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May 14, 2021

Mary Gauvain  
Chair, UC Academic Senate

Re: (Systemwide Senate Review) Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 610 (Residency)

Dear Chair Gauvain,

The Divisional Executive Board, councils, and committees appreciated the opportunity to review the (Systemwide Senate Review) Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 610 (Residency). The Executive Board reviewed the proposal and divisional committee feedback at its meeting on May 13, 2021. Members concurred that, regardless of modality, official approved UCLA courses should count towards the required six courses for residency. They noted that the systemwide regulation sets a minimum threshold, but also allows divisions to set a higher bar, providing some divisional flexibility. Members appreciated that this regulation addressed residency for degree completion, not for consideration for in-state tuition, but that such a clarification might prevent confusion.

Sincerely,

Shane White  
Chair  
UCLA Academic Senate

Encl.

Cc: Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate  
    Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate  
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
May 11, 2021

To: Shane White, Chair  
   Academic Senate  

Re: Systemwide Review: Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 610 (Residency)

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (CR&J) has reviewed the proposed revision to Senate Regulation 610, and finds it both timely and appropriate. The revision appears to primarily encode Legislative Ruling 6.11.A directly into Senate Regulation 610; while unnecessary, the committee hopes this revision will help avoid future confusion regarding online students fulfilling residency requirements.

CR&J also noted that the nomenclature of continuing to refer to residency requirements as “in residence” has the potential to create confusion with the state requirements for residency. Especially during an academic year that has found many students attending UCLA remotely, it is important to ensure that out of state students who have residency under this policy as a result of attending online classes do not make the mistake of believing they have California residency for the sake of tuition.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine on this issue.

Sincerely,

David Blank, Chair  
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction  

cc: Randolph Bucklin, Member, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction  
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate  
Alfreda Iglehart, Member, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction  
Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate  
Taylor Lane Daymude, Policy Analyst, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction  
Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
May 5, 2021

To: Shane White, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

From: Megan McEvoy, Chair, Undergraduate Council

Re: Systemwide Senate Review: Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 610 (Residency)

At its meeting on April 30, 2021, the Undergraduate Council reviewed the proposed revision to Senate Regulation 610 (Residency).

Members appreciated the revision’s clarification that residency is not defined by physical presence on campus, but rather enrollment in courses created through the Divisional course approval process. However, members expressed concern that this definition of residency, combined with the anticipated increase in the number of online courses offered post-COVID-19 pandemic, could allow students to complete a UCLA degree without ever setting foot on campus. In other words, this policy could unintentionally permit a fully online undergraduate degree without carefully considering the implications.

Earlier this year, Divisions and systemwide committees were invited to comment on the UC Academic Council Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force Report. UC Academic Senate Chair Mary Gauvain’s memo (dated January 28, 2021) to UC Provost and Executive Vice President Michael T. Brown summarized the Divisions and systemwide committee comments as follows:

Moving forward, the Council believes it is important to develop a clear definition of a “UC quality degree,” to guide further discussions about online courses and especially fully online degrees. The Council feels it would be particularly important for the definition of quality to be considered in the context of UC’s status as a Research I University that delivers research-based teaching and provides research opportunities to undergraduates and trains graduate students in a wide range of disciplines and professions.

Additionally, members request clarification on the impact that revising this Senate Regulation would have on other Senate Regulations that depend on the definition of “residency,” e.g. SR 612 and 630 (the latter of which was also under proposed revision earlier in the academic year):

612. Except as provided in SRs 614 and 694, the minimum residence at the University of California required for a degree is three quarters (or two semesters). Each Summer Session in which a student completes a course of at least 2 units may be used in satisfaction of half a quarter’s residence. A Summer Session in which a student completes at least 6 units may be used as a semester of residence. [See SR 688. For an exception to this rule see SR 690.] (Am 9 Mar 83; Am 6 Mar 85)
630 A. Except as otherwise provided in this section and SR 614, 35 (or 24 semester) of the final 45 (or 30 semester) units completed by each candidate for the Bachelor’s degree must be earned in residence in the college or school of the University of California in which the degree is to be taken. (Am 9 Mar 83; Am 23 May 01)

Thank you for the opportunity to opine. If you have any questions, please contact us via the Undergraduate Council’s analyst, Aileen Liu, at aliu@senate.ucla.edu.

cc: April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, Academic Senate
    Aileen Liu, Committee Analyst, Graduate Council
    Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
April 30, 2021

Shane White, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Systemwide Senate Review: Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency

Dear Chair White,

At its meeting on April 12, 2021, the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) had an opportunity to review and discuss the Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency. Members offered the following comments.

