



Robert Horwitz  
Telephone: (510) 987-0887  
Email: robert.horwitz@ucop.edu

Chair of the Assembly of the Academic Senate  
Faculty Representative to the Regents  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200

March 31, 2022

**MICHAEL T. BROWN**  
**PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT**  
**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**Re: Approval of UCSD's Proposal for an Eighth Undergraduate College**

Dear Michael:

In accordance with the *Universitywide Review Processes For Academic Programs, Units, and Research Units* (the "Compendium"), the Academic Council has solicited input from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB), and the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), regarding UC San Diego's proposal to establish an eighth undergraduate college. The Senate's three Compendium Committees are unanimous in support of UCSD's proposal; however, they have also identified several areas of concern that UCSD should take into account before it moves forward. These concerns are discussed the attached supporting committee memos. The Academic Council endorsed the proposal at its March 30, 2022 meeting, and encourages UCSD to consider the committees' concerns.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Robert Horwitz".

Robert Horwitz, Chair  
Academic Council

Cc: Provost Brown  
UCSD Division Chair Javidi  
UCSD Senate Director Hullings  
Chief of Staff Peterson  
IRAP Analyst Procello  
Academic Council  
Executive Director Baxter

Encl.

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)**

Andrea M. Kasko, Chair  
[akasko@ucla.edu](mailto:akasko@ucla.edu)

**ACADEMIC SENATE**

University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200

March 22, 2022

**ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR ROBERT HORWITZ**

Dear Chair Horwitz,

Via email, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) voted to endorse the proposal from UCSD to form an Eighth Undergraduate College, while noting a few questions and concerns detailed below.

An eighth college is needed to enable UCSD to appropriately serve our undergraduate cohort at its present size. While UC San Diego's enrollment has been projected to be 32,000 undergraduate students by 2035, unprecedented yield in the past several years has already exceeded that. The campus had over 33,000 undergraduates as of fall 2021. The establishment of the Eighth College represents an essential feature of the campus' long-range development plan to provide a unique residential and academic experience for its undergraduates.

The UC San Diego undergraduate college system is characterized by unique intellectual themes; the theme selected for the Eighth College was "Engagement and Community." The Engagement and Community theme is at the heart of some of the most difficult challenges that humanity faces; importantly, the Engagement and Community theme also is aligned with campus-wide efforts to combat structural racism and anti-Blackness.

CCGA considered the reviews of UCEP, UCPB, and the external reviewer. It raised the following questions and concerns:

- 1) Staffing: The proposal would be strengthened with greater clarity about the precise number of staff, information about which positions will be moved from other units, how many positions will need to be created as new positions, and an overall assessment of whether these staffing numbers will be sufficient. This is especially critical in the current hiring and employment context.
- 2) Instructional and Project Supervision Staffing: The proposal would be strengthened with additional information about the instructional support. How will instructional provisions be guaranteed, negotiated, and assigned, especially for courses and instructors provided by academic departments? Are these provisions sufficient to cover the curriculum?
- 3) Curriculum: The thematic focus of the proposed 8<sup>th</sup> College is important, but the thematic focus is not fully developed, nor is the proposed curriculum sufficiently developed in terms of specific courses, their focus, and how they will fit together into the larger programming.
- 4) Transfer Students: Although the proposal states that transfer students will be included in the College, the proposed transfer plans are not fully clear, nor is it clear how transfer students will satisfy the full College curriculum or what benefits this curriculum will provide.
- 5) Student Balance: The proposed theme of "Engagement and Community" is likely to appeal to students with a commitment to social justice, many of whom are members of underrepresented

communities. Is there a possibility that a disproportionate number of students from underrepresented communities might become concentrated in the 8<sup>th</sup> College? What might be the effects of such a concentration? It might be useful to include admissions staff in discussions.

