MEETING: The Riverside Division of the Academic Senate met on Thursday, May 31, 2001, at 2:10 p.m. in the Commons Terrace Rooms C&D. Chairman Irwin W. Sherman presided.

MINUTES: The Minutes of the Regular meeting of the February 1, 2001, meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR: Chancellor Raymond L. Orbach spoke about the development of the campus and the massive construction taking place. Handouts were distributed showing projections and current statistics. There will be several major new construction projects that will give the campus space for the sciences that UCR so desperately needs. The Chancellor said we have been blessed by the system and by the voters of the state of California in terms of state funded capital projects.

He went on to say that enrollment growth remains very impressive, SIRs (Statements of Intent to Register) are almost final and we are on target. The Chancellor noted that we are no longer the smallest campus. Transfer admissions are also up substantially. He said UC Riverside will be fully funded for enrollment for Fall and he noted that there were no students accepted by exception, all were UC eligible. He hoped this trend would continue. Chancellor Orbach believes that new faculty provisions are sufficient to keep up with enrollment growth.

The Chancellor pointed out that we have in the Governor’s budget the following construction programs. These are proposed new projects for 2000-2001:

1) Planning money for Engineering Unit II
2) Biological Sciences Building
3) Heckman Center in Palm Desert for Graduate School of Management

In addition, there are three seismic upgrades (which are the last of the building upgrades). Planning money for previously approved projects:

Physical Sciences I has been approved by both houses of the State Legislature and is set for bids with construction to begin in the Fall 2002. He indicted that we need to do planning this year for the east campus infrastructure, and for west campus infrastructure in the following year.

Chancellor Orbach said that he had no news regarding Riverside’s “Proposal for a Law School.” The proposal was approved by the Academic Council and a letter was being sent to the President in support of the proposal. We are now awaiting action by the Office of the President.

The Chancellor was asked if he had figures on the size of the faculty since 1993. Chancellor Orbach responded that the student faculty ratio was at 18:7 and that as the number of students increased so has the faculty. He also stated that the distribution across the campus was not equitable, but said “we are trying to work on it.” On a positive note, Chancellor Orbach said that graduate students were
polled during the last two years and recent graduates indicated that this campus is still the "First Love." It seems that the students are happy with UCR in spite of some deficiencies.

The Chancellor was asked to comment on the priority given to the new Biological Sciences Space Plan. He said that enrollment and faculty numbers alone can't justify new buildings and the cost of renovations. Other campuses use different methods to build buildings. One of these is the Garamandi method. He said NIH funding on this campus needs to be increased. He also noted that private giving is another method to gain resources for new buildings.

The Chair of the Committee on Library asked what the plan is for increasing the purchase of books for the library. The Chancellor agreed that though much information can be obtained from the Internet we still need a library, staff and books and would like to hear the faculty voice on how best to spend allocated funds. He said we need a viable plan. Funds have been carved out for the Library of about $3 million each year for three years but he needs guidance on where to best spend those funds. The upcoming budget hearings may reveal where the funds are most critically needed and faculty input would be most helpful.

A question was asked regarding the quality of the architects of the new buildings. The Physical Resources Planning Committee is concerned about the design of the buildings and the quality of the architects. It was suggested that the architects be commensurate with the quality of the faculty and the design of the new buildings be enhanced. The Chancellor agreed and stated that most architects are not decorators; they concern themselves with the structure rather than the cosmetics of design. It was suggested that in the future first rate firms be called upon and that the faculty be utilized in the planning design. One suggestion was the formation of a faculty committee to help in the choice of the firms selected. The Chancellor agreed and said he would try to utilize faculty talents in the area of architecture and design.

A faculty member commended the Chancellor on a job well done. He then asked Chancellor Orbach if at some point the faculty could get a detailed analysis of the educational future of the campus. We talk a lot about buildings, student enrollment numbers and projections, budget, etc. but little about the detailed analysis of the educational future of this campus. He observed that the quality of the curriculum, the plans for the curriculum, the SAT scores of entering students, grades, etc. are important as well. The Chancellor said that he would like to address these issues at the Fall Division meeting, and he will ask the Deans for information on this matter.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE DEANS OR OTHER EXECUTIVE OFFICERS: Secretary-Parliamentarian L. Wright gave the Election Report as found on page 102 of the Call. Nominations from the floor for Divisional Junior representative to the Assembly were called for by Chair Sherman; none were received. Chair Sherman announced that a Call for Nominations would be sent out via campus mail for this position.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN: Chair Sherman discussed the Academic Senate Retreat which was a very positive event. The report is on page 3 of the Call. He said the Retreat was very productive and hoped that another retreat will be held next Fall. He expected that in a future Retreat, the needs of the faculty will be addressed and there will be an attempt to formulate a plan on how to meet these needs as well as a discussion of educational needs.

