

II. MINUTES (Action)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE REGULAR MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE *DRAFT Minutes of May 12, 2004*

I. Roll Call of Members

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday May 12, 2004, at Covell Commons in Sunset Village at UC Los Angeles. Academic Senate Chair Lawrence Pitts presided. Chair Pitts called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m., and Academic Senate Director Maria Bertero-Barceló called the roll of members of the Assembly. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. Minutes

Action: The minutes of the meeting of March 10, 2004 were approved as written.

III. Announcements by the President, Robert C. Dynes

Provost M.R.C. Greenwood and Senior Vice President Bruce Darling joined President Dynes at the table. President Dynes' discussion topics and comments were previously distributed by email, which had allowed for review prior to the meeting.

The Budget and Interactions in Sacramento. UC is currently in a very difficult position—at the crossroads of mounting budget cuts and the pressures of increasing enrollment. Efforts to inform the Governor and state legislators about UC's role in the state and importance to California's overall economic health continue to be fundamental to the progress of budget negotiations. The recent higher education "compact" represents a personal commitment from the Governor to UC. The agreement would raise fees and cut budgets at California universities in the short term, in exchange for the promise of funding increases in the five subsequent years. The compact eliminates what would have been an additional 3% cut this year and restores the university to normal fiscal levels by 2010-2011—including funding to keep faculty and staff salaries competitive. There is also a new commitment to maintain "effective" Academic Preparation (Outreach) programs and a provision to allow UC to retain fee increases and to return 1/3 of those increases in financial aid, which is an improvement over the state's current mandate of 20% return to aid of the most recent fee increases. The compact also maintains funding for UC Merced. At each period of budget crisis throughout California's history, such compacts have helped both the state and the University. There is much reason for optimism now, because Sacramento's view has shifted. State leaders understand they can't afford not to invest in the University of California.

Advocacy Campaign. President Dynes and UCOP have launched an advocacy campaign on behalf of UC. All members of the university community—faculty, students, alumni and friends—are being asked to spread the message about UC's unique and critical role in the economic health of California. A campaign website has been set up at <http://www.UCforCalifornia.org>. As part of the effort, alumni have embarked on a massive email and letter writing campaign to state legislators. The President recalled that one state legislator was particularly impressed by the fact that UC generates, on average,

three inventions per day, and was later heard to repeat that fact to colleagues. Advocacy efforts must be long term and sustained to be effective in today's uncertain political and budget climate.

National Labs. The Academic Senate is conducting a survey about whether or not UC should enter competitive bids to renew management of the Department of Energy laboratories. It is important that the faculty inform themselves about the issues and weigh in.

Searches. The search continues for a Lawrence-Berkeley Laboratory Director, UCB Chancellor, and UCSC Chancellor.

Questions, Answers and Comments

Q: Can you provide clarity about professional school fee increases in the compact?

A: I believe that the professional schools will be independent to set fees, and that their fee revenues will be returned to the schools.

Q: Will there be a VERIP?

A: No. But individual campuses are free to negotiate individual post-retirement teaching circumstances.

Q: What is UC's position on the CSU Mission Statement, which suggests a role for research in applied areas?

A: There is a research role for CSU, and the Master Plan provides for state support of research at CSU, but we believe there is also a clear agreement that CSU will not offer doctoral degrees.

Q: What are the non-state funding sources for Outreach being discussed in newspaper reports?

A. The non-state sources come from private funding as well as funds from out of state tuition. There is still a misperception that Outreach is a student recruitment tool rather than college preparatory education. However, we are continuing efforts to educate legislators about the purpose and importance of Outreach programs like MESA, and we believe this is having an impact on thinking. UC has committed \$12 million to Outreach for 04-05 in the hopes that state funding will be restored. In addition, the Chancellors are committed to maintaining local outreach programs despite central funding issues.

C: The term "Outreach" carries too much baggage, and BOARS discourages its use. A better phrase is "Academic Enrichment" or "Academic Preparation," because these programs are truly academic in nature.

C: The increase in undergraduate fees—10% for each of the next 3 years—and graduate student fees—20 percent rather than 40 percent this year—is still below comparison institutions.

C: This budget is about as good as we can get at this time, although the devil is in the details. The Faculty can support the accountability measures in the Compact.

