonstrate rhetorically effective, discipline-specific writing and communication for appropriate academic, professional, and public audiences
- demonstrate, at an advanced level of competence, use of discipline-specific research methods, genres, modes of development, and formal conventions
- demonstrate advanced information literacy skills by locating, evaluating and integrating information gathered from multiple sources into discipline-specific writing**

Responsibilities:

The Council on Educational Policy (CEP) considers all matters related to academic policy, makes recommendations regarding curricula and programs and other educational matters, including general campus requirements and grading systems, issues recommendations on the establishment, substantive modifications or withdrawal of academic programs, and reviews and reports on the character of the educational programs on the Irvine campus. The Council is authorized to act for the Division in approving new or amended degree requirements, including new or amended minors, specializations, concentrations or emphasis, recommended to the Division by the several Faculties.

The Council acts as a screening committee for the breadth options. It reviews courses submitted by the academic units, and approves or disapproves them according to the guidelines listed in Appendix V of the Divisional Senate Manual. The Council reviews all breadth option courses at regular intervals and take appropriate action.

The Council advises on all educational policy matters pertaining to programs outside of the core campus undergraduate programs, including, but not limited to, matters relating to international education and continuing, part time, and summer session education. In matters pertaining to the establishment, substantive modification or withdrawal of programs that may impact core campus academic programs, the Council issues recommendations with the Graduate Council, as applicable.

The CEP maintains liaisons with the University Committees on Educational Policy, Preparatory Education, and UC Education Abroad.

Submitted by: Cathy Palmer

Date: June 30, 2009

Sheila Smyth	smyths@uci.edu	Council on Educational Policy – Subcommittee on Courses
--------------	--	---

1. Office/Committee Name: UCI Senate Subcommittee on Courses
<http://www.senate.uci.edu/Committees/SCOC/index.asp>

2. Membership and Terms: Elected to a two year term ending 2009.

3. Standing Charge: (from LAUC-I Bylaws) LAUC-I has an ex-officio member on the Subcommittee on Courses.

This Senate subcommittee meets once a month and approves new courses and changes in courses. An agenda packet is sent to each subcommittee member which contains a standardized form for each course requesting action, and additional documentation as necessary. The completed agenda packet with the action of the subcommittee is placed in the Bibliographers Approval Area in the Science Library. Bibs are encouraged to look at courses in their subject areas to determine if there are collection development needs.

4. Supplemental Charges/Tasks for 2008-2009 Year: none

5. Key Accomplishments (coordinate with charges above):

This subcommittee approves new courses and changes in courses. An agenda packet is sent to each subcommittee member which contains a standardized form for each course requesting action, and additional documentation as necessary. I attended the subcommittee meetings as a non-voting member and recorded the action on each course. Before putting the agenda packets in the Approval Area, I sent an e-mail to all LAUC-I members (which includes bibs) to call to their attention any significant new courses being offered and any other important information regarding changes to existing courses. This year the committee continues to look at the value/educational impact of offering online courses in the Summer quarters for regular students not in Extension (of course we don't want to have too many). Also the committee is investigating why some departments are increasing the number of graduate students teaching upper division classes (Is it for cost saving reasons in these bad economic times? We want to provide students with the best education as possible.)

Submitted by: Sheila Smyth

Date: June 30, 2009

Carole McEwan	cmcewan@uci.edu	Faculty Welfare (CFW)
---------------	--	---------------------------------------

1. Office/Committee Name: Council on Faculty Welfare
<http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CFW/index.asp>

2. Membership and Terms: Two Year Term ending 2010

3. Standing Charge: (from LAUC-I Bylaws)

(1) Consider and report in timely fashion to the Divisional Senate Assembly of the Irvine Division and confer with and advise the Chancellor and other officers of the campus administration on matters concerned with the welfare and diversity of the faculty. This is inclusive of issues pertaining to faculty salaries, benefits, insurance, retirement, housing, parking, University community amenities, conditions of employment, and the status of women and minority affairs campuswide. The Council shall initiate studies or make recommendations with respect to any conditions within or without the University which in the judgment of the Council may affect the academic freedom of the University Community. Procedures for treating issues with a major welfare component relevant to this Council that are also the concern of other committees will be developed by the chairs of the committees involved, in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Senate, Irvine Division.

(2) Maintain liaison with the University Committee on Faculty Welfare, the University Committee on Academic Freedom, and the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity.