6) Revenue: The establishment and stability of 8<sup>th</sup> College requires reallocation of revenue already within UCSD, plus additional support for new programming. The additional support is estimated at just under \$1m/year. What will be the impact of this reallocation of funds away from other units? Relatedly, what are the plans if enrollment is not corrected and capped and the university's fiscal situation is not stabilized? Are there plans for other sources of revenue, including external funding?

7) Enrollment: The need for 8<sup>th</sup> College rests on long-term enrollment plans, with campus plans to enroll 32,000 students by 2035. However, the campus has already exceeded this at 33,000 students. Is there a general plan to reduce enrollment? If so, by how much and when? What if the campus enrollment continues to exceed the current enrollment? How will that additional excess enrollment be accommodated? Will shifting existing staff from other colleges to the 8<sup>th</sup> College really alleviate the stresses on student engagement?

8) Post-Proposal Contingency Plans: What will UCSD do if the proposal for the 8<sup>th</sup> College is not approved?

Despite these concerns, CCGA and the external reviewer felt the proposal was strong and merited approval. Members voted and unanimously agreed (with one abstention) to endorse the proposal with the understanding that UCSD would take these concerns into account.

The Lead Reviewer's report is attached for your review. Please let me know if I can answer any questions for you regarding this proposal or the committee's vote.

Sincerely,



Andrea M. Kasko  
Chair, CCGA

cc: Susan Cochran, Academic Council Vice Chair  
CCGA Members  
Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director  
Michael LaBriola, Academic Senate Assistant Director  
Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst  
James Antony, UCSD Graduate Dean  
Lori Hullings, UCSD Senate Executive Director  
Ashley Hill, UCSD Senate Associate Director

March 17, 2022

Dear Chair Kasko:

UC San Diego has submitted a proposal to establish an 8<sup>th</sup> Residential College, with the theme “Engagement and Community.” The stated purpose of this new college is to alleviate the strain on UCSD’s other colleges. With a projected enrollment of 32,000 undergraduate students by 2035, the eight colleges would each serve approximately 4,000 students. It is important to note, however, that UCSD is already in excess of its 2035 enrollment target with a current undergraduate enrollment of 33,000 students.

The curriculum for the proposed 8<sup>th</sup> College will focus on the theme of “Engagement and Community,” with an emphasis on critical issues such as anti-racism, environmental justice, health inequities, sustainability, and community engagement initiatives. The 8<sup>th</sup> College will provide a general education framework: students will take 8 Alternatives courses that are chosen from academic departments and provide breadth and depth across the arts, humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences, plus a quantitative reasoning course; plus 4 college-specific Engagement courses that focus on the college them. Two of these Engagement courses will satisfy the intensive writing general education requirements, and one of the courses will entail a community-based interdisciplinary research project, although students may be able to satisfy the research project requirement with a course in their academic major.

The 8th College will be established both by the reallocation of current staff in the other colleges and the redistribution of funds already in the campus budget, and by the creation of new positions and approximately \$1m in extra funding. Instruction will be provided by Senate faculty, especially for the Alternatives courses, Unit-18 lecturers, Teaching Assistants, and community members. The Engagement and Community Program will be overseen by a staff that includes a Faculty Director, 2 Associate Directors, and 3 Staff Coordinators/Advisors. The College will also include a Provost and a Faculty Advisory Committee. The College will be physically located in the Theater District Living and Learning Neighborhood Project, which will be renovated for residential housing, instructional space, community space, and retail space. The plan is for 2,000 students to have housing in the new college, as part of an overall campus plan to house 50% of its undergraduates in campus housing (2,000 students per college).

The proposal has undergone a modified review process. Because the proposal was based on the template for a 7<sup>th</sup> College, UC Provost Michael Brown granted a request to waive the pre-proposal stage. The formal proposal was first submitted to the UC San Diego Divisional Academic Senate in May 2020. After the UCSD Divisional Senate provided feedback, the proposal workgroup responded to the feedback, and submitted a revised proposal. The UC SD Divisional Senate approved the revised proposal in June 2021.