C: President Dynes remarked that UC prepares about 5% of K-12 teachers in California, and 25% of math and science teachers. Math and science education is an area where UC can make a direct impact on the future of the state. Provost Greenwood added that too many students intending to major in math and science leave without a degree in those

areas. The University can step up and assume a leadership role in efforts to recapture some of these students, to keep them in the field and interest them in science and math teaching. It is vital for the economic recovery and long-term health of the state.

C: Clarification is needed about the new time and effort reporting system related to projects using federal funds.

Q: Which of California's educational segments is hurt most in the compact; where does the money for UC come from; and where will it be distributed?

A: None of the three groups gets hurt more. There is no zero sum rule. The monies will go back to the campuses to let them determine priorities.

Q: What kind of assurances do we have that the future will actually be promising after the bond money is used up and structural deficits remain?

A: I don't have an obvious answer to that. One answer may have to be tax increases.

IV. Chair's Announcements

Chair Pitts introduced incoming UC Provost M.R.C. Greenwood, who was attending her first Academic Assembly meeting. He introduced some of the main topics on the agenda, including the forthcoming CPEC study and BOARS' preliminary report; senate balloting on UC's management of DOE laboratories; and a Senate resolution related to the state and university budget. A Scholarly Communications Task Force will meet over the summer to study ways to address the rising costs of scholarly journals and new models for UC faculty to maintain access as editors, reviewers, and authors. A flow sheet has been developed to allow Council members to more easily track their actions as well as their interactions with the administration on various topics.

V. Consent Calendar

Action: Assembly approved the Consent Calendar items (as listed under "Special Orders," Item V of the published agenda):

- A. Santa Cruz, D.M.A. in Music Composition – Approval of New Degree
- B. Davis, M.A.S. in Maternal and Child Nutrition – Approval of New Degree

VI. Reports of Special Committees – Report of the Senate's Task Force on UC Merced

Task Force Chair Peter Berck updated the Assembly on the progress of the UC Merced campus enterprise. The UC Merced Task Force has acted as UCM's Senate as well as the department in faculty hires since its inception in 1998, but the Task Force is in the process of shifting from consisting of faculty from the other campuses to primarily UCM faculty as more of the latter are hired. Faculty recruitment and hiring is on schedule. Approximately 30 faculty will have been hired by July 1, and 60 will be on board by opening day in 2005. As more faculty are hired—there are approximately 23 currently on board—the Task Force will continue to transfer more Senate authority to UCM's committee structure. On a day-to-day basis, UCM is operating similarly to other divisions—through its committee structure. Divisional Council meets every other week, and several other committees—including Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council and a Committee on Planning and Resource Allocation—meet regularly. It is expected that

UCM will officially be granted divisional status when the 60th FTE is hired in fall 2005. Moreover, UCM faculty have been attending meetings of system-wide committees as guests, which has provided the UCM faculty with valuable introductions to shared governance and senate issues. Construction of the science building at Merced is behind schedule, and may not be useable for teaching until after opening term of fall 2005.

The Task Force is seeking the Assembly's endorsement of its plan for Merced's transition to divisional status. Academic Council approved a resolution related to this in March. The plan is for non-UCM Task Force members who are directly involved in the Merced committees to remain active over the next year. Other non-UCM members would retire and be replaced with UCM faculty, appointed by Council. Second, the Task Force would be authorized to delegate authority to its committees in a structure similar to that of a regular division.

One member asked if UC or the Task Force had followed a blueprint in developing Merced. The Task Force has studied the circumstances and lessons related to the development of other UC divisions. Recent senate divisions—UCSC, UCSD, and UCI—started with about 60 members, which has been considered a precedent. Consideration is currently being given to drafting a specific framework that would address potential future campus start-ups in the Senate bylaws.

Action: The following resolution was placed before members of the Assembly:

Resolved: "The UCM Task Force should increasingly be composed of members assigned to UCM. The Task Force is authorized to delegate authority to its committees (who are not all Task Force members) in manners similar to the delegations of existing Divisions to their committees."

Assembly gave unanimous consent to the resolution.

VI. Reports of Standing Committees

A. Academic Council, Lawrence Pitts, Chair

1. Nomination and Election of the UCOC Vice Chair for 2004-2005

Professor Gershon Shafir has been nominated by UCOC to serve as that committee's Vice Chair for 2004-05.

Action: The Assembly unanimously elected Professor Shafir as 2004-2005 UCOC Vice Chair.

