

Academic Advancement Program

AAP SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATION FOR 2000-01 AWARDS

(Online Version)

NAME	(LAST)	(FIRST)	(MIDDLE INITIAL)
------	--------	---------	------------------

ADDRESS	CITY	ZIP
---------	------	-----

UCLA STUDENT ID #	SOCIAL SECURITY #	TELEPHONE #
-------------------	-------------------	-------------

CLASS LEVEL IN 2000-01	MAJOR
------------------------	-------

EMAIL ADDRESS

I AM APPLYING FOR:

☐ BARBARA A. TURNER SCHOLARSHIP

☐ AAP SCHOLARSHIP

☐ AAP ALCOTT SCHOLARSHIP

You may apply for **more than one of these** scholarships, but
you can receive only one AAP award for an academic year

This application and all supporting materials must be received by 5:00 p.m.

Friday, January 14, 2000

Dr. C. Adolfo Bermeo, Director

or

Patricia Shaw

1232 Campbell Hall

AAP SCHOLARSHIPS FOR 2000-01

GENERAL INFORMATION

The Academic Advancement Program will award a minimum of twenty (20) scholarships to AAP students. These include:

- One (1) **\$5,000 Barbara A. Turner Scholarship** to an AAP students majoring in Economics, Business Economics, Computer Science and Mathematics.
 - Fourteen (14) **AAP Scholarships** ranging from **\$1,500 - \$3,000**, including a minimum of 3 scholarships for AAP students majoring in the Physical and Life Sciences.
 - Six (6) **\$2,000 Alcott Scholarships** to AAP students who are majors or pre-majors in Business Economics, Economics, Economics/International Area Studies, and Political Science, and to students who have been admitted to the Business and Administration Specialization.
-

All AAP students who have completed 36 units at the college or university level, and who have a minimum cumulative UCLA GPA of 2.75 or better by the end of the 1999 Fall Quarter are eligible to apply. To receive the scholarship, you must be enrolled as a full-time undergraduate during the entire academic year, 2000-01.

We encourage AAP transfer students, prior AAP Scholarship winners, and AAP Science students to apply.

INSTRUCTIONS

Your application sheet and all supporting materials must be submitted to **1232 Campbell Hall** by **5:00 p.m. on Friday, January 14, 2000. NO LATE OR INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL BE ACCEPTED.** A complete application packet includes the following:

- 1) **the application sheet**
- 2) **a typewritten essay** (maximum 600 words) answering the question given to you with the application. Essays must be double-spaced. Failure to limit the length of your essay will result in a lower score on your application. **THE PRINT ON YOUR ESSAY MUST BE DARK ENOUGH TO BE XEROXED CLEARLY.**
- 3) **a two-page, double-spaced typewritten statement** describing the major experience in your life which helped you form your values, ethical positions, community involvement, and personal and career goals.
- 4) **one letter of recommendation** (in a sealed envelope) which has been written within the last twelve months (written no earlier than January 1999). The letter must be from a faculty member, lecturer, teaching assistant, high school teacher or counselor, or college counselor.

ACADEMIC ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION WAIVER FORM

Students applying for the Academic Advancement Program Scholarships are required to submit ONE letter of recommendation (from a faculty member, lecturer, teaching assistant, high school teacher or counselor, or college counselor). **THIS FORM MUST ACCOMPANY THE LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION WHETHER OR NOT THE APPLICANT CHOOSES TO WAIVE HIS OR HER RIGHT OF ACCESS.**

Letter of recommendation must be current (dated no earlier than January 1999).

TO THE APPLICANT: This form should be sent to the recommender so that the waiver and recommendations are submitted together. If you are waiving your right of access of this recommendation, please fill out this form completely, including the date and your signature. If you choose **NOT** to waive your right of access, please print your name, but **DO NOT SIGN THIS WAIVER. The complete scholarship application (including one letter of recommendation) must be submitted to the Academic Advancement Program no later than 5:00 p.m., Friday, January 14, 2000.**

TO THE RECOMMENDER: Please return your letter of recommendation directly to the student in a sealed envelope. The letter of recommendation must not be sent through the mail or delivered by anyone other than the student. **This letter of recommendation will be made available only to members of the Academic Advancement Program Scholarship Selection Committee.**

Recommender's name (print)

Applicant's signature (sign only if waiving access)

Date

Applicant's name (print)

Applicant's current address

City

State

Zip Code

For additional information and/or assistance in completing this form, please contact Ms. Patricia Shaw at the Academic Advancement Program, (310) 206-1805.