The revised proposal received two reports from within the University of California: one from the Chair of the Council of Provosts at UC Santa Cruz, and one from the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education at UC Riverside. The proposal also received one external review,

from the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Tennessee. The proposal was also received by UCEP, UCPB, and CCGA.

The feedback from reviewers was consistent, both in terms of their enthusiasm for this proposal and in terms of their feedback and requests for additional information. Collectively, their concerns addressed the following issues: the adequacy of the proposed staffing levels; clarity about the nature and impact of the redistribution of staff from other colleges to the 8<sup>th</sup> College; clarity about the actual costs and revenue needed, especially with the redistribution of existing resources; clarification of the theme; sufficient level of faculty and departmental commitment; adequacy of the proposed instructional capacity; and access for transfer students.

The report by the external reviewer identified many of these same issues, while also raising new concerns. First, the reviewer observed that implementing such an ambitious project by Fall 2023 requires a significant amount of social infrastructure (staff, relationships with community members, buy-in from various stakeholders and prospective participants, messaging to students, etc.), and they noted that the proposal lacked sufficient detail about the resources that were already available and the resources that will need to be secured.

Second, the external reviewer commented that although the curricular focus addresses critical issues, the proposal does not fully describe how this curriculum will be met in practical terms beyond the number and topic of courses. For instance, the reviewer observed that the College's thematic focus might more easily lend itself to certain types of disciplinary approaches, but might exclude students from disciplines less easily compatible with community-based research, such as lab-based programs. The reviewer asked whether the College's curriculum will be flexible enough to accommodate multiple disciplines, and what types of substitute projects might be approved. The reviewer also asked if the curriculum cannot flexibly accommodate other disciplinary approaches, how this will be communicated to students so that they can make appropriate choices about College affiliation.

Third, the reviewer raised a very basic question about how "community engagement" will be defined and how this will be communicated to prospective students. The reviewer also noted that the proposed curriculum currently places the community-facing programming late in the course sequence (4<sup>th</sup> course) and asked whether this might be missing an opportunity to involve students in community engaged work earlier in the process. The reviewer noted that in their own experience, undergraduate students are often eager to get started with community engagement projects and it might be productive to consider offering these opportunities earlier in the sequence.

Fourth, the reviewer commented that the proposed number of staff (3) might not be sufficient to secure and offer enough community opportunities to appeal to students. The reviewer raised an important point that projects that look ideal in the planning stage may not be compelling in practice, and there needs to be sufficient staff capital to respond to these unexpected changes.

These are important issues that should be considered and addressed in developing the program.

In its discussion of the proposal and these reviews, CCGA considered these and other issues. Specifically, CCGA discussed the following items:

1) Staffing: The precise number of staff needed to support the 8<sup>th</sup> College is unclear. In different places, the proposal states that the program requires 6 staff positions (1 Faculty Director, 2 Associate Directors, 3 Staff Coordinators/Advisors), 8 positions (including various deans and directors), and ultimately 29 FTE to support the program fully. The proposal would be strengthened with greater clarity about the precise number of staff, information about which positions will be moved from other units, how many positions will need to be created as new positions, and an overall assessment of whether these staffing numbers will be sufficient. Will the 8<sup>th</sup> College also need additional staff to cover such areas as the Writing Program, transfer students, and diversity, equity, and inclusion?

2) Instructional and Project Supervision Staffing: The College's curriculum requires instructors, both within the College and with appointments in academic departments, who will provide courses. Instructors will be drawn from Senate faculty, Unit-18 Lecturers, and TAs, as well as community members who might be recruited to supervise engagement projects. It is unclear what the precise number of instructional support staff will be and the balance across these different instructional groups. The proposal also relies on an assumption that the university can and will provide support to individual departments that will in turn offer courses and TAs to support the College's curriculum.

The proposal would be strengthened with additional information about the instructional support. How will instructional provisions be guaranteed, negotiated, and assigned, especially for courses and instructors provided by academic departments? Are these provisions sufficient to cover the curriculum?

