MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION

MEETING: The Riverside Division of the Academic Senate met on Tuesday, February 21, 2006, at 2:10 p.m. in the Surge Building, Conference Room 171. Chair Manuela Martins-Green presided.

MINUTES: The minutes of the Regular meeting of November 22, 2005, meeting were approved with the following corrections: The second sentence in the 3rd paragraph from the end stated incorrectly that an ad hoc committee chaired by Professor A. Walker and made up of past members of CAP has been formed to become more interactive with Vice Chancellor Lord. It was changed to read: an ad hoc committee chaired by Professor A. Walker and made up primarily of past members of CAP has been formed to become more interactive with Vice Provost Lord.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ASSEMBLY: Professor Emory Elliott reported on the meeting of the Assembly held on February 8, 2006. Acting Provost Rory Hume made a presentation via phone since President Dynes was in Sacramento meeting with the Legislature on issues of administrative and faculty compensation. It was announced that Michael Brown, UCSB was nominated for Vice Chair of the Assembly for 2006-07. He was elected to fill this position.

Vice Chair Oakley reported that there was a request for a Memorial to the Regents on non-resident tuition. The proposed Memorial calls for the elimination of non-resident tuition for academic graduate students and was submitted to the Council by the Davis Division. If approved by the Assembly, a Memorial is to be submitted within 60 days for a mail ballot. If the majority of members approve it, it will be forwarded to the President to be put before the Regents.

The proposed memorial puts forth 6 points for the elimination of non-resident tuition for academic graduate students whether they are U.S. residents or not.

There was a debate over how strongly worded the Memorial should be. The Berkeley contingent submitted an alternate version that would require students to pay the tuition in the first year and then have it waived from the second year on. It was agreed and voted on that the stronger Davis Memorial should go forward as it would give the administration a stronger beginning point from which to negotiate.

Acting Provost Hume via telephone said he believed the stronger version was better and offered a better starting point for negotiations.

He then spoke about the Dynes report on compensation and that it was a serious press and PR problem. While there is strong support for Dynes’ position among the faculty, there are some who are critical and agree with the critics in the legislature. Dynes accepts the fault for not being more transparent, and he claims that he will be more transparent in the future. He also says that we must be competitive and that the faculty compensation is far behind where it should be. Hume said that the editorial board of the LA Times says it is not just a problem of transparency but of over compensation. They ask why it is necessary to pay the UCLA Chancellor $500,000. Why don’t we find someone who will take the position for half that amount. Hume also said that the University is planning greater enrollment growth in the health sciences, medicine, nursing, and pharmacy.

He stressed the need for better support for graduate students in order for UC to be competitive and get the best. Government leaders understand the need for this support, but the legislators have trouble understanding it.

Professor Joseph Childers asked about the impact of the slow down in enrollments and the coming end of tidal wave II. He noted that campuses are competing more vigorously for undergraduates and that UCR and Merced are being hurt by this competitiveness. Hume assured that “we all wish to see UCR prosper and grow.”
Many asked Hume questions about rumors regarding the University Retirement Program. He said that there have been several years when investments did well and it was not necessary for the University or the faculty to contribute to the program. Now, it is likely that some plan involving University and faculty contributions will be employed. The exact design was not yet completed. When asked about the impact of such a change on attracting faculty, he said they were aware of that problem but must do something to keep the program attractive. He said that the health plan will also need even greater changes.

George Blumenthal said we are losing in many efforts to hire deans and EVCs and that as of next year, UC faculty salaries will fall to 14.5% below our competitors. Hume said that the Regents know that. They see that we need to decide our priority – better graduate students or better faculty. They are inclined to think that we must choose one over the other.

Action Item: Resolution on compensation principles. At a meeting of the Academic Council on January 25, 2006, the Council approved Compensation Principles that it recommends to the Regents.

The Principles reaffirm the Master Plan’s model of excellence in research and teaching for the UC system. Therefore, the Council reasserts the important of adequate faculty and staff compensation and adequate support and appropriate fee policies for graduate and professional students.

Four principles should govern the compensation packages of senior administrators and all other employees:

1. Transparency
2. Fidelity to Shared Governance
3. Fairness within the context of the entire University
4. Merit

A motion to make a small amendment passed, and a motion to postpone a vote then failed. A vote on the final motion carried.

Professor Michael Brown gave a brief update on the 2005-06 BOARS activities.

