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April 3, 2012

D. J. Ozer, Secretary-Parliamentarian
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate
MEETING: The Riverside Division of the Academic Senate met on Tuesday, February 21 at 2:10 p.m. in the Genomics Auditorium Room 1102A. Chair M. Gauvain presided.

MINUTES: The Minutes of the Regular meeting of November 29, 2011 were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR: Chancellor White stated his intention to address three topics: The status of various senior positions searches; budget matters; and financial plan developments for the School of Medicine.

The Vice Chancellor of Research search has been moving forward. Airport visits are expected to be completed in March followed by on campus visits at the end of March or early April.

The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Business Operations, Gretchen Bolar, has announced her retirement effective at the end of this fiscal year. The Chancellor is initiating a review and search process for this division. Similarly, the University Librarian, Ruth Jackson, has announced her retirement effective at end of January 2013. Provost Rabenstein will be initiating the search process for this position.

Mary Gauvain, Chancellor White, Dallas Rabenstein and Matthew Hull from the Budget Office, joined Mark Yudof, Provost Pitts, and other administrators in the finance and planning offices on February 9th to discuss the budget.

Financial hardship has affected students and their families, academic faculty, and academic professional and support staff. At the staff level, there is often a lack of bench strength for succession when someone retires or leaves; and staff experiences longer hours and heavier workloads. At UCR, the ratio of Management Senior Professional to Ladder Faculty is the lowest among the 10 campuses. UCR has fewer staff per academic faculty and by extension to the student body than any other campus.

Over the last three years, UCR’s student body has increased 16% but the overall faculty size has decreased by 5%. A large part of UCR’s success is due to faculty willingness to teach additional as well as larger classes, and the Chancellor commended the faculty in this regard. While the teaching effort increased, research productivity has stayed relatively flat or gone up slightly. The campus has not had to exchange one for the other.

Over the past three years, there has been a 33% increase in class sizes. Among the three colleges, CNAS, CHASS and Engineering, CNAS has experienced a larger increase in student and advisory case load. In Fall 2011, the Math and Physical Sciences departments in CNAS reported a ratio of 575 students to 1 academic adviser, where the
national standard is 300 to 1. These data are cause for concern about UCR’s current and future learning environment. In order to reverse some of the trends more resources need to be generated and invested in the learning environment.

One financial planning model under consideration by UCOP includes a 5% net tuition increase in the next and following subsequent years. This model assumes that the Office of the President will continue to cover prior reductions. Under this model UCR’s bottom line would be slightly positive while assuming continual funding of the academic merits of 3% across the board as happened last year. The model also supports merit and salary increases that are part of the negotiated contracts with various members of UCR unionized staff.

The planning model accounts for a slight decrease (from 2,400 to 2,200) of so-called “unfunded” students. These students contribute to the teaching load, but also add to UCR’s resources. About 20 million dollars a year is associated with the 2,200 students. Slowly decreasing the number of these students while increasing the number of non-resident students (to the target figure of 1,500) would generate 35 million dollars per year.

Chancellor White closed by adding a few comments regarding the financial plan developments for the School of Medicine: Since 2008 the Regents have unsuccessfully attempted to obtain state funding. The Chancellor stated that in the coming years he will probably have to start spending two million dollars of non-general education funds a year to support the medical school’s development. The President was asked to match UCR’s two million dollar contribution. The outlook looks promising, but the decision has not been finalized. There will also be a sizable amount financed from UCOP resources over 10 years that will be paid back by medical school funds, not general campus.

UCR has received 10 million dollars from Riverside County, an estimated 12 million dollars from Coachella Valley, and projects clinical revenues at approximately 3.5 million dollars a year. Similarly, UCR has currently received state funding for 24 students who start their first two years at UCR. Eventually, these students will no longer need to transfer to UCLA and so state funding will remain with the students at UCR.

The financial plan envisions a medical school admitting students by Fall 2013. The buildings are built, the leadership team is in place, and faculty are joining the campus. The plan does not commit any additional UCR funds that were not previously considered as a backstop. UCR expects to submit an application for accreditation in April and should receive the results between August and September.