ESSAY QUESTION

Recently in New York City, in neighboring Riverside, and, most currently, in the police corruption scandal in the Ramparts Division of the LAPD, police departments have been strongly criticized for abuse of the African American and Latino communities. Yet, in his *Los Angeles Times* Commentary, UCLA Law School professor Cruz Reynoso points out that the vast majority of people are satisfied with the performance of their local police and believe that abuse by those police is “rare and random.” Many, including former U.S., Inspector General Michael R. Bromwich in his *Los Angeles Times* Commentary, argue that there is an urgent need for an independent external oversight agency to monitor police practice and investigate police abuse.

In a maximum of 600 words, how would you explain the lack of more widespread public outcry about the police abuse and what would you recommend to protect those whose rights are abused by their local police?

Los Angeles Times
Thursday, October 7, 1999
Commentary
Perspective on Law Enforcement

Few Protest Abuse, but Good Policing Is a Right of All

Community after community tells
us that the police culture that
accepts malfeasance must change.
By Cruz Reynoso

Police across the nation are trained to serve and to help others. And they do so with great distinction. They protect our important civil right to safe neighborhoods. Yet, in my 40 years as a lawyer, professor, judge and government official, the civil rights violation I've most often heard is that of police abuse. Last month's revelation that an LAPD officer confessed to the shooting and framing of an innocent man is one of the latest such local incidents. Can we make sense of all of this?

My recent experiences as vice chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights began to suggest what needs to be done. The California State Advisory Committee of the commission held an all-day hearing last year in response to concerns about police departments in several Sonoma County communities. As I heard witnesses, I was stuck by two distinct sets of views. First, we heard from the officials. Uniformly, their reports were of a community in harmony with few problems of police abuse. The Sonoma County district attorney reported that his office had investigated every police-involved killing and found no criminality; the Santa Rosa police chief testified that the city's surveys indicated that 82% to 85% of residents approved of their police department.

Then we heard from dozens of citizens. Countless witnesses, some speaking for themselves, most speaking for their religious or community groups, expressed deep concerns. It was as if there were two Santa Rosas and two Sonoma Counties.

Change scenes but not, as it turns out, the substance. Recently, the commission held hearings in Manhattan. The recent brutal sodomizing of a New York City resident by a police officer had captured headlines. Again, I heard the mayor, the police commissioner and other top officials present a vigorous defense of the quality of police community relations in New York City. Police abuse, they testified, is rare and random. Once more, I heard innumerable residents, including well-known religious leaders, speak to the horrors that the people they represent have suffered at the hands of the local police.

These hearings, I believe begin to explain the phenomenon. Under our democratic system, public officials are elected by majority vote. They must respond to a majoritarian view. What incentive is there to examine deeply the affliction of 15% or 18% who may suffer at the hands of the police? Not much. To respond to these few brings its own political risks, plus these few do not typically wield economic or political power. Nor do those who suffer abuse

generally share the same social circles, color or linguistic background of elected officials.

There is no easy answer. What holds the diverse peoples of the United States together is a shared culture found in our Constitution. One basic principle is that public officials, though elected by 51% of the vote, have a responsibility to all residents, voters or not, citizens or not. The Constitution protects us all.

Public officials must truly get to know who it is they represent. It would not have been a shock to public officials that Rodney King was treated roughly, had those officials been close to the communities they represent. Based on my experience, I was neither shocked nor surprised.

The long-term, but challenging, answer is to create a culture, an expectation by all Americans, that public officials have the high moral and constitutional duty to represent all their constituents. Culture and expectations can change; this change would benefit all Americans.

The best response to police abuse is also long-term. A culture change must take place. I have no doubt that more than 99% of officers would not steal cocaine or frame an innocent man. However, upon hearing that a fellow officer might have been involved in abusive or criminal behavior, how many would act? The Rodney King incident is instructive. What bothered me deeply was that, during the beating, more than a dozen officers representing several police organizations were present. There was no personal admonition on a one-to-one basis, nor were there reports to superiors. There appears to be a police culture that accepts malfeasance. That culture must change.

Meanwhile, what do we do? Our democracy recognizes that governmental power must be tempered. I am encouraged that the LAPD has responded to the Raphael A. Perez incidents – 12 officers relieved of duty and importantly, one captain cited for failure to supervise. These, and the internal investigation, are steps toward changing the culture. More needs to be done.