Professor Raymond Russell of UCR and Chair of the Statewide Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare gave a report. He said the new contributions to the Retirement Fund will begin on July 1, 2007. Issues: What is the relative burden of the administrations vs. the faculty? Many combinations of figures have been discussed. At present, the committee expects that UC faculty will likely pay a higher percentage than most other similar universities. Currently, the figures being recommended by UCFW are 6% by faculty and 10% by the administration.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR: Chancellor Córdova began by giving an update on professional schools. The whole UC system is looking at a vision for the next ten or twenty years. President Dynes put together a long range guidance team to bring together subcommittees. EVC & P Wartella is a member of the (PDPE) Planning for Doctoral Professional Education Committee which is going to take a look at all the proposals. There is also a Committee for Law Schools which is doing a study of where we should have more law schools. They have asked for ours so we have decided to refurbish our proposal. It will be basically the same one that the Senate previously approved but will contain some of the newer things that have happened during the interim especially with respect to programs that are in CHASS or CNAS that would apply under this umbrella. Also, it will contain an updated business plan that includes instead of just state resources, a lot of development activity. Chancellor Cordova said she looked over the draft and thinks it is a superb proposal and very high quality. The comments of the review team in 2000 were very good. The proposal will come before the Senate very soon and will include many talking points.

She then talked about the Medical School Proposal which is being prepared from scratch. It is being prepared for an April submission. We have been greatly assisted by 2 gifts. One for $5M is from the United Health Care which is very interested in our mission which is serving the medically underserved. The second gift of $1M was given anonymously for an Endowed Chair specifically for Cancer Research. In the interim, the donor has allowed us to use the gift to hire a director of the Research Institute. The Academic Senate has submitted a number of questions and comments regarding the Research Institute and will be responded to as the answers are compiled.
There is an effort to have a School of Public Policy here at UCR. The proposal should be ready by summer. These are important to UC’s profile overall because the ratio of graduate students, professional students is too low for an institution of first ranking and we hope to improve those NRC rankings by the creation of a Task Force for that purpose. This is a very big role and it matters very much to us what our rankings will be.

Finally, the Chancellor addressed the 2 recent suicides of students on this campus. This is taken seriously and the Chancellor has been working with the Vice Chancellor, Student Enrollment and asked him to Chair a Task Force on Student Welfare which will commence immediately in connection with the excellent Counseling Services we already have to do more to help identify students at risk. Resources to the Counseling Center have not been cut, and outreach programs have been offered to faculty regarding suicide training and will be offered to TAs to help identify symptoms of depression. Notices will be reissued to faculty to sit in on the workshops and training which will be made mandatory. It was mentioned that this information should be posted on the internet. R.A.s are already intensively trained in this area. UC Berkeley did major research and we will be working with them as well as seeking outside input.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR AND PROVOST: EVC & P Wartella introduced a new staff member Bryce Mason, who helped prompt a review of student enrollment. She then presented a Power Point presentation showing some figures regarding the students who are coming to UCR and A Profile of Student Success at UCR. This information can be viewed on the Senate website.

There has been a precipitous drop in student enrollment. Some analysis was done on students who graduate and gathering information about how our alumni feel. The data was disturbing. The matrix on SAT scores has not changed. There was considerable growth in 1998 but the same sort of students are coming. There is still academic difficulty during the freshman year. EVC&P Wartella noted that we work hard to recruit them then fail to work to keep them. There is a need for Science technology and mathematics. There is also a national need to work with students to make them successful and we especially need to address the persistence rate (students who continue). This is a very costly rate. We lost 26 faculty FTE this year because we didn’t bring in enough students and we didn’t have a high enough persistence rate. This makes it difficult for us to be more selective in admissions.

Students report in their exit interviews that their experience was not good. Twenty-five percent of the graduates said they would not or probably would not attend UCR if they had to make that decision again. Six months after graduation, half the 2002 students were not employed or in graduate school. These responses tell us that we need to change or add to our institution; we need to build the infrastructure and find new ways of helping our students to succeed. A national search will find a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs who will deal with these problematic issues of student success. Also, a freshman year coordinator, a fairly high level person, will be hired to coordinate all freshman year experiences. Starting in the fall, the Student Success Task Force will be charged to look at the data and then make suggestions as to what we might be able to do to make improvements. Special money has been put into discussion sections in the gateway science courses to try and reach students by offering extra tutoring and mentoring to them. We intend to increase participation in the Bridge Programs; currently there are only 300 students and we want to double that number this summer. The Learning Center has hired a new staff person and is in the process of being re-engineered so that it becomes more helpful to the students and the faculty. Most importantly, the EVC&P intends to look at the whole academic advising area. The two areas that need to be focused on are the Bridge Program and the Freshman Year Program. A “SWAT” Team has been put together to investigate how to reach the 2,000 students and identify theme students most at risk of failing.