4. Supplemental Charges/Tasks for 2008-2009 Year: None.

5. Key Accomplishments & Activities (coordinate with charges above): The Council on Faculty Welfare meets monthly to deal with local UCI faculty concerns and issues referred to them from the UCI Academic Senate and the UC Senate relevant to faculty welfare. UCI is unique in that this committee encompasses all of the concerns of faculty welfare, academic freedom, affirmative action, equal opportunity, diversity, Emeriti and benefits in general. Other UC campuses have separate committees for many of the above. The wide ranging interests make this committee particularly engrossing.

The dominant local concern this year was the finalization of Campus-Wide Analysis of Median Faculty Salaries by Gender and Ethnicity at UCI for 1998-2008 report submitted to the UCI Senate Chair in May 2009. This study examined whether there were campus-wide disparities in faculty salaries based on gender or ethnicity, using the data on individual faculty salaries for eleven years 1998 – 2008. The purpose of the analysis was to quantify and compare aggregate summary measures of salary (specifically the median salary) by gender and ethnicity rather than to pinpoint particular individuals with relatively high or low salaries. As a non-voting representative, I was not allowed to attend

the Executive Sessions discussing this final report and the committee's recommendations, although I attended the discussions leading up to them.

Other local issues discussed were the creating of a new Academic Senate Ethics Committee, UCI Childbearing and childrearing policies and practices, a possible University Hills shuttle and working with UCR and UCLA to compare career and pay equity for faculty.

Naturally the major UCI and UC Academic Senate concern was about the financial crises and the committee provided input about impending furloughs and salary reductions. It was noted that during the financial crises of the early 1990's, the Academic Senate committees were not asked for their input.

Submitted by: Carole McEwan

Date: July 9, 2009

Lorelei Tanji	ltanji@uci.edu	Graduate Council (GC)
----------------------	--	---------------------------------------

1. Office/Committee Name: Graduate Council

<http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/GC/index.asp>

2. Membership and Terms: Three year term ending 2009

3. Standing Charge: (from LAUC-I Bylaws)

4. Supplemental Charges/Tasks for 2008-2009 Year:

Academic Senate council concerned with graduate academic programs and graduate student support.

5. Key Accomplishments (coordinate with charges above):

Much of the pending work of GC is confidential so my report is brief or deliberately vague:

1) Academic Program Reviews for 2008-2009

Joint reviews are organized by the Academic Program Review Subcommittee (APRS) made of selected members from Grad Council and CEP (Council on Educational Policy):

College of Health Sciences and School of Medicine
Department of Education

Formal follow-ups from previous reviews/status reports: Samueli School of Engineering

Also some miscellaneous post-review issues related to past reviews.

2) Miscellaneous issues

- Graduate Division has created a center for graduate and professional students & post-docs to receive information, network, and workshop training. It had its opening during Spring Quarter 2009. It is called the Graduate Resource Center: <http://www.grad.uci.edu/center/>
- Jeffra Bussmann is currently the library liaison to the GRC.
- Submission of electronic theses & dissertations (ETDs) has been implemented as a pilot with submissions of dissertations beginning Spring Q 2009 and master's theses beginning in Fall 2009; Kevin Ruminson & Steve MacLeod with assistance from Andrew Jones successfully collaborated with Graduate Division staff in the implementation of this pilot.

3) Other subcommittees of Graduate Council:

- Graduate Program Structure and Student Mentoring Subcommittee: Ensuring that graduate programs provide the structural support and mentoring to enhance the graduate student experience.
- International Exchange Subcommittee: Interested in enhancing international exchange programs (particularly for graduate students)
- Graduate Student Support Subcommittee: Drafting a proposal for more funding support to graduate students.
- Graduate Student Housing : Trying to balance equitable access to housing and length of stay
- Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs: How to facilitate the development and oversight of interdisciplinary programs. An example is ACE Arts Computation & Engineering which might soon be called CPAST Critical Practices in Art, Science, and Technology

4) Evaluating numerous miscellaneous proposals for changes/modifications/proposals re academic graduate programs (new & existing)

I have distributed some of the relevant paperwork to subject librarians as appropriate to help inform them about plans for new academic programs or significant changes in existing programs, and have asked them to treat the paperwork as confidential.