2. Ratification of the 2004 Oliver Johnson Awardees

The biennial Oliver Johnson Award honors outstanding service to the Academic Senate, and is chosen by Academic Council on the advice of Divisional Committees on Committees and UCOC. This year, Academic Council selected two awardees—Aimee Dorr, Dean of Education at UCLA, and UCB Professor Calvin Moore. The Assembly was asked to ratify the choices.

One Assembly member praised Calvin Moore's tireless efforts on behalf of the Senate, noting in particular his work on admissions at UCB and his contributions to BOARS's

work on eligibility. Another member mentioned Aimee Dorr's previous roles as Council Chair, UCLA Division Chair, and CCGA Chair, and spoke of her contributions to the Compendium and the National Labs, and her work with the CSUs in teacher development.

Action: The Assembly unanimously ratified Aimee Dorr and Calvin Moore as the 2004-2005 recipients of the Oliver Johnson Award.

3. Academic Council's Resolution on the Budget

Academic Council approved this resolution in April, and has moved it to the Assembly for approval. The "Whereas" sections came out of extensive committee and Council deliberations about which fundamental University principles are being jeopardized by the budget crisis and why those areas need protection. Faculty are asked in the resolution to participate directly in a sustained advocacy campaign on behalf of the university by educating colleagues, friends, community leaders and lawmakers about UC's impact in California, particularly on the state's economy and health care. (Focus groups have determined that Californians view some of UC's primary importance to be in the areas of business and health care.)

One member suggested that the effort should maintain a central organizational oversight. Chair Pitts remarked that it would be most effective for Assembly members to focus individual action at the local level, but that best practices related to this could be a future Council discussion item. He encouraged those present to consider a process by which they could identify alumni, friends, contributors, etc., who have influence or who would be willing to lend their support to help educate Californians about UC's unique and critical role in the state. For instance, it might be useful as a motivator to pull together anecdotes about specific UC programs benefiting the community that have disappeared or are in jeopardy due to funding.

One Assembly member remarked that the campaign against Proposition 54 was successful in part because of a successful public education effort about the dangers of restricting health care research. It would be useful to revisit the public and private community partnerships developed in that campaign to strengthen the current effort. Another member suggested an additional key audience would be parents of current undergraduates.

Action: The Assembly voted unanimously in support of the Resolution.

4. Ad Hoc Committee on Bylaw Revisions, George Blumenthal, Chair

The current review of the system-wide Senate bylaws continues an effort begun last year, when the Assembly passed changes pertaining to committee membership and charges. System-wide committees and divisions have reviewed the additional changes being proposed this year. UCR&J has also reviewed the proposed amendments and found them to be consonant with the code of the Academic Senate.

New amendments and bylaws include:

- Clarification of the role of Secretary in the divisions.
- Clarification of procedures related to student petitioning of the Assembly
- Extending to Senate bodies the right to hold meetings and vote electronically, either at the divisional or system-wide level. (This bylaw also allows campuses to explicitly exclude the possibility of electronic meetings or votes).

- Establishment of a standard term of reference for time periods. At the system-wide level, “calendar days” would be the sole term of reference for the unit measuring time.
- Provisions allowing divisions greater autonomy to conduct business differently.
- Addition of two appendices: a glossary of terms, and a legislative record.
- Addition of a clause giving Council the right to act in lieu of the Assembly if an issue has appeared on an Assembly agenda and was not acted upon for lack of a quorum.
- Addition of a provision allowing system-wide Senate agencies that appoint committee members to remove a committee member by a 2/3 vote. (The member in question must be given the chance to respond).

Action: A motion was introduced to approve the proposed bylaw changes listed on pages 41-70 of the May 12 Call, which would take effect immediately, with the following two exceptions: First, Bylaw 120.D.6, allowing the Assembly to choose its own rules of order, would take effect immediately following the next regular meeting of the Academic Assembly (October 13, 2004); and second, the amendment to Bylaw 50.A and the elimination of Bylaw 235 would become effective only when the UCB division chair certifies that the UCB Division has established a Berkeley Faculty for the School of Public Health.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. Report from the President’s Council on the National Laboratories

The President’s Council is a body of advisors on the Department of Energy Laboratories. Among its ranks are a number of faculty including the Chair and Vice Chair of the Senate and the Chair of UCORP. It is the body to which the five lab review panels—covering the areas of science and technology, national security, environmental health and safety, lab security, and projects—report. The panels bring an outside view to the lab directors. The LBNL bid will be submitted shortly, with the award coming in January. The LANL contract will be awarded in July 2005. The draft RFP will be out for public comment in the summer or early Fall, with a final draft available after the November election.