We should have an office independent of the district attorney, to investigate and prosecute police abuse. Our experience tells us that an elected prosecutor will act with reluctance, conscious of the political drawbacks. The commission made such a recommendation earlier this year as part of its report on the Los Angeles hearings. Will it work? I think so. Time and earnest enforcement will tell.

Cruz Reynoso is a retired California Supreme Court Justice.

Los Angeles Times
Wednesday, November 3, 1999
Commentary
Perspective on Law Enforcement

The LAPD Must Open Its Doors to Oversight

Police resist outside review, but
competent investigating authority
must be brought to bear.

By Michael R. Bromwich

With the Rampart Division scandal, Los Angeles faces one of the most significant issues confronting every level of law enforcement in this country: defining the appropriate role for external oversight agencies.

Meaningful oversight reform of powerful law enforcement agencies generally comes as the result of scandal. However, this is not a sufficient condition for reform. The events of the next few months will determine whether the LAPD's inspector general and the Police Commission, both of which provide external review, are provided with the authority and resources they need to do the job properly. Unless they are, an important opportunity will have been lost, perhaps for years.

As in the past, the LAPD continues to question the authority of the inspector general's office to conduct its own investigations and refer criminal matters to prosecutors. Unless these powers are promptly clarified and the authority of the current inspector general, Jeffrey Eglash, is openly accepted by the LAPD, the ability of the office to do its job will be in grave jeopardy. More important, the public cannot be confident that there has been an independent search for the truth if the inspector general and the Police Commission are locked out of meaningful participation in investigating the Rampart

Division scandal. This would do far more lasting damage to the LAPD than if it cedes some authority now to the commission and the inspector general.

Judging by the public debate so far, LAPD officials appear to believe that any strengthening of the inspector general's office constitutes an institutional affront to the LAPD, implying that it is not capable of dealing with misconduct in its own ranks. This is the traditional law enforcement response.

Yet this ignores the potential for enhanced public trust that can come from external review. The LAPD's main objective should be to maximize the well-being of the people of L.A., not to maintain its own prerogatives.

The issues involved in the Rampart corruption investigation are part of a broader national debate over the merits of internal versus external oversight of law enforcement agencies. This debate has taken place over the past several years with respect to the ability of the U.S. Justice Department's inspector general to pursue misconduct investigations in the FBI and the Drug Enforcement Administration. The same debate is now playing itself out in New York City, where the police department with the support of the mayor, has resisted creating a credible and powerful oversight

agency to deal with allegations of law enforcement misconduct in two high-profile cases-Louima and Diallo. The arguments employed by the FBI, the NYPD and the LAPD, although understandable, are fundamentally misguided.

First, it is argued that external oversight entities, particularly those with independent investigative authority, deprive law enforcement agencies of the authority they need to control the conduct of their personnel. The reality is that most misconduct investigations would continue to be-and should continue to be-handled by the agency's internal affairs office. However, an agency such as the LAPD's inspector general's office should not be limited to reviewing the LAPD's internal affairs investigations, but it should have the authority, resources and access to conduct its own investigation.

Second, it is argued that outside investigators cannot understand the internal culture of police departments or other law enforcement agencies and that such scrutiny is damaging to morale. That is a compelling reason to ensure that the LAPD inspector general's office is made up of personnel experienced in law enforcement who understand the culture without excusing serious mistakes of judgement, much less misconduct. Eglash is a former prosecutor with extensive law enforcement experience.

Third, it is argued that external oversight agencies lack the expertise to investigate the complicated issues raised by the actions of law officers. It is true that so far the LAPD's inspector general has not been provided with the skilled personnel necessary to conduct difficult investigations. He should get the resources precisely so that we can handle these difficult matters well.

Without these resources, the inspector general is doomed to fail-and so is the system of oversight in which he plays a central role.

Oversight of law enforcement agencies is one of the most difficult challenges facing every level of government. Police possess enormous power to deprive citizens of their liberty and property and to do great harm as well as substantial good. The credibility of the LAPD is vital to ensuring that it continues to command the respect of all of the people of Los Angeles. In turn, that credibility requires that citizens be assured that police activities are subject to rigorous external oversight.

This issue will remain an important one long after the Rampart matter has been laid to rest. Los Angeles had the good judgement to create the inspector general's office when the last scandal engulfed the LAPD. The city should use the current scandal to give the inspector general's office the authority and the resources to do its job properly.

Michael R. Bromwich, who was inspector general for the U.S. Department of Justice from 1994 to 1999, is a partner in a law firm based in Los Angeles, New York and Washington, D.C.