Half-Year Report submitted on February 9, 2009

1) Academic Program Reviews for 2008-2009

Joint reviews are organized by the Academic Program Review Subcommittee (APRS) made of selected members from Grad Council and CEP (Council on Educational Policy):

College of Health Sciences and School of Medicine
Dept of Education

Formal followups from previous reviews/status reports:
Samueli School of Engineering

Also some miscellaneous post-review issues related to past reviews.

2) Miscellaneous issues

Grad Council has commented on most of these items under review:

<http://www.senate.uci.edu/ItemsUnderReview/ItemsUnderReview.asp>

- [Proposal for a PhD. in Public Health](#)
- [Proposal for a School of Nursing](#)
- [Proposal for a School of Education](#)
- [Proposal for an ORU: Spinal Cord Injury/Neural Regeneration](#)
- [Proposal for an ORU: Health Policy Research Institute \(HPR\)](#)

- Graduate Division has created a center for graduate students & post-docs to receive information and workshop training.
- Submission of electronic theses & dissertations (ETDs) are in the process of being implemented as a pilot with the launch of electronic submission targeted for Spring Q 2009; Kevin Ruminson & Steve MacLeod are working collaboratively with Graduate Division staff.
- Discussion of Doc2A students who are not eligible for fellowships.

Doctoral 2A - UC designation for doctoral students who are more than nine quarters post-Advancement. The University receives a budget based on student headcount. Students in this category are not included in these headcounts; thus, the campus does not receive funding from OP for Doctoral 2A students.

3) Other subcommittees of Graduate Council:

- Graduate Program Structure and Student Mentoring Subcommittee: Ensuring that graduate programs provide the structural support and mentoring to enhance the graduate student experience.
- International Exchange Subcommittee: Interested in enhancing international exchange programs (particularly for graduate students)
- Graduate Student Support Subcommittee: Drafting a proposal for more funding support to graduate students.
- Graduate Student Housing : Trying to balance equitable access to housing and length of stay

-Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs: How to facilitate the development and oversight of interdisciplinary programs. An example is ACE Arts Computation & Engineering which might soon be called CFAST Critical Practices in Art, Science, and Technology

4) Evaluating numerous miscellaneous proposals for changes/modifications/proposals re academic graduate programs (new & existing)

I have distributed some of the relevant paperwork to subject librarians as appropriate to help inform them about plans for new academic programs or significant changes in existing programs, and have asked them to treat the paperwork as confidential.

Submitted by: Lorelei Tanji

Date: June 30, 2009

Julia Gelfand	<u>jgelfand@uci.edu</u>	<u>Planning and Budget (CPB)</u>
----------------------	---	--

1. Office/Committee Name: Planning and Budget (CPB)

<http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CPB/index.asp>

2. Membership and Terms: Three year term ending 2009

3. Key Accomplishments (coordinate with charges above):

The Council of Planning and Budget (CPB) advises the Chancellor, Provost, and campus administrative units on matters of planning, budget and resource allocations on both short and long-term bases as well as initiating studies in planning and better matters. It meets bi-weekly for two hours during the academic year (this summer it is meeting through the summer due to pending serious business) and there is a fair amount of reading and preparation for each meeting. In addition, during the Winter & Spring Quarters, APG meets, usually monthly, especially when academic hiring is underway and the Provost seeks input about directions of how to implement the strategic directions for different hiring alternatives reflecting Excellence Programs, Partners Programs, Diversity Programs, etc. It maintains a close and active relationship with the systemwide University Committee on Planning & Budget. CPB members also represent the Council at other Administrative and Senate meetings including, Academic Planning Group (APG) led by the Provost and Vice-Chancellor of Academic Planning Mike Clark; Campus Physical & Environmental Committee (CPEC); Design Review Team, Space Planning Team, Budget Work Group, Senate Committee on Graduate Student Housing and Special Senate Committee on Diversity. With the state budget forcing such challenging times, CPB is reviewing academic program development very carefully. Like Graduate Council and the Council of Educational Policy, CPB thoroughly reviews all proposals for revisions and new academic launches, with careful attention to the fiscal and spatial implications of the request. This may include changes in units that want to evolve from

programs to departments to school status, directions of University Advancement and funding sources, and related issues. Members gain strong insights into the planning, operations and long term financial health of a campus enterprise. Deliberations of CPB are confidential until they are disseminated into the business agendas of the Academic Senate Executive Committee and shared with the Senate Assembly, becoming substance of those Minutes.