6. Academic Special Committee on the National Labs (ASCONL)

ASCONL is conducting a poll of UC faculty on the issue of whether or not UC should compete to retain management of the Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos National Labs. Voting will close Friday, May 14. The results of the vote will be analyzed and encapsulated in a form that can be presented to the Regents. A second follow-up poll is possible next fall, depending on changing circumstances. A student poll is also being conducted by Student Services to gauge undergraduate opinion, but does not capture graduate student opinion due to technical reasons. Finally, UC lecturers are conducting a poll, and have consulted with ASCONL about their ballot.

B. Report from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)

Chair Pitts summarized the terms and conditions for UC eligibility, admissions, selection and enrollment. Most UC eligible students fall under *The Eligibility Index*—a statewide standard set by BOARS that combines quantitative factors—a student’s GPA and average test scores, bounded by respective minimums, which have been shown to correlate with

UC success. A student may also be eligible through very high examination scores alone. Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) accepts the top 4% of students from all accredited public high schools. The Dual Admissions Program was a 2002 program that offered admission to the 4-12.5% block above the ELC group after those students completed lower division work at a community college, but the DAP is ending due to very low response. However, the Guaranteed Transfer Option, which is partly modeled on the DAP, and works similarly to UC's referral pool, has been instated in response to budget cuts limiting the enrollment of eligible freshmen. Approximately 8,000 students were offered this option this year. It is hoped that GTO will be used only this next academic year. Admission by Exception (perhaps should be re-named "Admission by Exceptional Performance") uses non-traditional criteria to offer pathways to underrepresented groups and/or athletes and artists. Finally, Admission by Transfer admits Community College students who complete certain coursework and achieve a minimum GPA.

Barbara Sawrey described *BOARS' Eligibility Criteria and Eligibility Principles*. BOARS has been working on revisions to UC's eligibility criteria in preparation for a report from CPEC, the first in seven years, which will be released at the end of May. The report is expected to show that UC is drawing more than the top 12.5% of California high school graduates mandated by the Master Plan. Since the exact level is unknown and may be as high as 16%, BOARS has drafted several contingencies, and will be ready to adjust its recommendations based on the specific outcome of the study. BOARS will bring its ultimate recommendation to Council and to a special June meeting of the Academic Assembly for endorsement.

BOARS' Eligibility Principles. UC is unique among institutions both in having separate concepts of eligibility and selection, and in making transparent the precise eligibility factors that guarantee admittance to one of UC's campuses. This works both as a filter and as a motivator for student success. BOARS has developed a set of principles to guide its detailed recommendations about UC eligibility, which it hopes will continue to be foundational in future Senate deliberations. Council approved these principles in March. In summary, BOARS believes primary importance should be given to a student's Subject a-g GPA (greater importance than standardized tests); eligibility criteria should remain stable and be easily understandable to the public, so students know whether they are eligible to apply; high achieving students from every high school in the state should have access to UC, including those who attend schools with fewer or lesser resources; eligibility paths should remain open to students from non-traditional educational backgrounds—e.g. home schools, alternative schools, and charter schools; new and more efficient ways of testing students should be explored; and finally, eligibility standards should be monitored and adjusted on a regular basis to ensure ongoing compliance with UC admissions goals.

Q: Where do underrepresented groups fall into the curve?

A: Most underrepresented groups—including certain ethnicities, low income, urban or rural students, first generation, etc., are admitted under the index. Adjusting the Eligibility Index at the margins of eligibility is one of the main ways UC can alter the number of students admitted. Along with its final recommendation, BOARS will present

data showing how changes to various aspects of the index and returning to 12.5% will affect specific groups.

Q: ELC students can get away with bad SAT scores because they are eligible just by taking the test. Egalitarian principles should not drive down standards.

A: These students are getting high scores on the SATs and performing well overall. In any case, the point is to urge them to complete their eligibility requirements. Because the vast majority of ELC students are eligible according to statewide standards anyway, BOARS is considering raising the ELC cut-off above 4%. I would be happy to receive comments about this.

Q: Does UC have a vision or a set of principles in view of changing student demographics?

