January 17, 2012

Robert Anderson
Chair, Academic Council

Re: Response to the Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 610 (Residency)

Dear Bob,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and opine upon the proposed changes to Senate Regulation (SR) 610. Upon receipt of the proposal, I distributed to all Academic Senate committees and specifically requested responses from the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS), the Graduate Council (GC) and Undergraduate Council (UgC). All others were welcome to opine at their discretion. The Executive Board, which speaks for the division on such matters, reviewed all responses (see attached), and offers the following comments.

Although we appreciate the effort to clarify ambiguity in the language of the SR, our position is that the added phrase “irrespective of physical location or mode of delivery” actually alters the meaning of the regulation, allowing for unanticipated modes of delivery, many of which could well find strong resistance from faculty (for example, courses by correspondence). In our view, the added sentence “This regulation does not address the California Residency Requirement or questions of non-resident supplemental tuition” sufficiently addresses the concerns of UCR&J and is therefore the only amendment we endorse.

Moreover, faculty members pointed out that the proposed changes to SR 610 should be viewed in light of the recent expansion of UCEP’s authority to designate courses for systemwide credit. In reality, campuses already must automatically accept each other’s courses for unit and grade credit. SR 610 in its traditional form, however, has worked to ensure the integrity and autonomy of each campus’ programs and identities. In a generous reading it would appear that UCEP is proposing that there be a minimal threshold (six units) for establishing residence. However, once a system of systemwide courses is established faculty fear that campuses will be obligated to accept them for the purposes of graduation credits. Thus, the revised version of 610 makes it possible for a student to receive a UC degree while taking a minimal number of courses at the home campus should they avail themselves of systemwide online offerings.

Thank you again for the opportunity to review and opine on this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Andrew Leuchter
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Cc: Martha Kendall Winnacker, J.D., Academic Senate Executive Director
    Jaime R. Balboa, Ph.D., UCLA Academic Senate CAO
November 30, 2011

Professor Andy Leuchter  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulation 610 (Residency)

Dear Professor Leuchter,

The UCLA Council on Planning and Budget discussed UCEP's proposal to clarify the regulation that governs terms of enrollment in an approved UC program. While noting that this issue might need to be revisited in the future should on-line courses become prevalent throughout the University, under current circumstances we find ourselves in unanimous agreement with the UCEP suggestion that this sense of "residency" be defined in terms of enrollment, "irrespective of physical location or mode of delivery."

Regards,

David Lopez,
Chair, Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Linda Sarna, Vice Chair, Academic Senate  
Ann Karagozian, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
January 5, 2012

To: Andrew Leuchter, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Tyrone Howard, Chair  
Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools

Re: Senate Item for Review: SR610 Revision Proposal

On behalf of the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools, I am writing with regard to the proposed revisions to SR 610. The Committee discussed the proposal at its October 21 and December 2, 2011 meetings.

Members expressed deep concerns about the proposed change regarding mode of delivery and were hesitant about overall endorsement of the proposed changes to SR 610. Members felt that any change concerning mode of delivery would require rethinking entirely what the change would entail for coherence of curriculum and the University’s mission as a research university and should be thus handled with far greater nuance. The membership was unanimous in opposing the proposed revision to the first clause of SR 610, which reads, “Residence in any regular term is validated by a program of courses or other exercises approved by the Faculty of a student’s college or school, irrespective of physical location or mode of delivery.” Furthermore, it strongly recommends that no consideration for implementation of this particular change be given until a system-wide consultative process to deliberate fundamental questions about the nature and ramifications of the proposed change is conducted.

With regard to the other proposed change concerning the term “residence,” the membership was in support, contingent upon modification of the proposed language to either of the following:

- “This regulation does not address the UC Residence for Tuition Purposes requirement or questions on non-resident supplemental tuition.”
- “This regulation does not address the California Residency Requirement, the UC Residence for Tuition Purposes requirement, or questions of non-resident supplemental tuition.”

The Committee thanks you for the opportunity to opine on the proposal and welcomes an invitation to review future drafts that respond to the concerns voiced in this letter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me (x74824; thoward@gseis.ucla.edu) or Academic Senate Principal Policy Analyst Jisoo Kim (x51194; jkim@senate.ucla.edu).

cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Jisoo Kim, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate  
Dorothy Ayer, Executive Assistant to the Senate Leadership, Academic Senate
To: Andrew Leuchter, Chair, Academic Senate  
From: Joseph Nagy, Chair, Graduate Council  
Date: November 9, 2011  
Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulation 610 (Residency)

At its meeting on November 4, 2011, the Graduate Council reviewed your request for comments on the proposed amendments to Senate Regulation 610 – Residency. Members noted the proposed amendments were aimed at reducing ambiguities in the existing language and felt that the proposed amendments would indeed offer better clarification with respect to a student’s fulfillment of residency requirements for a degree, especially as it relates to physical location (EAP, UCDC and other approved off-site programs). However, members also noted the ongoing discussions, at both the divisional and system-wide levels, about remote and online instruction and the seeming lack of a resolution or unified approach to addressing, let alone embracing, it. Given this fact the membership as a whole felt that it was premature to offer its endorsement of the proposed amendments.