Mid-year report submitted 2/09/09

1. The work of this Council is confidential. Its charge is to confer with and advise the Chancellor, the EVC/Provost and campus administrative units on matters of planning, budget, and resource allocations on both short and long term bases. The Council also initiates studies in planning and budget matters and, if necessary to accomplish such studies, authorizes establishment of ad hoc committees to carry out investigations and make reports. CPB maintains an active relationship with the systemwide University Committee on Planning & Budget, which in these days of economic constraints is increasingly important. Council members also represent the Council at other Administrative & Senate meetings such as CPEC, Design Review Team, Space Planning Team, Budget Work Group, Senate Committee on Diversity.

Every second year, CPB reviews requests for new faculty positions. This year was to have been such a year but due to the economic downturn the APG is engaged in more long term planning and monitoring campus initiatives systemwide.

2. Implications for anything that has budget needs – buildings & construction, space planning, new and expanding academic programs, endowed chairs and issues related to University Advancement, HR, faculty welfare, or anything where there are potentially new or ongoing costs or planning associated with proposal.

Submitted by: Julia Gelfand

Date: June 30, 2009

Carol Ann Hughes	hughes@uci.edu	<u>Research, Computing and Libraries (CORCL)</u>
------------------	--	--

1. Office/Committee Name: Research, Computing and Libraries (CORCL)
<http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CORCL/index.asp>

2. Membership and Terms: Elected to a three year term ending 2009

3. Key Accomplishments

Since the beginning of the fiscal year FY08 there have been 8 CORCL meetings (the ninth meeting, June 2009, was cancelled) of which I have attended 7. At the December meeting, I gave an overview of how Melvyl and ANTPAC link to Google Books, with some discussion of the Google settlement. At both the November and December meetings I gave an update on Libraries space planning progress. This spring there were a couple of conversations about the Google Book proposed settlement from CORCL members and from the representative to UCOLSC (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucolasc/ucolasc.5.1.09.minutes.pdf>) based on concerns about the fairness of the settlement.

The proceedings of CORCL are confidential, so there is no report on other matters.

Submitted by: Carol Ann Hughes

Date: August 3, 2009

Kristine Ferry	<u>kferry@uci.edu</u>	<u>Privilege and Tenure (CPT)</u>
-----------------------	---	---

1. Office/Committee Name: Privilege and Tenure (CPT)
<http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CSE/index.asp>

2. Membership and Terms: Elected to a three year term ending 2010

3. Key Accomplishments

The Committee on Privilege & Tenure met a handful of times as issues arose. We discussed grievance cases and responded to UC-wide calls for input on policies. The committee encouraged my participation and I was expected to give my input as much as the faculty members on the committee.

Mid-year report submitted 2/11/09

Academic Senate Committee on Privilege & Tenure.

It has been a light year so far, but the Chair has indicated some grievances requiring our attention will soon be coming our way.

Submitted by: Kristine Ferry

Date: August 12, 2009

Robert Johnson	<u>robertj@uci.edu</u>	<u>Student Experience (CSE)</u>
-----------------------	---	---

1. Office/Committee Name: Committee on Student Experience
<http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CSE/index.asp>

2. Membership and Terms: Three year term ending 2010

3. Key Accomplishments (coordinate with charges above):

Charge:

The Council shall promote learning, diversity, equal opportunity, and the quality of the student experience, and shall advise the Chancellor and the Division on issues in the areas of teaching, student life and welfare, and intramural and intercollegiate athletics.

Council on Student Experience has the following subcommittees:
Board on Undergraduate Scholarships
Honors
Financial Aids and Campuswide Honors Program Board

Fall 2008

The Council has discussed, voted on, and/or submitted comments on the following:

- Faculty Experiences and Perceptions on Academic Dishonesty
- Academic Integrity
- WASC (accreditation standards)
- Accountability Standards
- CSE is charged with appointing a Grievance Panel
- Request for Permission to Use Official UC Irvine Identification Photos within EEE environment

Academic Integrity has been thoroughly discussed (based on the results of the *Faculty Experiences and Perceptions on Academic Dishonesty* survey), and opinions differ widely between the schools. The UC Accountability Standards (Accountability2 Framework) was discussed at great detail, and members passed on areas of concern to UC.

