

7th College Pre-Proposal
Process Information
April 2017

The review process to establish a new school or college has two steps or phases: the pre-proposal phase and the full-proposal phase. Both phases involve a review by the Divisional Academic Senate, the UC Provost and the systemwide Academic Senate. Final approval is requested by the UC President of the UC Board of Regents. The Regents have final approval authority. The process normally takes a minimum of two years from the date a proposal is submitted for review to the date the Regents approve it.

The document that has been submitted for Senate review is a “pre-proposal.” The pre-proposal is not the final proposal. The purpose of the pre-proposal is to provide the Senate and others an opportunity to offer their input before a final proposal is drafted. Feedback from the review of the pre-proposal is taken into consideration in the drafting of the final proposal.

The Divisional Senate Chair distributes the pre-proposal for review by the Undergraduate Council (UGC), the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), and subsequently, Senate Council.* Senate Council places the proposal on a Representative Assembly meeting agenda for a vote. Following that review process, the Senate Chair reports back to the Chancellor.

If the Divisional Senate approves the pre-proposal, the Chancellor submits the pre-proposal to the UC Provost. The UC Provost submits the pre-proposal for review to the UC systemwide Academic Senate and to UCOP Academic Affairs for feedback. A systemwide Senate review then takes place, and the pre-proposal is reviewed by the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB), and discussed at Academic Council.* Academic Council’s feedback is transmitted to the proponents, the UC Provost, and the Divisional Senate Chair. The feedback from UCOP Academic Affairs is sent to the proponents, the UC Provost, and the Divisional Senate Chair.

A full/final proposal is then drafted by the proponents, incorporating feedback from the pre-proposal phase. And the final proposal is then submitted through the same review process – Divisional Senate Review, systemwide Senate review and UCOP review. The final proposal must ultimately be approved by the systemwide Senate Academic Council before it can be submitted by the UC President to the UC Board of Regents for final approval.

*Graduate Council and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs are also reviewers for proposals to establish new graduate schools.

April 2, 2017

Peter F. Cowhey, Interim Executive Vice Chancellor
Kaustuv Roy, San Diego Divisional Senate Chair

SUBJECT: Report of Seventh College Planning Task Force

Dear I-EVC Cowhey and Senate Chair Roy:

The Task Force assigned to provide recommendations for the planning of a Seventh (as well as possible Eighth and Ninth) College at UC San Diego has deliberated and developed responses to the three basic questions specified in the January 26, 2017 charge letter. On this cover page, we state the basic charges and our abbreviated responses to them, while the remainder of this report elaborates on specific details concerning each of the questions. We cite below our charges and summary recommendations.

First, in order to begin securing system-wide approvals expeditiously we ask this Task Force to reach a determination on whether there is a pressing need for creation of a Seventh College.

Given present student enrollments, University student growth projections, and considerations regarding optimal size viability for the successful functioning of colleges, we unanimously recommend the planning of a Seventh college and recognize the future need for additional colleges.

Second, we ask this task force to lay out a preliminary set of questions and considerations about the college's focus and objectives that should be addressed in the next three stages of work.

We have identified two basic structures for the orientation and goals of Seventh College. The first structure reflects the UC San Diego traditional thematic focus that has guided and shaped the creation of our present colleges. Under this traditional structure, we propose two alternative themes, each of which utilizes cross-divisional resources and further develops the interdisciplinary profile of UC San Diego: 1. Brain, Mind and Consciousness and 2. Information, Behavior and Ethics. The second structure is the development of a Transfer College. It is suggested that whichever of these structures is not adopted for Seventh College be considered in the subsequent planning for other colleges.

Third, we ask the Task Force to offer initial guidance on a physical plan of the college in the context of the overall campus building program.

A variety of options for location exist on campus, depending on whether a traditional structure or transfer college is adopted.

Regards,

Farrell Ackerman (Vice Chair, Academic Senate) ***Co-Chair***
Barbara Sawrey (Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean-Undergraduate Education) ***Co-Chair***

Report of Seventh College Planning Task Force

The Task Force assigned to provide recommendations for the planning of a Seventh (as well as possible Eighth and Ninth) college at UC San Diego has deliberated and developed responses to the three basic questions specified in the January 26, 2017 charge letter. Below we identify each charge and detail our deliberations and recommendations.

First, in order to begin securing system-wide approvals expeditiously we ask this Task Force to reach a determination on whether there is a pressing need for creation of a Seventh College.