President Atkinson will be visiting UCR on June 11 and will be available to meet with the faculty.
Chair Sherman encouraged the faculty to attend and take advantage of the opportunity to visit with the President.

The Consent Calendar was received and placed on file. Chair Sherman asked that Item L, the Graduate Councils' proposal for the Reorganization of the Graduate Division and the Office of Research Affairs be discussed out of order on the agenda. He noted that there was no report from the Representative to the Assembly.

Professor Cullenberg asked that the Distinguished Teaching Award and the Faculty Research Lecturer Award be announced first. Chair Sherman agreed. Items 10, A and B of the Reports of Standing Committees and Faculties were announced.

Chair Sherman called on Professor M. E. Adams, Chair of the Graduate Council.

Professor Adams announced that the Graduate Councils' Proposal for the Reorganization of the Graduate Division and the Office of Research Affairs is found on page 229 of the Call. The Graduate Council voted unanimously to bring the following motion to the Senate floor:

"The Graduate Council has considered the Draft Plan prepared by the Administration for decentralization of Graduate Affairs at UC Riverside. The Council asks the Senate to join them in opposing the transfer of academic and fiscal responsibilities of Graduate affairs away from the Graduate Council and Graduate Dean."

He made a motion to accept the proposal. Chair Sherman said the motion was now on the floor and open for discussion. The motion was seconded. Professor Adams said that to facilitate discussion, he had a short statement on shared governance to support this proposal and a statement by the Graduate Council. Professor Adams read the statement.

"The Graduate Council has brought to the Senate floor the issue of Graduate Education in the role that we the faculty play in its promotion and oversight. The Administrative changes proposed this academic year have altered the Senate governance of Graduate Education on this campus and if adopted permanently would establish practices at UC Riverside unique to the University of California. In keeping with our hallowed tradition of shared governance on this campus, the Council wishes to inform the Senate faculty of these developments and take advantage of your collective wisdom. We've provided informational materials in the Call consisting of a position paper written by the Council consisting of Graduate Administration reforms, excerpts of the Senate Bylaws, Standing Orders of the Regents, and comments from Graduate Deans at other UC campuses. I will provide some brief comments on the reorganization events this year and Council's views on appropriate faculty governance of Graduate Education to facilitate discussion.

Two major events took place this year which have altered the academic and fiscal responsibilities of the Graduate Dean, Graduate Council and ultimately the Senate faculty. First, the Graduate Division was merged with the Office of Research Affairs. An interim Graduate Dean was appointed along with an Interim Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Affairs. The interim Graduate Dean currently reports to the EVC through the Interim Vice Chancellor. Secondly, in December 2000, the entire budget for Graduate Fellowship and Block Grants normally administered by the Graduate Council and Graduate Dean was abruptly transferred to the College and School Deans. The Council believes that this step fundamentally diminishes the influence of the Dean and Graduate Council. These events
were imposed without any consultation of the Graduate Council or any Senate faculty body. Under a new model for campus organization as stated in Division 2010, the Graduate Division is to engage in logistical and coordinating support for the colleges and schools. This model focuses responsibility for academic and fiscal issues with the College and School Deans with responsibility for Graduate academic and fiscal issues whereas the Graduate Dean's role is to emphasize central policy and administrative issues. A bit of further background, consistent with the UC’s research mission, the Senate bylaws designate the Graduate Council as your representative to set standards and policy for granting admission, for recommending allocation of fellowships and to provide evaluation and oversight of proposed and existing Graduate Programs. The vesting of such responsibilities in the Council is clear indication of the primary role played by Senate faculty in directing the Graduate Education enterprise. To further emphasize the UC special mandate as a sole public institution entitled to grant advanced Graduate degrees, the Regents established Graduate Divisions along with colleges and schools as major academic units at the UC. This arrangement provides independent advocacy for the University’s mission of Graduate training and independent evaluation of the rigorous quality of its various programs. To diminish this independence would suggest that such training could be effectively conducted under the aegis of undergraduate organizational structures. The Council believes that such an impression would weaken the University’s position as an institution with a special mandate for graduate training. Traditionally, the Graduate Dean acts on all UC campuses as an agent of the Graduate Council taking responsibility for recruitment and admission of incoming students and support of enrolled students. This responsibility should be appropriately shared with the Graduate Program Advisors and also Deans of Colleges and Schools and the Council recognizes this explicitly in our position paper. The Graduate Dean works closely with the Graduate Council on a day to day basis to approve new Graduate Programs and to periodically evaluate existing ones. Needless to say, the Graduate Council would find it very difficult to carry out the will of the faculty without an effective Graduate Dean. In summary, the Council takes a position, unanimously, I might add, that these changes that have occurred this past year are inconsistent with proper Senate faculty oversight and governance of Graduate Education. The Council finds itself in an awkward position opposing the Administration which deserves our support in their efforts to shepherd this campus in a period of unprecedented growth. Nevertheless, the majority of faculty participating in the recent Senate Retreat also had the same sentiments I am expressing now. Shared governance dictates that differences will occur and the will of the faculty should be considered. We would like to place the emphasis on our motion on the principle rather than on the opposition of the principle of the Graduate Dean and Graduate Council who should be sufficiently empowered to effectively govern Graduate Education on this campus. Thanks for listening.”