Spring 2009

The Council has discussed, voted on, and/or submitted comments on the following:

- Financial Aid Proposal Wording
- Accountability2 Framework
- Linking student photos to IDs
- Discuss letter to Senate Chair from Peter Krapp on Faculty opinions on Salary reductions and retirement plan for faculty/staff
- Campus Teaching Evaluation Form
- Demo on Simplicity Software for academic dishonesty reporting
- Formation of CSE subcommittee on diversity

Much time was spent discussing the Campus Teaching Evaluation Form, which was amended to offer clarity for TAs teaching sections of classes. Also receiving attention was software to assist with academic dishonesty reporting, which wouldn't offer access to more people, but it would give the people who currently have access to dishonesty reports a comprehensive view of the student (as opposed to only receiving reports from one department). Time was spent in several meetings discussing the current budget problems, some of the discussion stemming from discussion of the letter from Peter Krapp of the Faculty Senate.

The Chair of the Council on Student Experience has noted that he feels that much of the Council's emphasis is on undergraduate students, rather than graduate students. On several occasions, he initiated discussions about the direction of the council, its role in the university, and whether or not it should continue under a new name (with the word "Undergraduate" added) or indeed continue at all. Discussion would occur, but no consensus was reached.

The Chair of the Council, Andre Putnam, announced he was leaving UCI, and therefore a new chair will be elected by members. As of this writing, no members have offered their names to be considered for the position.

Submitted by: Robert Johnson

Date: August 3, 2009

Cynthia Johnson	<u>cynthiaj@uci.edu</u>	<u>Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools (CUARS)</u>
-----------------	---	--

1. Office/Committee Name: Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools, Council on (CUARS)

<http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CUARS/index.asp>

2. Membership and Terms: Elected to a three year term ending 2009

3. Key Accomplishments

I. Council Operations

John LaRue, George Lueker, and Bruce Berg served as CUARS chairs for Fall, Winter and Spring quarters. The Council met ten times during the year. The meetings were attended by nine elected members, the Acting Director and Associate Director (ex officio) of the Office of Admissions & Relations with Schools (OARS), the Board of Admissions & Relations with Schools (BOARS) Representative, the Librarians' Association of the University of California, Irvine (LAUC-I) Representative, and the Associated Students of University of California, Irvine (ASUCI and AGS) representatives. Acting Director of Admissions & Relations with Schools, Brent Yunek, kept CUARS informed of the activities of the Admissions Office at UCI and solicited feedback on all policy modifications. All three Chairs, Bruce Berg, George Lueker, and John LaRue served as representatives to the Enrollment Council during their quarter long terms. Michael Clark, the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, kept CUARS informed about enrollment activities.

II. Divisional Issues/Policies

A. Senate Review of Furlough Standing Orders of the Regents Amendment and Guidelines (May, 2009)

CUARS was asked to review a proposal of a Standing Order which would allow for the UC President to impose employee furloughs or salary cuts in the case of fiscal emergency or natural disaster. CUARS unanimously disagreed with the proposed measures because the Standing Order does not preclude any potential disaster which means the president would be given too much authority and could mandate emergency salary cuts under any condition so long as it is deemed “emergency.” Further, mandates could be implemented inconsistently and unfairly by affecting selected campuses and units.

B. Non Resident Enrollment at UC (May, 2009)

The Council reviewed and commented on a UC policy to encourage non resident enrollment. Mostly, CUARS members took issue with encouraging the enrollment of this group at UCI because non residents, both international and out of state, are “net payers” who are upper-middle income students who do not potentially contribute to the diversity of traditionally underrepresented minorities in the university. CUARS members were, however, positive about the financial benefits as well as cultural and linguistic diversity non residents would bring to the university.

C. Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation governing Undergraduate Admissions (May, 2009)

CUARS was asked to review mandatory revisions to regulations of the systemwide policy for admissions to be implemented in 2012. CUARS members believe the revisions accurately reflect the new admission’s policy adopted by the Regents but found a few points where wording should be changed, for list see CUARS meeting minutes, May, 2009.

D. CUARS’ comments on increasing the number of transfer students at UCI:

CUARS submitted the following comments to the UCI Senate Chair in light of discussions the council had on putting caps on freshmen enrollment targets:

CUARS members are concerned with the systemwide admissions policy of capping the admission of first-year students without a comparable cap on transfer admissions. CUARS believes that increasing the ratio of transfer students relative to first year students will alter the quality of the student body. Moreover, a relative increase in the number of transfer students may change the composition of classes and alter the structure of departmental curricula (e.g. number of lower division courses relative to the number of upper division courses.) Additionally, transfer students

experience a different college life than 4-year students, which could adversely impact loyalty and alumni donations in the future. In comparison to the 2008-2009 academic year, the number of projected freshman admissions for the Fall of 2009 of freshman dropped by about 700 students and the projected number of transfers increased by about 450. CUARS feels that this trend should not continue and that admission caps be applied equitably to both freshman and transfer students.