EVC&P Wartella said that she is concerned about the nature of advising on campus. Forty percent of the advisors in CNAS have no college degrees. About 50% of all the advisors on this campus do not have college degrees. This is not acceptable. It is her plan to start a new job category called Academic Advising. The minimum level advisor will have a Bachelors Degree and the highest level will have a Ph.D. We need to professionalize our academic advising program. A Teaching Center will be set up to assist faculty and provide resources to students as well.
A faculty member noted that he felt that students are not taking personal responsibility for the time spent on their work. They often don’t know what is required to go to college and that problem needs to be addressed in high school before starting their college education. We also need to recognize that we have different types of students than in the past.

Dr. Wartella agreed and reiterated that it is important to double our Bridge Program to teach the students what they need to do to be successful and how to make the transition from high school to college. The CHASS Connect Program is successful but it is not reaching enough students.

The question was posed that for many of our students, English is not their first language and that this may contribute to the problem. The EVC&P did not have an immediate answer but stated that is something that the Freshman Year Coordinators are going to have to take up.

Another faculty member said that attendance in both lower and upper division courses is a problem. Students need to be told at orientation that they are not in high school and that they need to work and study hard in order to succeed.

It was noted by a faculty member that there are a large number of unfilled FTE which affects the student faculty ratio. The students are getting shortchanged because of little faculty contact. EVC&P Wartella said that there is a Task Force working with the deans and helping them look at what revenue could be used to gain FTE.

A faculty member mentioned the Master Plan. Students should attend the Community Colleges to get the basics and then come as juniors and this will also help them to succeed. EVC&P said that we are working with the community colleges to encourage more transfer students and to develop programs with the community colleges to recruit their honor students.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SECRETARY PARLIAMENTARIAN: Professor Russell gave the election report and stated that the complete report can be found in the full agenda as well as on the Academic Senate website. A motion was made and seconded to accept the election report. It was accepted unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR: Chair Martins-Green encouraged everyone to go to the Senate website and read the progress report of the University Club Planning Committee for updates. A more detailed report would be forthcoming. Chair Martins-Green also thanked the Chancellor the EVC&P for their support in this endeavor.

SPECIAL ORDERS:

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

II. Reports of Standing Committees: Professor G. E. Haggerty, Chair of the Committee on Courses moved that the report of the Committee on Courses, Item 7.II, A. be moved to its regular place on the agenda, item 10, for discussion. The motion was seconded and adopted unanimously. A motion was made to accept the remainder of the Consent Calendar as written. It was seconded and adopted unanimously.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND FACULTIES:

A. Professor P. Gorecki, member of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction moved that the proposed change to bylaw 8.1 (Committees of the Division Appointment and Tenure) be pulled from the agenda. The motion was seconded and adopted unanimously.

B. Professor P. Gorecki, member of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction moved that the proposed change to bylaw M4.1 and M4.1.1. (AGSM) be pulled from the agenda. The motion was seconded and adopted unanimously.
C. Professor P. Gorecki, member of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction presented and moved adoption of the proposed change to bylaw 8.5.1 (Advisory Committee). The motion was seconded and adopted unanimously.

D. Professor R. R. Russell, Chair of the Graduate Council presented and moved adoption of the proposal for an Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Bioengineering. The motion was seconded and adopted unanimously.

E. Professor D. Fairris, member of the Executive Committee of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences presented and moved adoption of the proposal to establish a Minor in Law and Society. The motion was seconded and adopted unanimously.

F. Professor R. A. Redak, Chair of the Executive Committee of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences presented and moved adoption of the proposal to establish a Minor in Physics. The motion was seconded and adopted unanimously.

Professor G. E. Haggerty, Chair of the Committee on Courses was called upon to discuss the Report of the Committee on Courses, pulled from the Consent Calendar, Item 7. II. A.

Professor Haggerty asked that the report of the Committee on Courses concerning the 22 courses that were converted from 4 to 5 units be tabled and that the remainder of the report be adopted. The courses in question were ANTHRO 2, 3, 5, CRWT 165, CRWT 175, ECON 2, 2H, 3, 5, 102A, 107, 111, 112, 130, POSC 015, POSC 017, POSC 182, POSC 186, RLST 007, WMST 010, WMST 020, WMST 100. This motion was seconded. A motion was then made to amend the motion to withhold only lower division courses until after the Committee on Educational Policy has made its report. An amplification of the amendment was made to table the 22 courses until CEP has submitted its report to the Division. Professor L. Bell, Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy stated that there were many more courses in the pipeline and that the CEP would need to look at them all. A lively discussion ensued.

Professor R. A. Redak was asked to restate his motion. He made an amendment to his motion “to table the 22 courses approved for 5 units as reported in the Committee on Courses Report of the Agenda until the Committee on Educational Policy reviews the conversion process and submits a report.” The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Chair Martins-Green invited everyone to have some refreshments and then to stay for the faculty meeting immediately following in the same room (171 Surge Building). The discussion will be on Academic Programmatic Decisions and FTE Allocations.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.
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