Vice Chair of the Graduate Council T. H. Morton asked the faculty to support this proposal of the Graduate Council.

Chancellor Orbach asked to address the proposal. He requested that the faculty consider the reasoning the Administration used. He said he believes that provisions of four year packages to prospective graduate students would improve the quality of graduate students on this campus. The Administration attempted to get the resources into the hands of the faculty in order to negotiate expeditiously with the best students. One of the ways the Administration envisaged this to take place was through a cooperative role of the Dean of the Graduate Division and the Deans of the Colleges looking at the way fellowships funds are allocated to departments, to areas within departments, and to ensure that the packages put together contain all the resource elements available to the schools and colleges thereby presenting the most attractive package to prospective graduate students. Also,
he believed it would enhance the role of the Dean of the Graduate Division and the Graduate Council. The two principles being addressed by the Administration’s plan were: get the money out to the faculty and get that money (in all forms) to the colleges in an attractive package.

He said the reporting of the Dean of the Graduate Division through the Vice Chancellor of Research or the two being fused can be deferred to the will of the faculty. On the fiscal side, Chancellor Orbach had strong feelings and suggested that the decentralized mode with full authority of the Graduate Division and Graduate Council is in the best interest of Graduate Education at UCR.

Comments by other faculty ensued. The general consensus was to support a separation of the Graduate Division and the Office of Research Affairs. Having the Graduate Dean and the Vice Chancellor of Research with combined duties or invested in one person, may well undo what the campuses began over ten years ago. Some opined, “It is better to leave the structure in place as it is so as to preserve its function.”

Another faculty member suggested that the process of reorganization was handled in a clumsy way and was implemented without prior consultation of the Senate body most severely affected, namely the Graduate Council as well as the Graduate Division. The faculty had no real voice in the decision and that has led to a loss of faculty trust in the top levels of Administration and has weakened shared governance. It was suggested that we restore the Graduate Division to the status quo ante and to not weaken the role of the Council and Graduate Division Dean. It should be possible to reorganize with good will so the concerns of the faculty and senior Administration are safeguarded but this cannot be done until trust is restored, temperatures have cooled, and the Administration agrees to conduct a systematic negotiation with all the parties concerned so a full representation of all campus views are heard.

Graduate Council Chair Adams stated that the Graduate Council was in agreement with the Chancellor on the subject of organizing the recruitment packages efficiently and quickly and with all the relevant players, the College and School Deans, the Graduate Dean, and the Graduate Advisors. The Council believes it is unnecessary to change the organizational structure. It requires putting good people in place that can work together. The Graduate Council suggested that instead of the Graduate Dean having a budget and not letting anyone know what is available, the Dean would be in a position of empowerment and proactively foster programs on the campus and the college Deans would know their allocations six months to a year ahead of time. “And the Graduate Dean shouldn't be placed in a position to only exert punitive measures to stop expenditures where compliance falls down or something is not right, but rather be in a proactive position to put adequate packages together.”

The question was called for and a vote was taken to accept the proposal as presented. The results are as follows: Fifty-five faculty members voted, 40 were in favor, 8 opposed, 7 abstained. The motion was carried as stated. The Chancellor agreed to restoration to the status quo ante.