A: The vision is that the make-up of UC will match the demographics of graduating High School classes, but we are a long way from that.

Q: Why is the SAT retained since standardized tests are poor predictors, culturally biased and expensive?

A: There would be more grade inflation if there were no second, verifying look at the achievements of students in high schools. There are many unused fee waivers for the SAT every year. Finally, the tests are changing for the better to include writing, due in part to pressure from UC.

C: Parents and students need better tools with which to accurately calculate GPAs.

C: In June BOARS should present a rationale for special consideration of student athletes.

Action: The Assembly unanimously approved BOARS' proposed eligibility principles.

BOARS will submit its full recommendation on eligibility standards to Council in June. For Assembly's recommendation to be forwarded to the Regents in time for their July meeting, a special Assembly meeting will need to be held June 30, and be centered primarily on this one discussion/action item. Chair Pitts polled Assembly members about whether the telephone format of the March meeting had worked well enough to be used again on June 30.

Action: The Assembly agreed that the teleconference format would be acceptable for the Special Meeting on June 30.

VIII. Petitions of Students (none)

IX. University and Faculty Welfare Update, Ross Starr, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare

Phased retirement plan. The Council of Vice Chancellors and UCFW have made significant progress on a retirement recall plan/phased retirement plan agreement.

Educational Fee Waiver. UCFW and Academic Council have recommended to President Dynes the phased introduction of educational fee waivers for dependents of UC faculty, which is a benefit available to faculty at many of UC's competing institutions. The

President responded positively to the idea, but has indicated that current budget conditions make the fee waiver impossible at the present time.

The UCFW Task Force on Investment and Retirement concentrates on retirement plans. The Task Force has been working with UCOP to implement an enhanced tax shelter, commonly known as a 457B plan, for the current tax year, which will allow faculty to double their tax-deferred income contributions. The issue will come before the Regents this month. UCFW does not expect the resumption of contributions to the UC Retirement Plan in the near term, but expects greater demand on the system in the future and is monitoring changes closely.

The UCFW Health Care Task Force consults regularly with UCOP staff in formulating medical plans and premium structures for UC faculty. The salary-based tiered premium structure introduced this year went through this Task Force. UCFW will be reviewing the 2005 structure as it becomes available.

X. Unfinished Business (none)

XI. New Business (none)

Meeting adjourned, 3:00 p.m.
Attest: Lawrence Pitts
Academic Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by
Michael LaBriola
Senate Analyst

Distributions:

1. President Dynes' List of Discussion Topics for the Meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate, Wednesday, May 12, 2004
2. Summary of Terms and Conditions for UC Eligibility, Admissions, Selection and Enrollment.

Appendix A

2003-2004 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of May 12, 2004

<p>President of the University: Robert C. Dynes</p> <p>Academic Council Members: Lawrence Pitts, Chair George Blumenthal, Vice Chair Ronald Gronsky, Chair, UCB Bruce Madewell, Chair, UCD Abel Klein, Chair, UCI Cliff Brunk, Chair, UCLA Irwin Sherman, Chair, UCR Jan Talbot, Chair, UCSD Daniel Bikle (alt. for Leonard Zegans, Chair, UCSF) Walter Yuen, Chair, UCSB Alison Galloway, Chair, UCSC Barbara Sawrey, Chair, BOARS Kent Erickson, Chair, CCGA Ramon Gutierrez, Chair, UCAP Lisa Alvarez-Cohen, Chair, UCEP Ross Starr, Chair, UCFW Janis Ingham, Chair, UCORP Michael Parrish, Chair, UCPB</p> <p>Berkeley (6) Ronald Amundson (alt. for Richard Abrams) Michael Hanemann (absent) Dorit Hochbaum David Hollinger (absent) Donald Mastronarde (absent) Raymond Wolfinger</p> <p>Davis (5) William Casey Peter Hays (absent) Gyongy Laky (absent) Brian Morrissey (alt. for John Rutledge) Philip Yager</p> <p>Irvine (4) Linda Georgianna Ross Conner Calvin McLaughlin Thomas Poulos (absent)</p>	<p>Los Angeles (9) Kathryn Atchison Charles Berst Yoram Cohen (absent) Harold Fetterman Vickie Mays Jose Moya Owen Smith Jane Valentine Jaime Villablanca</p> <p>Riverside (2) Mary Gauvain Linda Tomko</p> <p>San Diego (4) Stuart Brody (absent) Leroy Dorman (alt. for Gerald Doppelt) Barney Rickett (absent) Nicholas Spitzer (absent)</p> <p>San Francisco (3) Philip Darney Francisco Ramos-Gomez Peter Wright</p> <p>Santa Barbara (3) Ann Jensen Adams Susan Koshy Nelson Lichtenstein (absent)</p> <p>Santa Cruz (2) Faye Crosby Theodore Holman</p> <p>Secretary/Parliamentarian Peter Berck</p>
--	--