Chancellor White opened the floor to questions regarding the three topics discussed. The question was raised as to how dependent the model of 5% plus 5% increase in tuition is with the governor’s tax initiative. The Chancellor responded that if the governor’s budget fails, UCR might be required to immediately increase tuition by an additional 11% per year. Students would be facing 16 or 17% increase per year without any planning time.
ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR AND PROVOST: There were no announcements by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE DEANS AND OTHER EXECUTIVE OFFICERS: There were no announcements by the Deans and other Executive Officers.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SECRETARY-PARLIAMENTARIAN: There were no announcements by the Secretary-Parliamentarian.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR: The Chair noted there would be an open invitation for continued discussion after the completion of the meeting if anyone is interested in staying.

The Chair of the Statewide Senate, Robert Anderson, will address the Regents at their March meeting with prepared remarks concerning the value of graduate education to the University of California, specifically the issue of NRT’s. In addition, Chair Anderson would like to present an official statement, known as a Memorial, to the Regents this spring on behalf of the faculty. The Memorial will focus on the state’s disinvestment in higher education.

The Memorial process will require a full faculty vote. Around the third week of March ballots will be distributed via email to faculty regarding the Memorial. The Memorial will ask Regents to support upcoming state ballot and legislative measures that would provide more resources for higher education in the state. The outcome of the Memorial vote will be announced by the May Division meeting.

In Division news, a call for nominations for Senate officers will be emailed to faculty around Friday March 2, 2012.

SPECIAL ORDERS: The Consent Calendar was adopted with unanimous consent. Under the reports for standing committees item A; Committee on Committees—Appointments and item G; proposed changes to the additions for Statistics Transfer Students and changes to the BS in Statistical Computing and Quantitative Management Options was moved to its regular order on the agenda to be discussed. All other Reports of Standing Committees were received and placed on file.

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ASSEMBLY: Professor M. Gauvain announced there was no report submitted due to the cancelation of the December 7th meeting.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND FACULTIES

A. Professor Paulo Chagas, Chair of the Committee on Academic Computing and Information Technology, presented and moved adoption of the proposed changes in Bylaw 8.9.3.5 found on page 35 of the full agenda. The motion was adopted.

B. Professor Dan Ozer, Secretary-Parliamentarian, presented and moved adoption of the
proposed changes in Bylaws 8.22.1 and 8.22.24 for the Committee on Scholarships and Honors, found on page 37 of the full agenda. The motion was adopted.

C. Professor Begona Echeverria of the Graduate School of Education, presented and moved adoption of the proposed Undergraduate Minor in Education found on page 38 of the full agenda. The motion was adopted.

D. Professor Barry Mishra, Member of the Executive Committee of the School of Business Administration, presented and moved adoption of the proposed changes to Business Administration found on page 41 of the full agenda. The motion was adopted.

E. Professor Mike McKibben of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, presented and moved adoption of the proposed changes to the additions for Statistics Transfer Students and changes to the BS in Statistical Computing and Quantitative Management Options found on page 24 of the full agenda. The correct version of the document does not contain the first paragraph regarding transfer students. The motion to remove the first paragraph and adopt the remaining portion of the document was adopted.

F. On behalf of the Committee on Committees, Professor Tim Close presented and moved adoption of the proposed grammatical changes to Appointments found on page 11 of the full agenda. The motion was adopted.

PETITIONS OF STUDENTS: There were no petitions of students received.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: There was no unfinished business.

UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE: There was no university and faculty welfare business.

NEW BUSINESS: Professor Tom Morton, Assembly Representative for the Committee on Academic Freedom, proposed a motion to be adopted by the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate concerning the Right of Assembly and requested the resolution be introduced at the next meeting of the University Committee on Academic Freedom.

The Resolution states:

“The right of assembly and expression of views shall not be suppressed. Such assemblies and expressions, however, shall not interfere with the lawful conduct and public safety of others at the University.”

The purpose of the resolution is to clarify and perhaps expand the notion of academic freedom as it deals with the right of expression on campus. As such, the wording was devised, to be incorporated into APM 10. As a consequence, specific instances were neglected in the hopes this would be a general statement in which the first statement is a statement of philosophy and the second statement is the scope of the philosophy.
Professor Morton stated The Committee on Academic Freedom at UCR derived the rights of spontaneous assembly and expressions as properly the products of academic freedom through an evaluation of APM 10.