The Task Force has determined that there is a pressing need for the creation of Seventh College. The October 17, 2016 Report of Pre-Planning Recommendations for New Colleges at UC San Diego articulated (page 3) a goal that colleges be of similar size at 4,000 students each. With a UC San Diego steady state projected at 32,000 undergraduate students total by 2035, and the number of students in each of our six colleges already exceeding 4,000, planning should begin immediately for Seventh College, with the goal that Eighth College follow within two years.

Operational experience related to the realities of accomplishing administrative functions, academic advising, student affairs advising, student programming, housing, and dining within a college's physical footprint all point to 4,000 as a goal for the number of students per college. An important consequence associated with the development of successful colleges is the need to develop housing capacity to accommodate approximately half of a college's students: this is best done by via residence halls which integrate the students into the college. This need is supported by historical evidence, including attested patterns of housing demand, which suggest desirability for on-campus housing for the freshman and sophomore years with a tapering of demand in subsequent years.

There is unanimity that the college system at UC San Diego is one of the signature ingredients for the quality of the overall undergraduate educational experience on campus and that the development of additional colleges will preserve and enhance that experience.

Second, we ask this task force to lay out a preliminary set of questions and considerations about the college's focus and objectives that should be addressed in the next three stages of work.

The Task Force considered two essential aspects of this question. First, whether Seventh College should have the same structure and organization as the existing colleges. Second, how well would the selected structure and organization interface with existing and future departments/programs as well as plans for changing undergraduate populations. We discuss each of these questions in turn.

The Task Force entertained two different structures for colleges, specifically, a college reflecting a designated academic profile as presently implemented by all six existing colleges (serving freshmen through seniors) versus a Transfer College.

Recognizing that the development of previous colleges has been informed by exciting and forward-thinking contemporaneous themes in research, the Task Force identified two such present-day themes, specifically *Brain, Mind and Consciousness* and *Information, Behavior and Ethics*. These alternative themes address the following desiderata: (re)affirm UC San Diego's commitment to a broad liberal arts education, be distinct from, but possibly synergistic with, the themes of other colleges, and have the

broadest possible application to fields of study in all divisions. Both proposed themes assume that 2/3 of students enter as freshman and that 1/3 of students enter as transfers.

The motivation for a *Brain, Mind and Consciousness* theme derives from the explosion of research and professions. The theme resonates with current interdisciplinary and international work, does not overlap with the six existing college themes, and aligns well with UC San Diego initiatives and strategic vision (such as the Kavli Institute), and the research focus of numerous academic departments (such as Cognitive Science, Psychology, Philosophy). Developing a multi-course general education sequence which provides an introductory, interdisciplinary exploration of the topic, while fully integrating a humanities core-writing sequence, would provide an academically relevant and valuable new venture.

The motivation for an *Information, Behavior and Ethics* theme derives from the modern challenges presented to deliberative civic discourse and policy (economic, social, etc.) owing to the accessibility of huge quantities of information and the unprecedented proliferation of new media venues employed for its proliferation. This entails the need for students to critically evaluate and understand the quantitative and qualitative means of information organization and the interpretation of information with respect to their socio-economic and cultural impact. The mission envisioned for this college is to provide students with the cross-disciplinary resources crucial for making valuable contributions to the shape of civil society. It is projected that this theme would essentially utilize departments and programs from multiple divisions, facilitating new collaborative interactions between numerous components on campus. For example, synergies are easily imagined between History, Philosophy, Visual Arts, Political Science, Communication, Linguistics, Sociology, Computer Science and Engineering, the new Data Sciences Institute and the proposed School of Public Health.

These two themes satisfy the desiderata mentioned above. They also reflect present and future areas of critical importance in society, further implement the campus' strategic plan, provide opportunity for novel faculty initiatives and collaborations, enhance the campus public profile of interdisciplinarity, and provide a diverse student population with the knowledge and skills (both the critical and formal) to understand and shape an increasingly complex world.

Both alternatives would follow AAC&U guidelines and provide necessary overlap of college and major requirements:

- Approximately 1/3 units (60) college requirements, including general education
 - Embed college-level writing
 - 3 lower division courses + option for 1 upper division course (for students entering as freshman)
 - at least 1 upper division course (for students entering as transfer)
- Approximately 2/3 units (120) major requirements and electives

The Task Force found both alternative themes to present exciting opportunities and did not identify either as the preferred alternative.