I. Roll Call of Members

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met in a special session on Wednesday June 30, 2004 by teleconference. Academic Senate Chair Lawrence Pitts presided. Chair Pitts called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m., and Academic Senate Director Maria Bertero-Barceló called the roll of members of the Assembly. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. Announcements by the President, Robert C. Dynes

Provost M.R.C. Greenwood and Senior Vice President Bruce Darling also joined President Dynes on the call. President Dynes thanked the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and BOARS Chair Barbara Sawrey for their leadership and thoughtful work in developing recommended adjustments to UC freshman eligibility requirements being put before the Assembly. The President expressed his support for the proposal. He noted in particular its emphasis on academic achievement and how successfully it avoids negative impacts on any one group. He added that it will continue to be important for UC to emphasize and adhere to the California Master Plan for Education.

III. Chair's Announcements, Lawrence Pitts

Chair Pitts reviewed the order of business and procedures for discussion. A recent report from the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) indicated that UC is accepting as eligible 14.4% of California public high school graduates. In an effort to return to the 12.5% eligibility pool outlined in the Master Plan, BOARS has proposed several adjustments to UC's eligibility criteria. The Assembly is asked to review and approve BOARS' proposal, which was endorsed by Academic Council the previous week. Each division will be given the opportunity to speak, comment or propose amendments. Any Senate member may speak, but only Assembly members can vote. Assembly's recommendation will be forwarded to the Regents in time for their July meeting

IV. Report from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)

Meeting UC's eligibility criteria guarantees in-state high school graduates entry to a UC campus. The last CPEC study was conducted in 1996 and indicated that UC was making eligible those students from the top 11.1% of the public high schools. This prompted BOARS to make changes allowing a higher percentage of graduates to become eligible, including the institution of Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC). Now with a 14.4% pool, BOARS has had to study ways to tighten eligibility. They have projected how many students and which groups would be affected by different combinations of changes to various eligibility criteria, including minimum GPA achieved in A-G courses, scores on standardized tests, the ELC program, and the eligibility index.

First, BOARS is proposing procedural adjustments to the way eligibility is calculated, which are projected to reduce the pool to 13%. A-G grades in a statewide context will be calculated in a way that is consistent with ELC. This includes elimination of the “best of pattern” practice, which has allowed campuses to consider GPA from only the best grades from the minimum required number of A-G courses. Additionally, ELC students will now be considered and counted as only conditionally eligible, contingent on their fulfillment of testing and other eligibility requirements. These procedural adjustments can be made immediately.

Second, BOARS is proposing that the minimum high school GPA for UC eligibility in both the statewide context and ELC be raised from 2.8 to 3.1. GPA is the best predictor of student success at UC and is also something the student can control. Raising the minimum GPA also raises academic excellence at the university without disproportionately impacting any one group, although tighter standards will hurt students in all groups to some extent. The new GPA requirements would affect students arriving at UC in fall 2007, giving sophomores an appropriate two years warning.

Discussion

Several Assembly members commended BOARS for its hard work in finding an effective, compassionate and scholarly solution to a difficult problem. However, a couple of members expressed concern about recommendation #3 ([See Final Assembly Report](#)) to raise the minimum GPA to 3.1. One member called it premature to impose such a standard without knowing first what impact the procedural adjustments might have. Lowering the number of eligible students even more may give the university bad publicity, and moreover, it is ethically wrong to institute standards that hurt minority students at a time when the minority population of California is growing.