Members acknowledge that much work is underway to explore and evaluate online instruction as a supplement to classroom instruction, but also felt that they were not in a position to offer a definitive statement on the proposed amendments until the UC has a clear directive concerning its role in offering distance learning opportunities to matriculated students. Until this larger question is addressed, Council members are resistant to endorsing (or opposing) such a proposal.

If you have any questions or concerns about this response, please feel free to contact me via the Graduate Council’s analyst, Kyle Cunningham, at 310-825-1162.

cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Kyle Cunningham, Sr. Policy Analyst, Graduate Council  
Dorothy Ayer, Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
November 9, 2011

To: Professor Andrew Leuchter, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Professor Richard L. Weiss, Chair  
Undergraduate Council  

In Re: Undergraduate Council Response to SR 610 Revision Proposal

On behalf of the Undergraduate Council, I would like to extend the Council’s appreciation for seeking our input and thank you for the opportunity to review and opine on the proposed revisions to SR 610, which the Council discussed at its October 28, 2011 meeting.

Given that Senate Regulation 610 concerns “residence” requirements as opposed to the State’s “residency” requirements and that these two terms are legally distinct and are not interchangeable, the proposed language, inserted as “This regulation does not address the California Residency Requirement or questions of non-resident supplemental tuition,” should be modified to either of the following:

- “This regulation does not address the UC Residence for Tuition Purposes requirement or questions on non-resident supplemental tuition.”
- “This regulation does not address the California Residency Requirement, the UC Residence for Tuition Purposes requirement, or questions of non-resident supplemental tuition.”

Concerning the other revision which reads, “irrespective of physical location or mode of delivery,” the membership’s discussion drew attention to an issue of whether UC instruction will be geared toward distance learning, diminishing traditional in-class instruction.

The membership endorsed the proposal contingent upon the suggested amendment by a vote of 11 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions, which reflects some reservations with regard to mode of delivery.

The Council remains interested in following how these concerns may be addressed and would welcome an invitation to review future drafts. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me (x53621; weiss@chem.ucla.edu) or Academic Senate Principal Policy Analyst Jisoo Kim (x51194; jkim@senate.ucla.edu).

cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Jisoo Kim, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate  
Dorothy Ayer, Executive Assistant to the Senate Leadership, Academic Senate
November 9, 2011

Andrew Leuchter, Chair, Academic Senate

Dear Andrew,

Below are the responses from the Faculty Executive Committee of the School of Theater, Film and Television for the five review items we have recently received.

**Item #1 - Review of New APM 668, Negotiated Salary Program**

After extensive dialog the committee opposes the implementation of the proposed “Negotiated Salary Program”. The committee expressed the following concerns:

1) That the NSP policy/program weakens the central administration responsibility to provide fair and appropriate salary for its entire faculty.
2) That the NSP policy/program has the potential to create large disparities between “marketable” and “non-marketable” disciplines.
3) That the NSP policy/program would generate additional burdens on academic departments because of the required one/two year commitment stipulation.
4) Confusion about the mechanism by which Chairs would engage in “NSP negotiations” and approve “NSP proposals”.
5) Confusion about the potential use of “Professional Fees” for NSP.

**Motion:** We applaud and appreciate the President’s and Chancellors’ efforts to increase salaries for faculty across the board. However, we do not endorse this proposal to increase compensation through resources that the faculty themselves are required to earn or secure for the school.

The motion passed. The vote was unanimous.

**Item #2 – Review of New APM 670, Health Sciences Compensation Program**

The faculty found the proposed APM discipline-specific and decided to abstain from responding.

**Motion:** To abstain from responding.

The motion passed unanimously.
Item #3 – Analysis of UC Pay Equity by Sex and Among Men, Ethnicity 2009-2010

The committee reviewed the data and conclusions of the study conducted by Professor Pauline Yahr.

**Motion:** To encourage the university to continue to understand the dynamics according to ethnicity and gender and to take actions to bring fair and equal levels of pay for its entire faculty.

The motion passed unanimously

Item #4 – Revision by UCEP to Senate Regulation 610 addressing “Residency”

The committee reviewed the proposed policy clarification and new policy language.