III. System-wide Issues/Policies

A. Report on UC Accountability Standards (November, 2008)

CUARS was asked by the Office of the President to review accountability standards related to Admissions at UC. CUARS had comments on the standards as they relate to the sample size and statistical significance of the data sets analyzed. CUARS members were also concerned that demographic criteria of student population characteristics (GPA, SAT, geographic origin of student, first generation, high school API score, ethnicity, gender, income) be assessed using a based on School, department or major. CUARS members also noted that UC's most important product is the students. Thus, in order for an accountability report to be complete, that report should include some measures of post-graduate outcomes according to all of the variables used in the other student indicator comparisons.

B. Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan (January, 2009)

CUARS was asked to review the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan proposed by UC President, Mark Yudof. The plan states that all students whose family incomes are under \$60,000.00 would be eligible for tuition and fee reimbursement. CUARS members agreed that the goal of sending a simple message to California families would be helpful for students and their parents to make decisions about the affordability of UC. CUARS members did have a few reservations about the proposal, mainly that the distribution of financial aid money may be less fair than under the current model. The council was also concerned that fairness of financial aid distribution was being sacrificed to promote a simple message.

C. BOARS issues ((systemwide) Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools)

Entitled To Review (ETR): The Regents voted in favor of the ETR proposal (on freshman eligibility and guarantee to UC) in February, 2009. The regulation allows for a broader range of applicants to be eligible for review. The regulation will be implemented in 2012.

SHARED REVIEW: UC is working on a program that would allow shared review of applications to all UC schools. One of the scores on each

application will be a numerical, machine-read score. The starting place for the machine based score will be the UCLA Read Sheet, which provides a great deal of contextual information about students: how they rank on GPA and test scores among applicants to UC and UCLA and with respect to other students from the same school. Also, information on the high school from which the applicant is applying will be considered as part of the overall context of a student's performance. BOARS voted to ask UCOP to provide the relevant data for this analysis and to create a template into which the data could be downloaded and distributed to campuses.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND EARTH SYSTEMS SCIENCE. The proposal to include Environmental and Earth System Sciences under the "D" category of required courses for freshman applicants will be sent out, against BOARS' recommendation, for systemwide review. Once again, BOARS had another lengthy discussion of the pros and cons of the proposal. Some thought that adding EESS courses to the "D" requirement would lead to improvement of high school courses in this area. Others felt that using the a-g requirements for "social engineering" was inappropriate. It might also be something of a "slippery slope" which would prompt all kinds of pressure groups to lobby for including their courses in the a-g requirements. The new director of the Articulation Office observed that he would need more staff to handle course approvals if EESS courses are included under the "D" requirements. BOARS will produce a pro/con document to be provided to units reviewing the proposal.

IV. Local Issues

A. UCI Admissions: Importance of Achieving Enrollment Targets for AY08-09

The Office of the President did not fund overenrollment of UCI freshman for AY08-09 as UCI had anticipated. Normally because UCI is a growth campus, it receives extra money from the Office of the President (OP) to fund overenrollment, but budget reductions systemwide meant that UCI would have to come up with the funds on its own this year. As a result of this unexpected cost and knowing that future overenrollment would not be financed by OP, it was especially important that UCI meet enrollment targets with the utmost precision for AY09-10. As of June, 2009, the Office of Admissions reported that enrollment targets would in fact be met nearly to the exact number assuming a degree of melt (students who SIR but decide not to come to UCI) would occur over the summer. The enrollment target for Freshman for AY09-10 was cut by 550, for transfers, the enrollment target was up 50.

B. Admissions Models used to capture most diverse and academically prepared students while maintaining enrollment targets in Schools.