Professor Sawrey talked about the fine line UC has to walk between Proposition 209, constraining the university’s ability to look specifically at race or ethnicity, and federal guidelines against discrimination. She said BOARS has been very sensitive to the impact of its recommendations on diversity and disadvantaged students. There is still the possibility of admission to the university “by exception,” and BOARS supports efforts by campuses to maximize to 6% their enrollment within this category. The admissions study group convened by the President last year also made a strong recommendation that campuses fully utilize admission by exception. Finally, the 3.1 GPA probably is a maximum level. The proposal allows for flexibility after data gauging the effects of the procedural adjustments and the new SAT/ACT tests becomes known. CPEC’s study was the best under the circumstances and UC should adhere to the data. There is a risk to the University of not abiding by the Master Plan. For instance, CSU may continue to seek the authority to grant the doctoral degree. Finally, the Senate has been charged with bringing a plan to the Regents for how to return to 12.5%, and must do so. This is the best possible solution.

Action: An amendment was introduced to strike recommendation #3 from the proposal. First, on the basis that the statistical uncertainties were too great and there needed to be more research and assurance that the change would produce the intended effect without overcorrecting; and second, that raising GPA would be an unwise move politically. Therefore, UC should wait until after implementation of procedural adjustments #1 and

#2 to move forward with recommendation #3. The motion was seconded, but was later withdrawn after the member received clarification to his satisfaction that #3 will not go into effect until 2007, giving ample notice to students, and that there is sufficient flexibility present in the proposal to allow for adjustments as solid data become available about the impact of #1, #2 and the new SAT and ACT tests.

Action: An amendment was introduced to strike the numeral “5.” from recommendation #5, so that the recommendation reads as part of the body of text, not as a separate recommendation for the Regents to approve. The recommendation is not in the Regents’ purview. The motion passed unanimously.

Action: A motion was introduced and seconded for Assembly to endorse the BOARS report. Assembly members voted to approve BOARS’ proposed eligibility criteria, with one abstention.

Chair Pitts thanked Assembly members for their hard work. He noted that the teleconference can be an effective medium for discussion of substantial topics, and in the future may allow the Assembly to meet more often.

Meeting adjourned, 10:50 a.m.
Attest: Lawrence Pitts
Academic Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by
Michael LaBriola
Senate Analyst

Appendix A

2003-2004 Assembly Attendance Record, Special Meeting of June 30, 2004

<p>President of the University: Robert C. Dynes</p> <p>Academic Council Members: Lawrence Pitts, Chair George Blumenthal, Vice Chair Ronald Gronsky, Chair, UCB Bruce Madewell, Chair, UCD Abel Klein, Chair, UCI Cliff Brunk, Chair, UCLA Irwin Sherman, Chair, UCR Jan Talbot, Chair, UCSD Leonard Zegans, Chair, UCSF (absent) Walter Yuen, Chair, UCSB Alison Galloway, Chair, UCSC Barbara Sawrey, Chair, BOARS Quentin Williams, Vice Chair CCGA (alt. for Kent Erickson, Chair, CCGA) Ramon Gutierrez, Chair, UCAP Lisa Alvarez-Cohen, Chair, UCEP (absent) Ross Starr, Chair, UCFW Janis Ingham, Chair, UCORP Michael Parrish, Chair, UCPB (absent)</p> <p>Berkeley (6) Richard Abrams (absent) Michael Hanemann (absent) Dorit Hochbaum (absent) David Hollinger (absent) Donald Mastronarde Raymond Wolfinger</p> <p>Davis (5) William Casey Peter Hays Gyongy Laky Brian Morrissey Philip Yager</p> <p>Irvine (4) Linda Georgianna (absent) Ross Conner (absent) Calvin McLaughlin Thomas Poulos (absent)</p>	<p>Los Angeles (9) Kathryn Atchison Charles Berst Richard Weiss (alt. for Yoram Cohen) Harold Fetterman Vickie Mays (absent) Jose Moya Owen Smith Jane Valentine (absent) Jaime Villablanca</p> <p>Riverside (2) Mary Gauvain Joseph Childers (alt. for Linda Tomko)</p> <p>San Diego (4) LeRoy Dorman (alt. for Stuart Brody) Gerald Doppelt (absent) Barney Rickett (absent) Nicholas Spitzer</p> <p>San Francisco (3) Philip Darney (absent) Francisco Ramos-Gomez Peter Wright</p> <p>Santa Barbara (3) Ann Jensen Adams Susan Koshy (absent) Nelson Lichtenstein (absent)</p> <p>Santa Cruz (2) Tony Fink (alt. for Faye Crosby) Theodore Holman</p> <p>Secretary/Parliamentarian Peter Berck</p>
---	---