According to the proposal, the College will rely on an LPSOE to direct and supervise faculty. How might this affect the research mission of the College and the involvement of graduate students?

The proposal states that the instructors, including TAs and community members, who will supervise projects will require training to supervise those research projects. What will be the nature of this training? Who will provide these trainings?

Lastly, the capstone research projects rely heavily on TAs for instruction, supervision, and interaction with community partners. Yet because of the nature of graduate school, graduate students can not provide stable or consistent instruction. How will stability be ensured? How might CCGA or the local Graduate Council participate in defining appropriate training for graduate students to take on the important role of supervising capstone projects?

3) Curriculum: The thematic focus of the proposed 8<sup>th</sup> College is important, but the thematic focus is not fully developed. Nor is the proposed curriculum sufficiently developed in terms of specific courses, their focus, and how they will fit together into the larger programming.

The proposed curriculum depends heavily on courses provided by academic departments. How will the College ensure adequate and regular course offerings?

4) Although the proposal states that transfer students will be included in the College, the proposed transfer plans are not fully clear. Nor is it clear how transfer students will satisfy the full College curriculum or what benefits this curriculum will provide.

5) The proposed theme of “Engagement and Community” is likely to appeal to students with a commitment to social justice, many of whom are members of underrepresented communities. Is there a possibility that a disproportionate number of URM students might become concentrated in the 8<sup>th</sup> College? What might be the effects of such a concentration? It might be useful to include admissions staff in discussions.

6) Revenue: The establishment and stability of 8<sup>th</sup> College requires reallocation of revenue already within UCSD, plus additional support for new programming. The additional support is estimated at just under \$1m/year. What will be the impact of this reallocation of funds away from other units? Relatedly, what are the plans if enrollment is not corrected and capped and the university’s fiscal situation is not stabilized? Are there plans for other sources of revenue, including external funding?

7) Enrollment: The need for 8<sup>th</sup> College rests on long-term enrollment plans, with campus plans to enroll 32,000 students by 2035. Because current Colleges are enrolled at roughly 5-6,000 students per college, the creation of the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> colleges will reduce student enrollment to 4,000 students per college. However, the campus has already exceeded the 2035 plans and is at 33,000 students. Is there a general plan to reduce enrollment? If so, by how much and when? What if the campus enrollment continues to exceed the current enrollment? How will that additional excess enrollment be accommodated? Will shifting existing staff from other colleges to the 8<sup>th</sup> College really alleviate the stresses on student engagement? Or will it exacerbate it?

8) Post-Proposal Contingency Plans: What will UCSD do if the proposal for the 8<sup>th</sup> College is not approved?

In conclusion, I advise that the issues raised during our discussion and by the reviewers should be considered and addressed in order to ensure the success of the 8<sup>th</sup> College. I recommend endorsement of this important initiative.



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY (UCEP)  
Mary Lynch, Chair  
Mary.Lynch@ucsf.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607-5200  
Phone: (510) 987-9466

January 12, 2022

**ROBERT HORWITZ, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

**RE: UC SAN DIEGO'S PROPOSAL FOR AN EIGHTH COLLEGE**

Dear Robert,

The University of California Education Policy Committee (UCEP) of the Academic Senate voted to endorse UC San Diego's proposal to establish an Eighth College by email. UCEP assessed the academic rigor, need, and fit of the proposed Eighth College as stipulated in the Compendium. This letter provides a descriptive summary of our assessment and outlines several areas of concern. Balancing these, UCEP voted to endorse the proposal.

*Need and anticipated benefit*

UCSD administers its undergraduate programs within 7 multidisciplinary, themed Colleges. Currently, the 6 oldest colleges serve more than 5,000 students each. The newest Seventh College, started just two years ago, has already grown to 1,586 students. Over the last 10 years, the campus has grown from serving 22,676 undergraduate students to more than 33,000 undergraduates. This exceeds the campus target of 32,000 undergraduates by 2035.