**Motion:** To endorse the policy revisions as written.

The motion passed unanimously

Item #5 – BOARS Policy on Transfer Admissions

The committee had an extensive dialog regarding the proposed policy. Concerns were expressed about the potential student pool limiting factor of the proposal. The committee also felt that the proposal does not generally apply to the fields of study in our School. Yet, generally it was seen as a positive step for the University.

**Motion:** To endorse the proposed BOARS policy as a mechanism to more effectively bridge the transfer process and to facilitate graduation in the appropriate time.

The motion passed unanimously

Sincerely,

Fabian Wagmister

*Associate Professor, Department of Film, Television and Digital Media*

*FEC Chair, School of Theater, Film and Television*
Dear Jaime,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments in relation to the proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 610 (residency). After consultation with my colleagues at Anderson, we had one comment in particular to bring forward:

“One thing to consider is the situation whereby a state supported student is not studying on campus, but enrolled in courses, during a quarter. Someplace in the university’s policy documents there is a statement about charging these students less fees since they are not using campus resources. (I would have someone check the Registrar’s site for this policy statement.) Incidentally, this policy was probably written eons ago ... probably before technology has become so important in the learning process. I would assume a student studying on or off-campus uses the same critical university resources remotely; i.e. university email, university databases, remote library access, etc. There may be reason to update this policy statement, otherwise the university will need to reduce fees charged to students.”

Best regards,

Eduardo Schwartz
Chair, FEC
UCLA Anderson
December 19, 2011

To: Andrew Leuchter, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Michael Meranze, Chair
       UCLA College Faculty Executive Committee

Re: College FEC response to the proposed revision of Senate Regulation 610 (Academic Residence)

Thank you on behalf of the College Faculty Executive Committee for the opportunity to review and
opine on the proposal to revise Senate Regulation 610 (Academic Residence). We discussed the
proposal at our November 18, 2011 meeting and on December 12, 2011, a formal vote to endorse
the comments of this letter was conducted electronically (11 approve, 1 oppose, 0 abstain). In sum,
the FEC membership wishes to express strong opposition to the proposed revision of SR 610.
We concluded that the proposal seriously threatens the integrity of degree programs and bypasses
the divisional course approval process. The proposal thereby would effectively disenfranchise
faculty oversight of graduate and undergraduate curricula.

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) is proposing revisions to SR 610 so that
campuses, departments, and programs will be obligated to accept any amount of academic credit
for online courses taught at other UC campuses or from some yet-to-be-determined systemwide
course list. This move seriously undermines degree programs, particularly, if campuses and
departments are divested from determining transferability of credit and course equivalencies. At
present, SR 610 helps maintain the integrity of degree programs by limiting students’ ability to take
courses that are not explicitly connected to the home campus and its faculty. If the proposed
revisions go into effect, and students are able to take an unsupervised portion of their courses
online from another UC campus or a systemwide course list, the FEC believes campuses will lose
the ability to ensure their students are the product of their campuses’ educational efforts and that
degrees will cease to represent individual campus standards and educational goals.

Also, the proposed revisions to SR 610 will require that campuses accept by fiat courses from other
UC campuses or from a systemwide course list. This circumvents each division’s ability to review
and approve courses and determine whether a student has a legitimate academic reason to take
courses at another UC campus. Presently, students may request (subject to campus approval)
permission to enroll at other UC campuses through the Simultaneous UC Enrollment Program or
the Intercampus Visitor Program. Both the existing campus-based course approval process and
special cross-campus enrollment programs enable faculty to exercise appropriate and rigorous
supervision of students’ credit load and course taking practices. The proposed revisions
unnecessarily sidestep these structures and may have a detrimental impact on established campus
learning outcome and assessment efforts.
Finally, the FEC membership believes the current language of SR 610 is adequate and can accommodate the introduction of online instruction across the UC system. The proposed revisions far exceed what is necessary to allow the pursuit of responsible online instruction. It will, the membership thinks, create more problems than it will solve. We strongly encourage the Academic Senate to join us in opposing this revision.

We appreciate the consultative process and are available should you wish to discuss the concerns raised in this letter. In the meantime, you are welcome to contact me at meranze@history.ucla.edu with questions. Kyle Stewart McJunkin, Academic Administrator, is also available to assist you and he can be reached at (310) 825-3223 or kmcjunkin@college.ucla.edu.

cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
Lucy Blackmar, Assistant Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education Initiatives
Kathleen Copenhaver, Associate Registrar, Registrar's Office
Kyle Cunningham, Sr. Policy Analyst, Graduate Council
Penny Hein-Unruh, Assistant Vice Provost, Undergraduate Academic Support
Jisoo Kim, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
Joseph Nagy, Chair, Graduate Council
Richard Weiss, Chair, Undergraduate Council