Members expressed concern that six units is not a high enough threshold for residency. The standard is less clear for graduate students. The policy would benefit from further specificity and clarification to avoid challenges to its application.

If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at groeling@comm.ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Tim Groeling, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Elizabeth Feller, Principal Policy Analyst, Council on Planning and Budget
Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
April 26, 2021

To: Shane White, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

From: Andrea Kasko, Chair, Graduate Council

Re: Systemwide Senate Review: Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 610 (Residency)

At its meeting on April 23, 2021, the Graduate Council reviewed the proposed revision to Senate Regulation 610 (Residency).

The Council requests clarification on whether and how the proposed revision to this definition of residency affects how nonresident supplemental tuition is calculated for students residing outside of the state of California, and how residency is established for the purposes of tuition.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine. If you have any questions, please contact us via the Graduate Council’s interim analyst, Aileen Liu, at aliu@senate.ucla.edu.

cc: Estrella Arciba, Committee Analyst, Graduate Council
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, Academic Senate
Aileen Liu, Interim Committee Analyst, Graduate Council
Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
To: Shane White, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Andrea S. Goldman, Chair  
Committee on International Education

Date: April 19, 2021

Re: Systemwide Senate Review – Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 610 (Residency)

At its meeting on April 7, 2021, the Committee on International Education reviewed and discussed the Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 610 (Residency). Members did not have any concerns regarding the proposed revisions.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via the Committee on International Education analyst, Emily Le, at ele@senate.ucla.edu.
March 1, 2021

CHAIRS OF SENATE DIVISIONS AND COMMITTEES:

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision of Senate Regulation 610, Defining Residency

Dear Colleagues,

I am forwarding for systemwide Senate review the attached revision to Senate Regulation 610 proposed by the University Committee on Educational Policy. The intent of the revision is to eliminate an ambiguity in the definition of “residency” to clarify that “residency” is not necessarily linked to physical presence on campus.

Please submit comments to the Academic Senate office at SenateReview@ucop.edu by May 19, 2020 to allow us to compile and summarize comments for the Academic Council’s May 26 meeting. As always, any committee that considers these matters outside its jurisdiction or charge may decline to comment.

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

Sincerely,

Mary Gauvain, Chair
Academic Council

Encl:
Mary Gauvain, Chair,
Academic Council

RE: PROPOSED REVISION OF SENATE REGULATION 610, DEFINING RESIDENCY

Dear Mary,

Senate Regulation 610 deals with the definition of ‘residency’ for undergraduate and graduate students:

“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. For undergraduates this shall be at least six units of resident courses of instruction. Graduate students validate residence with programs of instruction or research approved by the appropriate Graduate Council. [See SR 688-690.] (EC 15 Apr 74) (Am 9 Mar 83; Am 6 Mar 85)”

In recent years, the question of whether or not on-line courses are included in this definition has been discussed and debated repeatedly. UCEP concurs with the liberal interpretation of SR 610 adopted by UCRJ with a 3-2 vote in 2011: “residency [is] determined by course approval by the relevant Faculty and Senate governing entities of the University of California, not linked to the physical presence of a student on campus” but also agrees that the language of the existing regulation is sufficiently ambiguous as to allow for a more literal interpretation, in which residency is linked to physical presence on campus. In order to eliminate confusion on this point, UCEP proposes the following revisions to the regulation:

610. Residence in any regular term is validated for an undergraduate student by enrollment in at least six units of a program of courses that were created through the Divisional course approval process of the student’s home campus or other exercises approved by the Faculty of a student’s college or school. For undergraduates, this shall be at least six units of resident courses of instruction. Residence in any regular term is validated for a graduate student with programs of instruction or research approved by the appropriate Graduate Council of the student’s home campus. [See SR 688-690.] (EC 15 Apr 74) (Am 9 Mar 83; Am 6 Mar 85)
The revised version without the mark-up:

610. Residence in any regular term is validated for an undergraduate student by enrollment in at least six units of courses that were created though the Divisional course approval process of the student’s home campus. Residence in any regular term is validated for a graduate student with programs of instruction or research approved by the Graduate Council of the student’s home campus. [See SR 688-690.] (EC 15 Apr 74) (Am 9 Mar 83; Am 6 Mar 85)

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or concerns about this matter.

Sincerely,

Daniel Potter, Chair
UCEP