The campus aims to have each College serve about 4,000 students, to optimize administrative and operations efficiency and student experience. The Proposal argues that an Eighth College is necessary to reorganize enrollment such that each college could serve its target population of roughly 4,000, relieving pressure on the six older colleges, without creating undue pressure on the Seventh.

The Proposal asserts that when Colleges grow too large, it becomes difficult to provide the highest quality services—including advising—and a sense of belonging for students. Currently, the Proposal reports a strain on advising, student affairs, housing, and seat availability in general education (GE) courses. So the principal benefit anticipated from adding an Eighth College is ensuring quality of service, time-to-degree, and the most supportive campus environment possible for students.

*Academic rigor*

Each college at UCSD, including the Eighth College, maintains College requirements (including writing and GE) amounting to 60 units, with 120 units devoted to major requirements and electives. The Eighth



College Academic Plan is based on the plan adopted by the Seventh College academic workgroup, which was contained within the Seventh College proposal endorsed by the Academic Council in 2019. The Colleges organize GE requirements around the theme. The GE requirements for the Eighth College consist of 14 four-unit courses to offer intellectual breadth with an emphasis on community-engaged learning. To fulfill the GE requirements, students take “alternatives” courses and “engagement” courses. Students can choose ten alternative courses from the arts, humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and quantitative reasoning. These courses are meant to encompass writing, critical thinking, social justice, foreign language and cultures, historical and multicultural understanding, design thinking, business, and other topics. Students also would choose four “engagement” courses—two first-year, one second-year, and one upper-division—specific to the college, all of which emphasize community, wellness, anti-racism, and social justice. Two of the engagement courses will be writing-intensive. One will require a community-based, interdisciplinary research project.

The College is expected to develop partnerships with campus offices, academic programs, and community organizations to facilitate the engagement coursework, led by professional staff with a faculty advisory committee.

The Proposal demonstrates through sample completion plans that four-year completion appears feasible for all majors, including those with high unit-requirements.

#### *Fit*

The overall goals of establishing the Eighth College are consistent with the student-centered experience that UCSD strives to achieve. In that sense, the Eighth College fits very well within UCSD goals. In addition, the eighth college is a natural extension of the campus, with the same administrative and very similar academic structure to existing colleges. Its program design does not compete with other colleges, but complements them well to relieve pressure on existing infrastructure.

The focus on the Eighth College is ‘Engagement and Community’ and this theme is aligned with the campus’ efforts to combat structural racism and anti-Blackness. A proposed set of courses (pages 39-40) outlines how these goals will be achieved through the Engagement courses.

UCSD has been active in promoting equity, diversity, and inclusion (e.g. Vice Chancellor EDI, Office of Student retention and success). UCSD is an emerging Hispanic Serving Institution and expects to achieve the status of a Hispanic Serving Institution in a few years. In keeping with its commitment to EDI and combating structural racism, the proposal outlines a plan to continue to enhance its efforts with respect to EDI.

#### *Areas of concern*

1. The proposal mentions potential challenges for incoming transfer students, but it is unclear whether there is a concrete plan to fully integrate transfer students into the Eighth College experience without the risk of delays in time-to-degree. This is particularly the case in light of the evolving nature of the pandemic and continued global challenges with bringing and keeping students on campus. Would UCSD consider special programs to enable this transition for transfer students in light of the current challenges?
2. The Divisional Senate expressed concern as to whether the nature of the campus may change in the wake of the pandemic in ways that might make it prudent to delay the development of an Eighth College. The proposal addresses the need for a new college despite the COVID-related challenges and also how

lessons learned from COVID can inform the undergraduate experience moving forward. The UCEP review sub-committee appreciated this response.