Concerning the development of a Transfer College, the discussion revolved around the novel notion of creating a college designed to address the particular needs and requirements of transfer students, who account for 1/3 of all entering undergraduates. It is acknowledged that this college could not accommodate all transfer students and that some will select and/or be assigned to the other existing

colleges. There was considerable discussion among the members of the Task Force concerning the desirability and feasibility of a Transfer College. The nature of this discussion is presented below. The arguments for a Transfer College are that it would be an academic entity specifically designed for the needs of the transfer student, with a core program that is specifically tailored to augmenting the transfer experience. This would provide increased institutional support and resources for transfer students and demonstrate greater value to this valuable student cohort, supported by academic advisors and student affairs staff who specialize in transfer students. The organizing theme for this college would be career and post-undergraduate preparation. In a sense, the college would be preparing them for graduation from the moment they arrive. A Transfer College, staffed by transfer specialists, could also share best practices with the other colleges and may improve the transfer experience across the campus.

Concerns about a Transfer College centered on the goal of primarily serving the practical needs of transfer students, without providing a clear intellectual and academic focus. Without the latter it seems challenging to specify a core curriculum associated with the college. Correlatively, unlike with the thematic college options guided by educational foci, there are no evident new synergies among Divisions associated with the Transfer College. Furthermore, transfer students form a heterogeneous group with respect to their academic backgrounds. Some will have completed Intersegmental General-Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC), some with partial IGETC preparation, some with major preparation and few GE-associated courses. With the roll-out of major preparation, transfer student profiles may be in flux over the next few years; this may argue for revisiting the transfer college option during eighth college discussions. Accordingly, it seems difficult to treat this diverse population as uniform and to design a college curriculum to meet all of their needs. Finally, the question arose as to whether some of the main issues motivating the need to better integrate transfer students into campus life might be more efficiently addressed by reconceptualizing present strategies to achieve this goal.

In sum, the Task Force recommends considering two specific thematic colleges as well as the option of a Transfer College. While there was unanimous enthusiasm for both of the thematic alternatives, there was less agreement about the proposal for a Transfer College. There was consensus, however, that whichever alternative is not adopted for Seventh College might serve as a guiding idea in the development of Eighth College.

Third, we ask the Task Force to offer initial guidance on a physical plan of the college in the context of the overall campus building program.

The physical plan for Seventh College depends on the selection of the proposed college profile as discussed above, i.e. traditional or transfer college. Location options include using or redeveloping the existing Sixth College housing, using the existing North Campus Village housing, developing in the North Torrey Pines/Extension area, and developing on the Revelle parking lots, though the extensive capital plans for the campus may expand or contract the list of options.

Traditional

Short term

- Sixth College site

Long term

- Sixth College site
- North Torrey Pines/Extension area
- Revelle parking lots

Transfer

Short term

- The North Campus Village
- Sixth College site

Long term

- The Village
- Sixth College site

Independent of the determination of traditional or transfer college, each site has different features, capacities and limitations:

Sixth College site

- Short term
 - Start date 2020-21 or 2021-22
 - Capacity: 1,243 to 1,461 beds depending on configuration (short of 2,000 bed goal)
 - No dining facility
 - Residence Life support spaces are in place
 - Temporary provost administrative space would be available in Pepper Canyon Hall starting Fall 2020
- Long term
 - Housing, Dining and Hospitality (HDH) proposes to develop a comprehensive plan to move the entire college to either east or west of the proposed LRT station
 - Capacity: 2,000 beds
 - Requires a permanent Provost administration building to be built (8-10K asf)

The North Campus Village

- Short term
 - Achievable as early as academic year 2018-19
 - Capacity: 1,996 beds
 - Residence Life Staff is in place and fully functioning
 - Requires temporary provost administrative space
- Long term
 - Requires a permanent Provost administrative building to be built (8-10K asf)

North Torrey Pines/Extension area

- Long term
 - Housing, Dining and Hospitality (HDH), in consultation with Campus Planning, proposes to develop a comprehensive development plan for further consideration

Revelle Parking Lots

- Long term
 - Housing, Dining and Hospitality (HDH) , in consultation with Campus Planning, proposes to develop a comprehensive development plan for further consideration

Thank you very much for the opportunity to provide input on this important campus initiative.

Seventh College Planning Task Force

Farrell Ackerman (Vice Chair, Academic Senate) **Co-Chair**

Lera Boroditsky (Associate Professor, Cognitive Science)

Matthew Herbst (Associate Teaching Professor and Director, MMW/ERC Writing Program)

William Hodgkiss (Sr. Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Planning and Resources)

John Moore (Provost, Muir College)

Robert Pomeroy (Teaching Professor, Chemistry-Biochemistry)

Steve Ross (Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs Resource Administration)

Barbara Sawrey (Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean-Undergraduate Education) **Co-Chair**

Robert Clossin (Director, Campus Planning) *Consultant*

Mark Cunningham (Assistant Vice Chancellor, Housing, Dining & Hospitality) *Consultant*

Kathleen D. Johnson (Assistant Dean, Undergraduate Education) *Staff*