A number of Admissions models were presented to CUARS. Finely tuning models should select for students with the highest academic profiles while

also optimizing diversity outcomes. This year the admissions differed from the previous years because (about) 550 fewer freshmen were selected as a result of lower enrollment targets. Admissions Model, Option 8, was selected. No model guarantees outcomes as it is difficult to guess which students will actually enroll once accepted; furthermore, it is difficult for any model to select for the precise number of students based on School. For example, although Option 8 was clearly the superior model, it selected for larger numbers of Bio Students and fewer ICS and Social Ecology students. In the end, it appears that Option 8 worked out well but that fewer ICS students SIREd compared to previous years and too many Business students had enrolled (as of June, 2008).

C. Shared Review with UCLA

Because UCI and UCLA admit about 97% of the same students, and the overwhelming majority of these students come from cohorts A (academically superior cohort of applicants), and H (mostly unqualified cohort of applicants). UCI thought the review process for freshman applications might be handled more efficiently if UCI used UCLA's review scores for some cohorts. CUARS members voted in favor of using UCLA's review score of applications from Cohorts, A, B, and H with the provision that UCI reread applications that were rejected by UCLA in the A and B cohorts. Sharing review with UCLA saves UCI significant labor costs that are equivalent to the expense to employ reviewers (internal or external) to read approximately 10,000 extra applications. An additional advantage to using UCLA to help review applications is that UCI is receiving more and more applications each year while at the same time less money to employ staff and external readers to review the increasing number of applications.

D. Enrollment Outcomes for AY2009-10

4119 freshman have SIREd for AY09-10 compared to 4818 last year. The Office of Admissions met enrollment targets this year by carefully managing admissions using yield data from previous years and by tweaking this formula with expectations that more students would yield this year due to the economic recession. Admissions also used appeals to admit interested students and waitlisted 330 students, who were eventually admitted. Some points of interest:

- Freshman Statement of Intent (SIR) data shows that Freshman SIRs for ICS have decreased dramatically this year perhaps due to slightly fewer applicants but this cannot fully explain such a drastic drop.
- The School of Business is overenrolled for the upcoming year. SIRs—94 SIREd last year compared to 266 this year. Some of this is due to higher enrollment targets; some of it is unexpected increase in Business SIRs.

- There was no identified target for non residents this year. 92 non resident freshmen have SIREd this year compared to 110 last year.
- 86 African Americans have SIREd this year compared to 96 last year and though the number/percentage difference (2.0% last year vs. 2.1% this year) is almost imperceptible, the Office of Admissions had hoped to significantly increase the admittance rate for this group compared to last year. African Americans SIREd at a higher rate than other groups but their admittance levels were down due to GPAs and SAT scores.
- Chinese/Chinese American and East Indian/Pakistani SIR rates were up, from 18.1% to 19.2% for Chinese/Chinese American and from 3.8% to 6.1% for East Indian Pakistani. Caucasian rates of SIR are down from 21.7% to 19.9%. Latino, Chicano, and Native American rates of SIR are about the same compared to last year, 3.9%, 11.5%, and .4% respectively.
- The average GPA for incoming freshman is 4.0 (weighted). This is the highest GPA UCI has seen for incoming freshmen.

E. Summer Session Enrollment

There was discussion about whether Summer Session should continue to have a fee cap whereby students can take an unlimited number of credits but only have to pay for eight. One benefit to raising the capacity to ten units is financial. Students receiving financial aid, however, can take up to 12 units so they will not be negatively impacted by the cap. In the end, the enrollment council decided to eliminate the fee cap and students were required to pay per unit without discounts for those registering for more than eight units. As of June, 2009 enrollment for summer was down by 15% (likely as a result of the discontinuation of the cap) and some students expressed concern about the rising cost of summer session. Students were told that more financial aid was also available to complement summer fee increases.

F. Office of Admissions Used External Readers

For AY08-09, to save money and to expedite the review process, OARS employed/trained 150 external readers of applications.

V. Continuing Issues

A. Review of the impact on UCI regulations in light of the UC Freshman Eligibility policy change.

CUARS members must ensure that Admissions regulations are in compliance with systemwide regulations that have been modified to correspond to the UC Freshman Eligibility policy change to take place in 2012.

B. Shared Review

CUARS will continue with Shared Review with UCLA while assessing its outcome.

C. Enrollment Issues

CUARS will continue to review and assess enrollment projects in light of the current budget situation. UCI has been ordered by the UC Office of the President not to increase freshman/transfer enrollment for AY2010-2011.