3. There is some concern expressed by the Divisional Senate as to whether proposed staffing to supervise students' engagement work will be sufficient. UCEP hopes that attention will be devoted to this question, with assurance of additional resources to be made available if needed.
4. UCEP wonders whether structural deficits or other fiscal issues may follow within the wake of the continuing pandemic and urges attention to the analysis of the Committee on Planning and Budget to determine whether these challenges should weigh on the plan to create a new College.

*Summary and recommendations*

Conditional on the Committee for Planning and Budget finding evidence of financial sustainability, we recommend endorsement of the proposal to create an Eight College at UCSD focused on Community and Engagement.

The intention of the proposal to expand the UCSD undergraduate programs in a way wholly consistent with the existing, high-quality and student-centered academic programs is admirable. The intention to maintain campus infrastructure at a scale commensurate with growth in enrollment is very much appreciated. The design of the academic programs encompassed within the proposed new College appears both academically rigorous and extremely well-suited to support students both during and long after their studies, so that they may thrive and contribute positively amid continuing societal challenges and transformation.

UCEP appreciates the opportunity to comment on this matter. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mary Lynch", written in a cursive style.

Mary Lynch, Chair  
UCEP



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)  
Kathleen McGarry, Chair  
mcgarry@econ.ucla.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607-5200  
Phone: (510) 987-9466  
Fax: (510) 763-0309

January 10, 2022

**ROBERT HORWITZ, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

**RE: PROPOSAL FOR AN EIGHTH UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE AT UC SAN DIEGO**

Dear Robert,

UCPB appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposal for an eighth undergraduate College at UC San Diego.

The proposed eighth college is focused on “Engagement and Community.” As such, it fulfills an important mission of the University, and provides a much-needed home for the forecasted increase in undergraduate enrollment. The new college would be housed in the Theater District Living and Learning Neighborhood, which is already under construction and funded.

UCPB applauds the campus’ focus on community engagement and agrees with the need to plan for increasing enrollments. The Committee’s concerns center on staffing and resource issues. The college will draw the bulk of student-facing staff from other colleges, raising questions of the impact to student services at those colleges. With the intent of helping the University provide for a growing number of students, one would expect there to be concomitant increase in staffing and it is disappointing that there does not appear to be a provision for such. Rather, the bulk of increased personnel costs for the new college are slated for administrative and supervisory staff (Provost, Engagement Program Director, Dean of Student Affairs, Dean of Academic Advising, Director of Residential Life) and few support staff. Staff workloads vary across colleges, and the proposal indicates that the new college will balance workloads. However, the report notes currently "Staff resources are severely taxed, and this affects the student experience...." UCPB is concerned that student services will be strained at the new college as they reportedly are elsewhere.

In addition, proposed academic staff are almost all non-Senate faculty, primarily Unit 18 lecturers. Instructional faculty are a mix of lecturers and graduate TAs, with some Senate stipends for teaching. A key component of the college’s curriculum is a capstone project. Capstone projects by their nature require substantial time investments by faculty, and ongoing faculty-student

relationships. Unit 18 lecturers, without security of employment held by Senate faculty, may not be able to provide the longitudinal support necessary for this required project. We would much prefer to see a greater commitment of ladder faculty to the new endeavor, and particularly with respect to the capstone experience.

Finally, open questions remain regarding the articulation of this proposal with strategic priorities in graduate funding. The Eighth College General Education courses include four core courses and nine alternatives, curated from courses taught in departments. UCPB wonders how the use of existing courses will impact department and graduate funding for those departments that experience in influx of students and what this means for allocation of TAs. The proposal points to a plan under consideration, to develop teaching assistant guarantees between the colleges and departments. However, this initiative appears disconnected from plans for the Eighth College.

UCPB notes that the proposal was forwarded without a pre-proposal phase, and that some of the concerns with the proposal may have been mitigated with a pre-proposal feedback round. UC San Diego has experience opening new colleges, suggesting that they will be able to mitigate these concerns and address problems as they arise. However, it would be preferable to have some issues addressed more immediately.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kathleen McGarry". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Kathleen McGarry, Chair  
UCPB

cc:UCPB