APM 10 describes traditional aspects of Academic Freedom such as the right to teach and the right to learn. However, the committee felt the statements within this document did not directly pertain to the right of assembly. As a result, the resolution was created.

Similarly, the resolution was reasoned necessary and produced by the Committee on Academic Freedom because of recent events that occurred at the Regents meeting. The guidelines for assembly that were prorogated at the end of the winter quarter have raised the issue for the Senate to put forth its views independently of the task force.

In Professor Morton’s opinion the guidelines that were put forth are not in conflict with the first amendment rights of assembly. It was the committees feeling that the rights of assembly on the UCR campus should enjoy greater latitude and greater freedom.

During the protests at the Regents meeting, a sworn officer declared “this is an unlawful assembly”. In the Committees view the declaration seemed to be a suppression of the right of assembly and was believed to be inappropriate. Therefore, the committee is bringing forth the idea that Academic Freedom embraces a right of assembly and expression.

The Chair opened up the floor for discussion.

Several individuals on the floor appreciated the spirit in which the resolution was presented, but did not agree on the wording as well as the implication of the two statements put together. Several individuals indicated a desire for a special meeting where further discussion could take place and answers could be sought after regarding the events at the Regents meeting before finalizing the resolution.

The motion to introduce the resolution at the next meeting of the University Committee on Academic Freedom was passed. The Chair noted the request for a special meeting in the near future.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

ATTEST:

D. Ozer, Secretary-Parliamentarian
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

Genie Mulari
Recording Secretary
We wish to call a special meeting of the Riverside division of the Academic Senate, in order to discuss a faculty resolution regarding the protection of free speech and assembly on campus. We feel that such a faculty response is urgently needed in light of the police brutality that we witnessed in response to the January 19 protests.

We are aware of the fact that a number of students were shot with rubber paint pellets at the January 19 protest. Astonishingly, the campus leadership not only failed to express concern regarding the use of violence against our own students, but also initially avoided even acknowledging this fact. The responses that we have received since that time have been extraordinarily vague and slippery, replete with unsubstantiated claims about the “threats” posed by these nonviolent protests. As faculty members on this campus, we feel a moral obligation to demand serious answers regarding what happened that day, not only in the interest of accountability, but also in the interest of establishing guidelines for protecting freedom of speech and assembly on campus in the future.

We wish also to examine the crowd control methods used by both the UC and Riverside police departments (and authorized by the campus leadership), which we feel were disproportionately violent. These officers moved directly to the violent use of batons and rubber bullets, rather than engaging in strategies for de-escalation or relying on the minimal use of force. Our special meeting therefore, will seek to emphasize that all response to campus protest cannot and must not be led by the presumption that force should always be an option, based on the unsubstantiated assumption that all protest presents a potential threat.

In addition to the use of violent force against our own students and others gathered that day, we are concerned about the fact that the protest was deemed an “unlawful assembly” with absolutely no explanation or justification. The special meeting will thus call for discussion of the question of who authorized the use of force on January 19th, what the grounds were for this authorization, what form it took, and how it was transmitted to the police confronting the demonstrators. We are also concerned with various reports about campus administrators engaging in surveillance and disciplinary actions that function to intimidate student protesters. In requesting this meeting, we also wish to observe that a number of our own faculty members and faculty members from other UC campuses, including a number of highly prominent academics, have signed a petition requesting answers regarding the events of January 19.

The goals of the special meeting would be the following:

1. To review, discuss, clarify and amend the resolution recently passed by the Senate regarding the protection of speech and assembly on our campus

2. To open a broader discussion regarding the official administrative response to the protests

3. To identify a set of principles that will complement the resolution in protecting speech and assembly on campus in future contexts, so that the university can adopt policies that encourage robust debate and peaceful protest

The special meeting seeks to introduce an amendment to the existing legislation. The existing legislation reads:

*The right of assembly and expression of views shall not be suppressed. Such assemblies and expressions, however, shall not interfere with the lawful conduct and public safety of others at the University."


The special meeting will therefore discuss the following amendment to the existing legislation:

"The right of assembly and expression of views shall not be suppressed. The Senate affirms, moreover:
(i) that peaceful protest is not only permissible but protected and valued as a vital form of speech;
(ii) that responses to campus protest should be led with the presumption that force should never be used against demonstrators."