SPECIAL ORDERS:

I. **Consent Calendar:** The Consent Calendar was adopted with unanimous consent.

II. **Reports of Standing Committees:**
A. Reports of the Standing Committees were placed on file

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND FACULTIES:

A. Professor Cullenberg, Chair of the Committee on Distinguished Teaching, announced and introduced Professor J. W. Childers, Department of English, as one of the nominees for this award. He then announced and introduced Professor B. C. Hyman, Department of Biology as the other nominee. Both nominations were accepted and applauded by the Division members. Professor Cullenberg congratulated both awardees.

B. Professor D. Reznick, Chair of the Faculty Research Lecturer Committee announced the nominee for the award, Professor W. A. Jury, Department of Environmental Sciences. The nomination was accepted and Professor Jury was introduced and congratulated.

C. Executive Committee, College of College of Engineering Chair, Molle presented and moved adoption of the proposed major in Information Systems as found on page 115 of the Call. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

D. Executive Committee, College of College of Engineering Chair, Molle presented and moved adoption of the proposed change in the Minor Regulations ENR3.3.3 as found on page 117 of the Call. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

E. Executive Committee, College of College of Engineering Chair, Molle presented and moved adoption of the proposed new Regulation ENR2.8 and a change in Regulation ENR3.2.1 as found on page 118 of the Call. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

F. Executive Committee, College of College of Engineering Chair, Molle presented and moved adoption of the proposed new bylaw EN4.4 as found on page 119 of the Call. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

G. Executive Committee, College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences Chair, Russell presented and moved adoption of the proposed change HSR2.3.2 as found on page 120 of the Call. The motion was seconded; 1 opposition and adopted.

H. Executive Committee, College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences Chair, Russell presented and moved adoption of the proposed change to Campus Graduation Requirements, Regulation R6.3.2, R6.3.3, R6.4.1, R6.4.2 as found on page 121 of the Call. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

I. Executive Committee, College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences Chair, Russell presented and moved adoption of the proposal to establish a B.A. Degree in Psychology/Law and Society as found on page 123 of the Call. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

J. Graduate Council Chair M. E. Adams, presented and moved adoption of the proposal for a Masters Degree in Education as found on page 125 of the Call. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

K. Graduate Council Chair M. E. Adams, presented and moved adoption of the proposal for a
Masters of Fine Arts Degree in Creative Writing and Writing for the Performing Arts as found on page 187 of the Call. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

**PETITIONS OF STUDENTS:** David Lee, current Academic Affairs Director and next year’s President of ASUCR spoke on Subject A. He asked how we can retain students when the exit examination, which Mr. Lee stated is UCR specific, causes students to be concerned as to their academic status based on the results of this test. The students expect some resolution of this matter from the faculty and he asked for further faculty involvement and support.

A faculty member suggested that the Deans can assist in resolving these concerns. Effective communication and starting early to discuss issues of a problematic nature are the keys to resolving problems in a timely manner.

**NEW BUSINESS:** Professor R. L. Russell spoke to the body regarding Funding of Instructional Activities and the Library. A letter was sent from CHASS Executive Committee to the Chancellor and to the Dean of the College which is found on page 243 of the Call. The two main issues discussed were the Library and the glaring issues of growth and lag of book purchase and the growth of student body which has increased class sizes. Growing class size especially creates problems for faculty. These problems have not been sufficiently budgeted i.e., no increase in the number of Teaching Assistants as well as additional clerical support to help deal with these growth problems. Rooms are in short supply for meetings and discussions. Lack of classroom space as well as the above mentioned issues are not being adequately addressed.

The Director of The Center for Teaching Excellence suggested that they could discuss these issues. A pamphlet is being put together by the Center to address some of the needs of students and the faculty. Strategies are being developed to meet some of these challenges throughout the country. Organizational instructional technology and student peer to peer mentoring are two that are most prominent. Director Carter invited the faculty to start conversations to discuss ways of addressing these issues and to suggest solutions as well.

Chair Sherman stated that the shortage of general classrooms is not usually discussed and should be brought up in the Senate committees. Conversations should be held on ways to solve these problems. He assured the faculty that a future meeting with the Advisory Committee would include space and classroom availability.

Chair Sherman thanked everyone for their participation as well as the Senate Staff for their devoted assistance.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

**ATTEST:**
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