D. Use of Subject SAT in Admissions into some Schools/Departments.

The Director of Admissions, Sue Wilbur, is concerned that because the SAT subject test will no longer be required as of 2012, some departments or Schools may still wish to continue using subject SAT scores to select students. Wilbur wants to make sure that students are not penalized by departments or Schools for not taking the subject SAT. Wilbur asked that UC admission councils provide feedback on this issue.

VI. Guests

- Michael Clark, Vice Provost for Academic Planning
- Gary Matkin, Dean, Continuing Education

Members

Craig Martens, Chair, Physical Sciences

Stephen Tucker, Arts

Margerethe Wiersema, Business

Rahul Warrior, Biological Sciences

John LaRue, Engineering

George Lueker, ICS

Andromache Karanika, Humanities

Gregory Weiss, Physical Sciences

Susan Charles, Social Ecology

Bruce Berg, Social Sciences

Ex Officio:

Brent Yunek, Acting Director, OARS

James Given, BOARS Representative

Consultants:

Joe Maestas, Director of Student Academic Advancement Services, DUE

Representatives

Cynthia Johnson, Librarians' Association University of California, Irvine

Andrea Johnson, Associated Students University of California, Irvine

Eric Ruzek, Associated Graduated Students

Analyst: Michelle AuCoin

Submitted by: Cynthia Johnson

Date: August 24, 2009

Judy Bube	jlube@uci.edu	<u>Board on Undergraduate Scholarship, Honors, and Financial Aid (BUSHFA)</u>
------------------	--	---

1. Office/Committee Name: Board on Undergraduate Scholarship, Honors, and Financial Aid (BUSHFA)

<http://www.senate.uci.edu/Committees/BUSHFA/index.asp>

2. Membership and Terms: Elected to a two year term ending 2009

3. Key Accomplishments

The Board on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Financial Aid reviewed the UC President’s proposal, the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan, to modify the UC’s financial aid program and submitted comments to the UC Academic Senate. The Board reviewed and made comments on the revised Standards for Accountability with consideration on the affordability for undergraduates. BUSHFA voted on how to treat non-residents in the admissions process.

BUSHFA reviewed feedback from the Schools on the Latin Honors process. It approved the preliminary cutoff of Latin Honors for the Schools. BUSHFA approved a change in the bylaws two years ago which required Schools to consider the last quarter GPA/Achievement in the calculation of Latin Honors. Before that, the last quarter did not count. Schools are required to give Latin Honors to no more than 12% of the graduating class. BUSHFA will monitor the process as schools adjust to the new bylaws.

The BUSHFA approved the plans and participated in the Honors Experience at UC Irvine held on Saturday, March 7, 2009. The 2009 Honors Experience was well attended.

Changes were made to the event due to cutbacks in financial aid that reduced the number of offers made for Regents Scholarships from 2800 to 800. Because of the state budget crisis, the level of funding to the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships was cut by one million dollars. The result of the funding cut was that one-third of Regents Freshman scholarship funding was cut, so that only 800 of the intended 2800 offers to Regents Scholarships for freshmen were offered. Of the 800 offers, BUSHFA hopes that there will be at least 50 acceptances. The Regents Scholarships for transfer students were not affected by the budget. Financial Aid offices at other UC campuses are also impacted by budget.

BUSHFA reviewed the dollar amount for the Regents Scholarship. It is \$2500.00 honorarium (base, for those without financial need) in addition to a \$1000.00 summer stipend with up to \$8,900.00 (which includes the 2500.00 honorarium) for those with financial need (plus the \$1,000.00 stipend). BUSHFA felt it is important that Financial Aid funds be targeted appropriately for Regents Scholarships. One idea is that Financial Aid need not offer Regents solely on merit, but the means of students will be taken into consideration. A need component may be added to attract low income students. Last year, \$6600.00 was the average Regents award for students with need. The level of need is 35% for Regents Freshman and over 50% for Regents transfers. Financial Aid applications for all freshmen are up 29% this year due to the economy.

Mid-year report on 2/12/09

The Board on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Financial Aid reviewed the UC President's proposal, the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan, to modify the UC's financial aid program and submitted comments to the UC Academic Senate. The Board reviewed and made comments on the revised Standards for Accountability with consideration on the affordability for undergraduates. It also reviewed feedback from the Schools on the Latin Honors process. The Board discussed the plans for the Honors Experience at UC Irvine scheduled for Saturday, March 7, 2009, including suggested changes for the program from previous years.

Submitted by: Judy Bube

Date: 07/01/2009